

**REPRESENTATIONS AND TROPOLOGIES OF TERRORISM IN  
SELECTED AFRICAN, ASIAN AND NORTH AMERICAN PROSE  
WORKS**

**BY**

**ISRAEL OLUWASEUN ADELEKE**

**MATRIC NO.: 180409**

**B. A. English (Ondo), M. A. English (Ibadan)**

**A Thesis in the Department of English  
Submitted to the Faculty of Arts  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**of the**

**UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN**

**AUGUST, 2023**

## **CERTIFICATION**

I certify that this work was carried out by ISRAEL OLUWASEUN ADELEKE in the Department of English, University of Ibadan, under my supervision.

---

### **Supervisor**

E. B. Omobowale

B.A., M. A., Ph.D. (Ibadan)

Professor, Department of English, Faculty of Arts  
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to God Almighty, the fount of every knowledge, and to my late father,  
Pa. Fatai Ipadeola Adeleke, an epitome of diligence and excellence.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the rare gem, my darling wife, Oyinlola Adeleke, thank you for all your sacrifices, for filling the gaps during my absence and for tending the children. I appreciate your prodding, prayers, encouragement and intellectual critique. You are a great gift. And to our children – Imodoye, Oyelagba and Tamilore Adeleke – this kept daddy away then. I hope by the time you read this, you are already shining the light in your positive endeavours. I also acknowledge my mother, Mrs Nike Adeleke, for her continuous motherly love and prayers, and thank my siblings: Deborah and Tope Adeleke.

I appreciate immensely my supervisor, Professor Emmanuel B. Omobowale, who has been a father to me since I started this programme. If not for God and his advice, I would have deserted this thesis. I also acknowledge my various lecturers in the Department of English, University of Ibadan, especially the Head – Professor Olutoyin B. Jegede – and Dr Kazeem Adebisi-Adelabu, for making this journey a worthy one. I acknowledge my colleagues – especially Blessing Ochuku, Funmi Gaji and Iya Adewumi – for their constant support, calls and reminders.

I also thank Mrs Olajuyigbe, my surrogate mother at Adeyemi College of Education (now a university), for her contribution to this expedition, she cultivated in me the spirit of excellence. I commend Professor Olaniyan of the Department of Botany, University of Ibadan, for her profound support too.

God bless you all.

## ABSTRACT

Terrorism is a controversial subject because of its variations and the perpetrators. Extant literary studies have approached terrorism from the trauma perspective and the relationship between the West and its Others, with little attention paid to the textual representations and tropologies of terrorism in current colonial and postcolonial spaces. This study was, therefore, designed to examine the representations and tropologies of terrorism in selected African, Asian and North American prose works. This was with a view to establishing the forms and patterns of terrorism in the selected texts, the tropes employed and the alternatives proposed by the authors.

Frantz Fanon's, Edward Said's and Achille Mbembe's aspects of Postcolonial Theory were employed as the framework. The interpretive design was deployed. Africa, Asia and North America were purposively selected for high incidents of terrorism. Twelve texts (four from each region) were purposively sampled for their in-depth representations of terrorism. The works from Africa were Adaobi Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree (BBTBT)*, Yasmin Khadra's *Wolf Dreams (WD)*, Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones* and Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday (BOAT)*. The texts from Asia were Abdul Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban (MLWTT)*, Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner (TKR)*, Collin Mallard's *Stillpoint* and Elias Chacour's *Blood Brothers (BB)*. The texts from North America were John Updike's *Terrorist*, Amy Waldman's *The Submission*, Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* and James Yee's *For God and Country (FGAC)*. The texts were subjected to literary analysis.

Two forms of terrorism, non-state and state, are identified, with Islam playing prominent roles. Non-state terrorism spans Africa, Asia and North America; while state terrorism is more pronounced in Africa and Asia. The tropes deployed are betrayal, animalisation, master-slave, madness and olive trees. The postcolonial condition of Islam's connection with politics, socioeconomic deprivations, radical Islamic ideologies (*BOAT*, *BBTBT*, *Crossbones* and *WD*) and resistance against neocolonialism (*Crossbones*) promote Islamic (sectarian) terrorism in Africa. Necropower and state of exception (*BOAT*, *Crossbones* and *WD*) engender state terrorism. The tropes of betrayal, master-slave, animalisation and madness aid the representations (*BBTBT*, *BOAT* and *WD*). In Asia, the Taliban Government (1996-2001) and Israel's neocolonial occupation of Palestine signify state terrorism (*TKR*, *Stillpoint* and *BB*), while non-state terrorism underpins some Palestinians' resistance (*Stillpoint* and *BB*). The Taliban's image as saviours and terrorists represents the politicisation of terrorism (*MLWTT* and *TKR*). Non-violent protests, embracing peace, philosophical reflections and spirituality that respect justice and human dignity are proposed as non-violent humanist alternatives to terrorism (*Stillpoint* and *BB*). The trope of olive trees signifies peace (*Stillpoint* and *BB*). In North America, the stereotyping of non-Westerners as terrorists persists (*Terrorist*, *FGAC* and *FM*), while its deconstruction (*TS* and *FGAC*) focalises extremism among Westerners. The construction of extremist-Muslims as terrorists persists (*Terrorist*, *BOAT* and *Crossbones*), while there is emerging deconstruction of Muslims as terrorists (*FGAC*, *BBTBT* and *TS*).

In the selected African, Asian and North American prose works, the representations and tropologies of terrorism are marked by stereotyping and deconstruction of common prejudices.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Postcolonial condition, Neocolonial occupation, Necropower, Non-violent humanist precepts

**Word count:** 487

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Table of contents`	vi

### CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	8
1.3. Aim and objectives of the study	9
1.4. Research questions	10
1.5. Scope of the study	10
1.6. Significance of the study	10

### CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Chapter overview	12
2.1. Conceptual review	12
2.1.1. Interdisciplinarity	12
2.1.2 Global overview of terrorism	14
2.1.2.1. Pre-modern terrorism	14
2.1.2.2. Modern terrorism	21
2.1.2.3. Contemporary terrorism	44
2.1.3. Terrorism and literary expressions	53
2.1.4. Representations and tropologies	61
2.2. Review of empirical studies	63
2.2.1. Critical works on the representations of terrorism in literary expressions of Africa, Asia and North America	63
2.2.2. Tropologies of terrorism in literary discourse	82
2.2.3. Critical works on the sampled texts	85

2.3.	Theoretical framework	90
2.3.1.	The postcolonial project: violence, resistance, representation, and identity	93
2.3.2.	On Violence: Frantz Fanon as the frontier of postcolonialism and terrorism	93
2.3.3.	Edward Said and Postcolonialism: Resistance/Terrorism?	96
2.3.4.	War on terror, religious fundamentalism and the postcolonial text	104
2.3.5.	Models of interrogating post-colonial literatures	105
2.3.6.	Theorising postcolonial terror: state hegemony and non-state actors' resistance	106
2.4.	Chapter summary	108

### **CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY**

3.0.	Chapter overview	109
3.1.	Research design	109
3.2.	Study setting	109
3.3.	Population of the study	110
3.3.1.	Sampling method	110
3.4.	Methods of data collection	111
3.5.	Method of data analysis	111
3.6.	Chapter summary	111

### **CHAPTER FOUR ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF STATE TERRORISM AND NON-STATE TERRORISM IN POSTCOLONIAL AFRICAN FICTION**

4.0.	Chapter overview	112
4.1.	Representing Islamic sectarian terrorism, its affects, and tropes in selected Nigerian novels	113
4.1.1	Textual analysis of <i>Born on a Tuesday</i> : a brief background	117
4.1.1.1.	Salafi-Wahhabism, funding and Islamic sectarian terrorism in <i>Born on a Tuesday</i>	118
4.1.1.2.	<i>Born on a Tuesday</i> : Representing war against terror and necropower in the postcolony	130
4.1.1.3.	Othering, terrorists' identity, and its fantasy in <i>Born on a Tuesday</i>	134
4.1.1.4.	Tropes and representations of terrorism in <i>Born on a Tuesday</i>	139
4.1.1.5.	Agency and representations in <i>Born on a Tuesday</i>	143
4.1.2.	Textual analysis of Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's <i>Buried beneath the</i>	

<i>Baobab tree</i>	145
4.1.2.1. Communal life, dreams, and mediatisation of terrorism in <i>Buried beneath the Baobab Tree</i>	146
4.1.2.2. <i>Buried beneath the Baobab Tree</i> : representing the terror of victims and the agencies of women in terrorism	149
4.1.2.3. Tropes and representations of terrorism in <i>Buried beneath the baobab tree</i>	156
4.1.2.4. Style and narrativising of terrorism in <i>Buried beneath the baobab tree</i>	157
4.2. <i>Wolf dreams</i> by Yasmin Khadra: the historical background	158
4.2.1. <i>Wolf dreams</i> : plot account	162
4.2.2. The postcolonial condition as push factors to terrorism in <i>Wolf Dreams</i>	162
4.2.3. Representing terrorism, its motivations, and the changing figures of terrorists in <i>Wolf Dreams</i>	168
4.2.4. Narrativising terrorism and its tropes in <i>Wolf Dreams</i>	177
4.3. <i>Crossbones</i> by Nuruddin Farah: a background	179
4.3.1. Nuruddin Farah's <i>Crossbones</i> : plot account analysis	182
4.3.2. Representing terrorism, Al-Shabaab, and neo/occupation in <i>Crossbones</i>	183
4.3.3. Imperial counterterrorism force and the postcolony in <i>Crossbones</i>	188
4.3.4. Tropes of representing terrorism in <i>Crossbones</i>	191
4.4. Chapter summary	193

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TERRORISM AND NON-VIOLENT ALTERNATIVES IN SELECTED ASIAN AND AMERICAN PROSE WORKS AND COMPARATIVE REFLECTIONS

5.0. Chapter overview	195
5.1. Violence, occupation, and their representations in Israeli/Palestinian prose works	195
5.1.1. Elias Chacour's <i>Blood Brothers</i> : a brief account	203
5.1.1.1. Ruptured identities and the terror of occupation in <i>Blood Brothers</i>	203
5.1.1.2. Spirituality and nonviolent alternatives in <i>Blood Brothers</i>	214
5.1.1.3. Tropes in <i>Blood Brothers</i>	216
5.1.2. <i>Stillpoint</i> by Colin Mallard: plot overview	218
5.1.2.1. Representing Israeli/Palestinian terrorism in <i>Stillpoint</i> :	



colonialism, imperialism and the metaphors	218
5.1.2.2. Mediating nonviolent humanist alternatives to terrorism in <i>Stillpoint</i> : the nexus between culture and philosophy	225
5.1.2.3. The tropes in <i>Stillpoint</i>	228
5.2.    Afghanistan: History, Taliban(ism) and literature	230
5.2.1.    Abdul Salam Zaef's <i>My life with the Taliban</i> : An overview	244
5.2.1.1.    Of homeland and Soviet imperialism in <i>My life with the Taliban</i> : jihad, drives and the nuances	245
5.2.1.2.    Representing the Taliban in <i>My life with the Taliban</i> : the mujahideen terror, the drives and the self/group identity	250
5.2.1.3.    Representations of the United States' war on terror in <i>My life with     the Taliban</i> : the state of exception and othering	255
5.2.1.4.    Silence in the text: a critique of Zaef's representations of the Taliban	260
5.2.2.    The literary representations of the Taliban's terror and its nuances in Hosseini's <i>The kite runner</i>	262
5.3.    Representations of terrorism and the other in selected North American 9/11 novels	268
5.3.1.    Representing the Other in western novels about terrorism: a postcolonial perspective	268
5.3.2.    Representations of the hybridised postcolonial (terrorist) subject in John Updike's <i>Terrorist</i> : orientalisng and continuity	273
5.3.2.1.    Tropes and representations in <i>Terrorist</i>	279
5.3.3.    Representing post-9/11: fundamentalism, agencies and paradox in Amy Waldman's <i>The Submission</i>	280
5.3.3.1.    Fundamentalism and deconstruction of the stereotype in <i>The Submission</i>	282
5.3.3.2.    Symbolism, resistance and manipulative agency in <i>The Submission</i>	288
5.3.3.3.    The politics of representation and its ambivalence in <i>The Submission</i>	291
5.3.4.    Representations and tropes of terrorism in Don DeLillo's <i>Falling Man</i>	294
5.3.4.1.    Postcolonial unravelling: stereotypes, generalisations and	

continuity of representations in <i>Falling Man</i>	296
5.3.4.2. Tropes and metaphors in <i>Falling Man</i>	298
5.3.5. James Yee's <i>For God and country</i> : war on terror, colonial present, resistance and the question of hybridity	300
5.3.5.1. Representations of war on terror as state terrorism and colonial Present in Yee's <i>For God and country</i>	300
5.3.5.2. Space of exception, necropower and resistance in <i>For God and Country</i>	306
5.3.5.3. Stereotyping the hybridised postcolonial subject, the deconstruction and the trope in <i>For God and Country</i>	309
5.4. Comparative analysis: concatenation of the representations of terrorism in the selected prose works	312
5.4.1. Comparative reflections on representing terrorism in African novels	313
5.4.2. Comparative views on the representations of terrorism in selected Asian prose works	316
5.4.3. Comparative reflections on the representations of the postcolonial subjects and Islamic terrorism in the selected 9/11 American prose works	317
5.5. Summary of findings	323
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>	
<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
6.1. Summary of the study	324
6.2. Conclusion	326
6.3. Recommendations	327
6.4. Contributions to knowledge	327
6.5. Suggestions for further studies	327
<b>REFERENCES</b>	328

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background to the study**

Literature, globally, interrogates and engages diverse topical issues in societies. Such issues include war, corruption, love, betrayal, migration, displacement, terrorism and the like. From antiquity to this contemporary period, literature explores these issues to reflect and refract different societies. The relationship of literature with society has also extended its tentacles into different epistemological fields. This, over time, has established the relationship between literature and fields like sociology, history, philosophy, medicine, law, among others. This interdisciplinary undertaking is necessary to make literature remain relevant and to prove that no field of study is mutually exclusive. Emmanuel Omobowale (2008) proves this point and explains how medicine ‘provides the inspiration for the creation of art’ (p. 22). This is instructive that literature is not a mutually exclusive field of study.

Also, literature is a significant constituent of cultural studies. The implication of this is that other aspects of cultural studies have an immense influence on and relationship with literature. In consequence, literature has taken an interdisciplinary turn in recent times. Scott McClintock (2015) in his justification of the connection between literature, terrorism and counter-terrorism opines that the cultural field which comprises literature is ‘characterised by exchanges between different modes of knowledge’ (p. 3) and discourses like history, economics, law and politics. Thus, critics like Anthony Kubiak, Walter Laqueur, Alex Houen, Margaret Scanlan, and Scott McClintock have explored the relationship between literature and terrorism. The relationship is based on the contemporary connection between terrorism and its traumatic effects and literary representations, thematic engagements, mediations and the like. Therefore, this thesis interrogates and engages the various representations and tropologies of terrorism in the selected literatures of Africa, Asia and America.

Terrorism is one of the most challenging issues in modern time. The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in the United States and the spate of attacks by terrorists in Africa and around the world have drawn the attention of many scholars to terrorism. It must be emphasised that terrorism is not a recent issue. It has been in existence since the fifth and sixth centuries, starting with groups like the Sicarii, the Order of the Assassins, *et cetera*. However, it has changed in semantics from what it used to be in ancient times to its present meaning.

Writers like Joseph Conrad, Robert Louis Stevenson, Henry James, Fyodor Dostoevsky have explored terrorism in their various novels based on its synchronic symptoms during their time. Since the early twentieth century, fiction has been the most utilised literary space by writers to narrativise and figure terrorism (Francis Blessington, 2008; Frank and Guber, 2012). However, this does not mean terrorism as a topical issue is not examined in other literary genres. Thus, why literature and terrorism? According to Laqueur (1977), literature (fiction) avails the world to comprehend “the character and mental make-up of the dramatis personae” (p. 38) of a group or individual that perpetrates terrorism. Also, Laqueur (1977) states that fiction helps to understand the psychological motives of terrorists but he adds a caveat that fiction must be wary of overgeneralisation. On the other hand, terrorism provides fiction with materials for plot making and theme mapping.

Terrorism is one of the most difficult concepts to define in modern times due to its protracted history and its changing forms and meaning. Also, Ondrej Ditrych (2014) attributes this difficulty of definition to the politicisation of the term owing to its relationship with power. Philip Jenkins (2003) corroborates this stance by citing the example of the United States of America’s use of the term to its favour. Equally, he explicates that most governments have adopted terroristic tactics at one point or the other. Therefore, a diachronic examination is needed to fathom the mutative definitions of terrorism.

The history of terrorism is broad and diverse, covering a spectrum of centuries and spaces across the world in a non-linear pattern. Terrorism, in this guise, is based on its perpetration by both state and non-state actors. State terrorism has been designated top-down terrorism, perpetrated by the state and its actors, while non-state terrorism is bottom-up terrorism that is carried out by non-state actors. These two types have been dominant and have sometimes

existed concurrently in the same space at a particular period. Randall D. Law (2015) defines state terrorism as the use of violence by a state against its civilians similar to Mbembe's (2003) conceptualisation of necropolitics. In addition, Law (2015) opines that terrorism is based on the tripod of the perpetrators, the act against the few – the victims – and the reaction of many, the audience. This tripod on which terrorism is premised differentiates it from other forms of violence. Roger Griffin (2015) designates it “the triadic relationship between perpetrators, victims and targets” (p. 371). In converse, non-state terrorism is perpetrated by non-state actors against states or their representatives to accomplish a particular goal.

The terrorism in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century evoked literary responses from different prominent writers in Europe like Joseph Conrad, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Robert Louis Stevenson, among others. One might wonder why the comprehensive history of terrorism is important to literary analysis and interpretation. The apt response to this inquiry is that the diachronic understanding of terrorism provides the best perspective for comprehending the history of literary response to terrorism. This literary response in its modern sense is visible in literary works like Lord Byron's “Ourika,” Joseph Conrad's *Secret Agents*, Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Besy*, Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*, Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Dynamiter*, among others.

Therefore, based on the background of the historical examination of terrorism, it is apposite to examine some definitions of terrorism at this stage. It must be stated that no definition of terrorism is all-encompassing due to the elasticity of its meaning. However, some definitions provide some critical clues into what terrorism entails. David George (1988) defines terrorism as “instrumental violence” (400). He conceives terrorism as “a method or technique in which acts of violence are perpetrated or threatened in order to terrorise a particular group of people and, through their intimidation, to promote the practitioner's political objectives” (p. 400). Three points are to be noted in this definition viz. violence, intimidation, and political objectives. The implication is that some violent acts are perpetrated to intimidate a party/group of people to achieve a political objective. One may ask if terrorism is limited to political objectives, this is a lacuna in George's definition. Terrorism may be based on religious objectives, which, possibly, may transmute to a political objective.

In furtherance of the definition of terrorism, Michael C. Frank and Eva Guber (2012) expound terrorism as “politically, religiously or ideologically motivated acts” (p. 10). The definition of Frank and Guber (2012) is more encompassing than George’s, perhaps due to the time difference between their publications. From the two definitions, one can decipher that terrorism is based on various motives.

Also, Ditych (2014) defines terrorism as both a state and an activity. This involves the act of terrorising and being terrorised. In the author’s opinion, terrorism may be direct violence or a subtle campaign of fear to suppress the objects. This means terrorism can either be active or passive. Active engagement in terrorism is the violent form, while the indirect form comprises activities of either state or non-state actors to propagate fear and trauma in the citizens. The passive form of terrorism is the psychological aspect that perpetrates terrorism through subtle means. Stephen Sloan (2006) conceives terrorism “first and foremost as a form of psychological warfare” (p. 23). This significantly differentiates terrorism from all forms of violence because it is meant to send a message of fear to the audience based on ideological or political perspectives. Furthermore, there is a discourse on terrorism which deals with contriving, mapping, and configuring the identity of the Subject (terrorist) and the Objects (victims). Therefore, terrorism is a state, an activity that is supported by a discourse.

In continuation of terrorism as psychological warfare, Margaret Scanlan (2001) defines terrorism as a “violent means of communication” (p. 5) which may be symbolic. Critics like Alex Hoeun (2002) have argued that there is a symbolic communication that underpins the World Trade Centre attack on September 9, 2001. The World Trade Centre symbolically stands for economic prowess which was attacked to destroy the world economy as represented by the United States. Forms of killings by terrorists such as the slaughtering of captives’ throats are also a means of instilling fear in the people.

Terrorism as discourse has been described as hegemonic by many critics. The terrorist discourse has been mostly constructed and mapped by the West that defines the Subject/the object. This construction pervades dominant media framing which, in simple terms, means “one-sidedness in framing of a particular issue” (Mary Brinson and Michael Stohl, 2009:229). Furthermore, Solomon (2015) corroborates this stance that “discourses of and

about terrorism have largely been appropriated by the West and our understanding of the concept have been either broadened or narrowed by these discourses” (p. 5). This denotes that the conception of terrorism in terms of its nature and ontology is mostly determined by the West which is postcolonial owing to the argument by scholars like Edward Said that the West constructs knowledge and power to favour its vantage point. Solomon (2015) therefore raises a caveat that based on the westernisation of the terrorist discourse; terrorism in other spheres must be critically assessed as some actions which are terrorist in nature may be excluded. For example, Solomon (2015) quotes Oladosu Ayinde’s unique conceptualisation of terrorism in Africa into three phases namely: Afro-Oriental, Afro-Occidental, and Afro-Global. The first is the incursion of Arabs into Africa for slaves to further their economic development, while the second phase is the invasion of Africa for slaves by Europeans and the third is the colonisation of Africa. This *sui generis* perspective shows different types of terrorist violence that have been perpetrated in Africa hitherto that have not been mapped as a part of the wider discourse on terrorism.

Some basic features cut across the various definition of terrorism viz. symbolic violence, far-reaching psychological effects, innocent victims, and political or religious motives. Thus, for this thesis, terrorism is posited as the perpetration of extreme violence by state or non-state actors to instil fear in a designated population to achieve peculiar motives ranging from religious to secular. To explicate terrorism more, Laqueur (1999) in his groundbreaking book *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass destruction* expounds the different types of terrorism. In the book, he identified several types of modern and contemporary terrorism which include religious terrorism, political terrorism, state terrorism, narcoterrorism, ecoterrorism, among others. However, the different types of terrorism overlap.

Thus, in this thesis, state and non-state forms of terrorism, especially the sub-forms of religious and political terrorism, will be the focus that are interrogated in the selected texts. These forms of terrorism are based on their preponderance over the other types. Religious terrorism is based on religious fundamentalism, extremism, and radicalisation that culminate in various forms of violence. Laqueur (1999) gives an insight into how Voltaire engaged religious terrorism in some of his works. While Islamic terrorism is one of the

dominant forms of religious terrorism, there are other types like Zionism, Christian fundamentalism, Buddhist terrorism, and the like. David Canter (2009) argues that terrorism is “diverse and varied” (p. 2) and it has been perpetrated by people of all religions. Political terrorism is aimed at achieving a political objective. State terrorism is perpetrated by state actors or by proxy, while non-terrorism is carried out by non-state actors.

Why is the historical analysis of terrorism hitherto significant to this research? This diachronic trajectory is expedient to comprehend the response of literary writers to terrorism and their examination of the subject. As stated earlier, there is a symbiotic relationship between the history of terrorism and the history of the literary responses of writers to terrorism. Furthermore, political terrorism is usually connected with ideological or ethnonationalist terrorism based on opposition to foreign occupation. Such are the engagements of groups like the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO). Also, state terrorism is examined. This will be based on terrorism practised by a state on its citizens or the Other within its borders. This explication is based on the French Reign of Terror paradigm postulated as the genesis of modern terrorism. A contemporary example is the Taliban Government (1996-2001) in Afghanistan. It must also be stated that sometimes one form of terrorism overlaps the other. For example, it is not unusual for religious terrorism to intersect political terrorism. The representation of this relationship and its seeming tropes will be examined in the literatures selected for this thesis.

On the relationship between literature and terrorism, Anthony Kubiak’s 2004 essay “Narrative Typologies of Terror” provides a framework for categorising the relationship between literature and terrorism. The first is designated terrorist narratives. This type of narrative is written by the terrorists themselves. The narrative, in this sense, can be expanded into fictional works and non-fictional works which may include manifestoes, memoirs, among others. Examples include *The Abandoned Duty* by Abdul Salam Faraj and *The Armed Prophet* by Rifaat Sayed. Such narratives are mostly used to propagate and justify terrorism. The second classification by Kubiak (2004) is narratives about terrorism which include fictional exploration of terrorism, and critical examination of such literary works. This second classification is the major focus of this thesis. Modern works in this category include Joseph Conrad’s *Secret Agent* and *Under the Western Eyes*, Fyodor Dostoevsky’s



*Besy*. The third typology by Kubiak (2004) is narrative terrorism. This type of narrative is terroristic in nature by disrupting the established discursive order, causing violence in terms of the subjects invoked. Examples of such texts include Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*. Frank and Guber (2012) rename Kubiak's first classification the terrorist literature which means literature by terrorists, the second is terrorism in literature which is premised on thematisation of terrorism while the third is literature as terrorism which signifies "literature as a phenomenon analogous to terrorism to established order" (p. 9).

For this thesis, most of the works selected are based on the second category viz. terrorism in literature or narratives about terrorism except Abdul Salam Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban* (2010) which belongs to the first category. The selected literatures for this thesis are Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner* (2004), James Yee's *For God and Country* (2005), John Updike's *Terrorist* (2006), Yasmina Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* (2007), Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* (2007), Abdul Salam Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban* (2010), Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones* (2011), Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2011), Collin D. Mallard's *Stillpoint* (2012), Elias Chacour with David Hazard *Blood Brothers* (2013, first published 1984), Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* (2015) and Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* (2019).

The novels and autobiographies are drawn from former colonies of Britain and France. *The Kite Runner* is set in Afghanistan, *Terrorist* in America, *For God* in America and Cuba (Guantanamo Bay), *Falling Man* in America and Germany, *The Submission* in America and Afghanistan, *Wolf Dreams* is set in Algeria, *Crossbones* in Somalia, *Stillpoint* in Palestine, Israel and America, *Blood Brothers* in Israel, France and Palestine, *Born on a Tuesday* and *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* in Nigeria. The selection of these narratives extends the argument of interrogating and engaging the representations of terrorism and the tropes deployed beyond the Euro-American novels which have become a hegemonic form of discourse in literature and terrorism.

This thesis, therefore, aims to explore and interrogate the representations of terrorism and the tropes deployed from a comparative perspective, taking particular interest in the intersections and gaps based on the geographical setting of the narratives in the postcolony and the Othering of the terrorist's Subject in the contemporary western canon, especially in

America, a former colony that has joined the imperial order and become its vanguard. Also, this thesis examines the different tropes and symbolic portrayal of terrorists in the selected texts. The question of Palestine and Israel will also be examined based on terrorism as resistance.

## **1.2. Statement of the problem**

Numerous critics have examined the different relationships between literature and terrorism. Critics like Alex Houen, Margaret Scanlan, Walter Laqueur, Anthony Kubiak, Scott McClintock among others, are among those that have done groundbreaking works in this area. However, most critics have concentrated more on Western novels and Indian novels like in the case of McClintock's (2015) work. This has been at the expense of novels from Africa and some peculiar Asian countries like Palestine and Afghanistan. Also, most critics have concentrated more on interrogating the representation of political terrorism in European and American novels at the expense of religious and state terrorism. Another prominent aspect that has been examined is writers as terrorists (Scanlan, 2001) which falls under literature as terrorism.

Houen (2002) interrogates the various shades of terrorism in modern literature but Houen's (2002) coverage of modern literature does not encompass the postcolonial literature which is a gap. Equally, Scanlan (1990, 1994 and 2001) expounds broader perspectives of terrorism in literature, even from the postcolonial angle, however, there is no connection between terrorism in the metropole and the postcolony, especially from a comparative analysis. Also, Scanlan (2001) and Houen (2002) neglect the implication of war on terrorism on the postcolonial subject. McClintock (2015) focalises the connection between terrorism and counterterrorism in 20th-century fiction of Indian and American authors and this extends the argument of counterterrorism as a critical issue in fiction. Nevertheless, McClintock's (2015) still valorises the hegemony of American and Indian texts that have received a glut of critical exegesis. Boehmer and Morton (2010) provide a foundation for this study by accentuating the connection between terrorism and war on terror in the Global North and the postcolony, the perpetuation of the colonial present and the essence of apprehending and subverting imperial history. Although they do not engage in any textual exegesis, their praxis of interrogation demands paying more attention to different guises of

terrorism perpetrated by both state and non-state actors. Equally, Anjuli F. R. Kolb (2021) evinced how metaphors of epidemics have been deployed from the colonial epoch till present to depoliticise terrorism and avail stratospheric security mechanism for war against terrorism. Kolb's (2021) critique essentialises the appropriation of tropes for strategic aims.

Consequently, little critical attention has been paid to how certain extreme violence/terrorism perpetrated by state and non-state actors is represented in postcolonial literature in Africa and some cardinal countries in Asia in comparison to their counterpart, Euro-American literature. Furthermore, less critical attention has been paid to the aesthetical tropes employed in the representation of terrorism in postcolonial novels, except Kolb (2021) and Laqueur (1977). Laqueur's (1977) synoptic appraisal requires deployment in contemporary prose works. It is also observed that not much attention has been paid to literary responses to religious terrorism regarding representations and tropologies. Therefore, this thesis wishes to complement the literature on the representations and tropologies of terrorism in postcolonial literature, especially from specific, former British and French colonies whose colonial heritage continues to rupture their spaces. Similarly, this thesis seeks to examine the representations and tropologies of terrorism in the selected African, Asian and American literatures from comparative and transnational perspectives. The inquest of this thesis is to fill the gap of the meagre critical work on the representations of terrorism and its sundry tropes in selected African and Asian novels in comparison with Euro-American novels.

### **1.3. Aim and objectives of the study**

This research aims to examine the representations and tropologies of terrorism in the selected prose works. The objectives of this study are to

- i. establish the forms and patterns of terrorism represented in the selected prose works;
- ii. critically examine how place or spatial configuration impacts the representations of terrorism in the selected texts;
- iii. interrogate the tropologies of terrorism employed as narrative strategies;
- iv. critically identify the alternatives to terrorism proposed by the authors in the selected prose works and

- v. interrogate the concatenation among the texts.

#### **1.4. Research questions**

Based on the background given above, this thesis aims to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How are different forms and patterns of terrorism represented in the prose works?
2. How does “place” or spatial configuration impact the representations of terrorism in the selected texts?
3. What are the aesthetical tropes of terrorism that are employed as narrative strategies in the selected texts?
4. What are the alternatives to terrorism that are proposed in the selected prose works?
5. What is the concatenation among the selected texts?

#### **1.5. Scope of the study**

The study covers the literary expressions of strategic countries in Africa, Asia, and North America. The narratives selected for this thesis range from prose fiction to autoiographies. Khaled Hosseini’s *The Kite Runner* (2004), James Yee’s *For God and Country* (2005), John Updike’s *Terrorist* (2006), Yasmina Khadra’s *Wolf Dreams* (2007), Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man* (2007), Abdul Salam Zaeef’s *My Life with the Taliban* (2010), Nuruddin Farah’s *Crossbones* (2011), Amy Waldman’s *The Submission* (2011), Collin D. Mallard’s *Stillpoint* (2012), Elias Chacour with David Hazard *Blood Brothers* (2013, first published 1984), Elnathan John’s *Born on a Tuesday* (2015) and Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani’s *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* (2019).

#### **1.6. Significance of the study**

This thesis provides insight into the representations and tropologies of state and non-state terrorism, especially religious and political, in the selected literary texts from a comparative perspective. This is a departure from the usual hegemonic and popular stance of interrogating religious terrorism mostly in western novels. Thus, this thesis interrogates terrorism from the unique perspective of each geographical space represented in the texts

and a comparative engagement of the texts based on their regions as represented in the prose works.

Furthermore, the thesis provides insight into the tropes deployed. Equally, this research is undertaken to complement the body of knowledge in literature and terrorism, especially from a postcolonial perspective, and to expand critical attention beyond American/Western prose works to other regions. This research also examines how literature and terrorism can extend beyond terrorism to its alternatives. Equally, this research expatiates the link between terrorism and war against terror in the Global North and the postcolony and evinces the differences guises of terrorism that are perpetrated by the state and the empire and the implications on literary expressions and culture. This research reveals how some authors, in their representations of terrorism, propose alternatives to terrorism which furthers the discourse of literature and terrorism and demands the shift to new modes of research in literature and terrorism as well as postcolonial studies.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0. Chapter overview**

This chapter comprises the conceptual review, basically interdisciplinarity, empirical review of related literature, the theoretical framework and the chapter summary. Interdisciplinarity underpins the conceptual framework of this research, while postcolonialism serves as the theoretical framework.

#### **2.1. Conceptual review**

In this section, the concepts that are related to this study are reviewed. The concepts comprise interdisciplinarity, terrorism and its general overview, representations and tropologies.

##### **2.1.1. Interdisciplinarity**

Disciplines have been a subtle method of knowledge categorisation and differentiation since antiquity. In the Greco-Roman world, categorisation of knowledge served as a medium for knowledge acquisition unlike the current ordering of knowledge based on disciplines. The current ordering of knowledge entrenches rigid specialisation, the hierarchy of knowledge, and the politics of fixing arbitrary disciplinary boundaries for research funding. This is in contrast with the cross-disciplinary approaches and web-oriented focus of interdisciplinary studies or interdisciplinarity. Hence, this section presents interdisciplinarity as an argument for literature and terrorism.

Interdisciplinary studies have two major theories: the instrumental theoretical approach and the critical theoretical approach. The instrumental theoretical approach is most relevant in the sciences based on its practical proclivities. This approach involves bringing researchers from different scientific fields together to solve a practical problem, for example, the

building of the atomic bomb. The critical approach is also designated the synoptic approach by Ato Quayson (2000). It involves borrowing concepts widely from diverse fields of study. This is the basis of postcolonialism according to Graham Huggan (2008). He argues that postcolonialism as an epistemological approach is comparative and interdisciplinary. Klein (2010) believes the critical theoretical approach in interdisciplinary studies aims at interrogating the dominant structure of knowledge and education like Edward Said (2003) in *Orientalism* questions the (mis)representation of the Orient by the West. Critical approaches also aim at decentering the western epicenter and reifying the subaltern and the marginalised.

In the humanities, literature has been a primary site of interdisciplinary studies. Such studies include deconstruction of texts; psychoanalysis – a marriage of psychology and literature, feminist approach, literature and medicine – with emphasis on bioethics and the like (Omobowale, 2007). Literature therefore fosters interdisciplinarity through its permissiveness to theoretical approaches from other fields. In consequence, interdisciplinarity is crucial for the comprehension of the nexus between literature and terrorism. Terrorism has become a complex concept and its dissection requires insights from other fields like history, religious studies, political science, and the like. For a comprehensive understanding of terrorism within the literary space, an interdisciplinary approach is expedient. The insights from other fields will provide a critic with analytical insights into terrorism, its scope, and the diverse typologies of terrorism. In addition, it will acquaint one with the socio-political prejudice attached to terrorism as a term and its historical development hitherto. Therefore, an interdisciplinary approach to literature and terrorism will enhance the knowledge of the form of terrorism represented in literature; familiarise one with the causal factors that writers interrogate, the psychological drives of terrorism, and the terminologies of terrorism as well as its sundry fields necessary for in-depth analysis of terrorism in literature.

For this thesis, the interdisciplinary critical and comparative approach will be adopted through the theoretical lens of postcolonialism. This interdisciplinary general method underpins the critical theoretical approach explicated by Klein (2005, 2010) and Quayson (2000). Some of the relevant subthemes in literature and terrorism comprise representations

and religious terrorism in literary texts; Islamophobia in literary and popular fictions; hegemony and the representations of terrorism in literature; violence and political terrorism in literary texts; ethnocentrism and terrorism; symbols, metaphors, and tropes of terrorism in literature; plotting of terrorism in literature; stereotypes and literary representations of terrorism; state terrorism and literature; gendering terrorism in fiction; feminising victims in the fiction of terrorism and the like. In all, interdisciplinarity is an indispensable approach to the critical appraisal of terrorism in literature and its connection to the material world.

### **2.1.2. Global overview of terrorism**

Some terroristic events serve as precursors for others in subsequent periods; therefore, events in one period remain a sequel to those in the next. A good illustration is the nuanced connection between the Sicari of the pre-modern period and the modern Zionist terrorist groups in Israel. Pre-modern terrorism spans the antiquity period to the Middle Ages. It marks the period of the Ancient Syrians, the Sicariis, the Assassins, the Mongols and the tyrannicides of the ancient world and the Middle Ages. Modern terrorism starts from the French Revolution, also known as the Reign of Terror, to the period before the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. Modern terrorism is marked by the ideas of Enlightenment which foregrounds individual liberty and the essence of human reason. Modernity according to Griffin (2015) signifies the era of “anti-traditional forces...the secularization of society, politics...intensified social mobility, the rise of science, materialism, individualism” (p. 370), among other factors. Modernity entrenched by the Western revolution of ideas has generated different forms of terrorism from the small-scale to the large-scale. The last categorisation of terrorism is contemporary terrorism which runs from the post-1979 Iranian revolution and the Afghan war against the Russian invasion to the globalisation of mujahideens’ violence and religious terrorism, the Palestinian and Israeli exchange of terrorism, and various terrorist groups in Africa like Boko Haram in Nigeria.

#### **2.1.2.1. Pre-modern terrorism**

The term terrorism is not in existence in the ancient world. However, scholars like Law (2009), Bruce Hoffman (2006), have drawn a link between the violence perpetrated in the



pre-modern era and what is now conceptualised as terrorism. The acts in this era centred on violence as symbolic acts, violence to instil fear and other modes of violence that suit the terror category.

### **The Assyrians**

Many kingdoms and empires in the ancient world employed psychological warfare to conquer their enemies and to instil fear against any rebellion in occupied territories. The Assyrians were an example of ancient kingdoms that waged wars using systematic terrors to decimate their enemies. Law (2009) regards the Assyrians as the “ancient world’s fiercest and most violent people” (p. 12). The Assyrians organised their armies to conquer large territories and leave vestiges of their triumphs to create fear in other territories to cower and subdue psychologically potential resistance. Emperor Assurnasirpal II, according to Law (2009), conquered the city of Susa and bragged about how he decimated the leaders of the city and left the remaining denizens of the city to hunger and thirst in the desert. In addition, Alexander the Great terrorised his enemies and subdued revolt with terror like the Theban revolt. This made his enemies submit to him in volition.

### **The Sicarii of Judea**

The Sicarii was a terrorist group that existed in Judea in the early first and second centuries. The group’s activities were mainly chronicled by Flavius Josephus. Josephus (translated by William) refers to them as robbers but a close examination of the Sicarii’s actions and violence pitches them in the same tent with contemporary terrorists. The group was established by Judah of Galilee and the members are sometimes referred to as the Zealots (Gerard Chaliand and Arnaud Blin, 2007). The Sicarii’s main contempt is the occupation of Judea by the Romans, a foreign power. This is similar to the occupation of Afghanistan by Russia, Ireland by Britain, in the modern era. According to Robert Taylor (2002), Judea was turned into a colony of Rome in 63 B.C. by the Roman Legions commanded by General Pompey and a Roman governor was later installed by Emperor Augustus.

Apart from the occupation or colonisation of Judea by the Romans, other factors contributed to the rebellion of the Sicarii. Donathan Taylor and Yannick Gautron (2015) enumerate them as the reduction of the political authority of the high priesthood of Judea, the rebuilding

of several towns that culminated in the high influx of Gentiles into Judea, the imposition of onerous taxes on the masses and the obligation to pay the taxes with the Roman coin that bore the emperor's image, which was opposed to the Jewish religious ordinance. In addition, Emperor Nero confiscated the gold and sundry treasures in the temple when he needed finance for his opulent life. This was greatly opposed by the Jewish masses. Therefore, the Sicarii rebelled against religious, social and political injustice.

Like their contemporaries, the Sicarii identified their potential enemies within the Jewish communities as the Hellenised Jews and other Jews that collaborated with the Roman occupiers. According to Josephus (1961), the Sicarii engaged in "plundering their property, rounding up their cattle, and setting fire on their habitations" (p. 577). They regarded the Jewish collaborators as aliens and terrorised them to instil fear in the masses. Furthermore, the Sicarii employed the Roman *sicae* as their weapon of destruction. Josephus described *sicae* as a short dagger that was hidden in the robes of the Sicariis and it was used to stab their victims among crowds of people, especially during festive periods. They killed their victims openly for publicity and served as precursors for the contemporary terrorists that seek global attention by engaging in symbolic violence to gain the attention of the mass media. To the Sicariis, killing their victims alone was not enough compared to the open killing that filled people with terror.

Another terroristic technique employed by the Sicariis was the kidnapping of prominent Jews for ransom and in exchange for the release of their captured members. Menachem, the Sicarii leader in Jerusalem, made the group capture Jews that belonged to the gentry and trade them for the apprehended members of his group. For example, Ananias – a collaborator with the Romans and a high priest – suffered in the hands of the Sicariis. His servants were captured and used as barter for the release of captured Sicarii. The Romans later quelled the Sicarii rebellion and this made them leave Jerusalem for a fortress named Masada. Eleazar became the leader of the Sicariis when they receded to the mountain of Masada. The Sicariis pillaged villages, killed women and children, stole from people and burnt villages to intimidate the masses and make Judea an ungovernable place for the Romans.

At this point, the Romans sent troops that besieged the fortress of Masada. They built a fence around the mountain and waited for the Sicarii to turn themselves in. Eleazar spoke to his followers and proselytised them on the essence of martyrdom in contrast to them dying in the hands of aliens/the gentiles. The Sicarii slaughtered one another and the last of them fell on his sword. However, about nine of them survived as captured by Josephus. The Sicarii served as an inspiration for the Zionists against Palestinians and the British.

### **The Assassins of Persia**

Another terrorist group during the pre-modern period was the Assassins of Persia led by Hassan i-Sabbah. The Assassins were a brand of Shi'a Islam. Chaliand and Blin (2007: p. 61) trace the emergence of the group to the conflict that ruptured the Islamic world after the demise of Prophet Mohammed. Abu Bakr was picked to succeed the Prophet after his death as the Caliph but it was contested by some who believed that the successor of Prophet Mohammed should be a descendant. The latter group picked Ali, the Prophet's cousin, and this culminated in the formation of the Shiite movement known as followers of Ali. The ripples continued within the Shi'a group between Isma'il and Musa, the sons of the sixth Imam, Ja'far, which led to the further disintegration and fragmentation of the Shiite movement.

Isma'ili developed into a separate Islamic group that led to the emergence of the Assassins. The struggle of the Assassins was against the Sunni Turks represented by the rule of Seljuk Sultan (Law 2009). Sabbah was also involved in a power tussle and supported Nizar as a candidate for the Fatimid throne. Therefore, the Assassins were also regarded as the Nizaris. Sabbah rooted his terrorism in religion and made his followers swear an oath that could cause them death from Allah if violated. He planned to overthrow the Seljuk regime, a Sunni rule, and enthrone himself as the ruler.

Sabbah was strategic in the establishment of his group. He preached to the belligerent group, the people of the Daylam region of Northern Persia, and won them over (Chaliand and Blin, 2007: p. 64). He and his followers later receded to the fortress of Alamut in Elbuz mountain in modern-day Tehran like the Sicariis sought succour in the fortress of Masada. These early terrorist groups like their contemporaries excluded themselves to strategise and perpetrate

violent attacks. The Assassins had been designated the forerunners of present-day Jihadists. Sabbah drugged his followers and made them hallucinate about “a paradise filled with damsels” (Taylor, 2002) before he sent them on a mission. This is similar to the current proselytisation in some radical Islamic ideologies that suicide bombers who martyr themselves will experience satisfaction with virgins in the transcendental world. The Assassins named themselves *Fedayeen* meaning they were willing to sacrifice themselves for a cause.

Assassination was the major technique of the Assassins. They employed assassination for the elimination of opponents and anybody that stood in their way. Their first victim was Nizam al-Mulk, a prominent vizier of the Seljuk regime. He was assassinated by Bu Tahir Arrani on October 16, 1092 (Chaliand and Blin, 2007: p. 66) during Ramadan. The group used their acts of assassination to engender fear and as a means of psychological warfare against the Sunni Turks. They also engaged in systematic violence and later gravitated towards expanding their ideologies and occupying territories. The Assassins expanded their missions and occupied territories like Aleppo, and Damascus and promoted their religious and political propaganda. Assassins also killed with daggers. The Assassins killed the King of Jerusalem in 1192. They used threats, systematic violence and assassinations to widen their influence. However, the Seljuk regime used terroristic violence to counter the Assassins. The regime used its troops to decimate and humiliate the sympathisers of the group. This is analogous to the current counter-terrorism of some modern states that have been conceived as terroristic too. The Assassins were later conquered by the Mongols under the rule of Genghis Khan. The Assassins were highly regarded because of their organisation and practice of systematic terror to further their agenda as well as expansionist conquests. The group wielded power between the 1090s and 1220s. Their main objectives were to defeat the Sunni Turks, defend their Nizarii Shiism, and propagate their brand of Islam to other territories.

### **Tyrannicide in the pre-modern world**

According to David George (1988), terrorism starts after tyrannicide. Tyrannicide was preponderant during classical antiquity and this is based on the assassination of a tyrant or despot by an individual for the good of the masses. Tyrannicide, according to George

(1988), started with Harmodius and Aristogeiton who freed the Athenians from the Peisistratid tyranny of Hippias and are regarded as the “founders of Athenian democracy” (p. 392). They both stabbed Hipparchus, a tyrannical ruler of Athens, in 514 B. C. Law (2009) states that the two lovers were the first humans to have statues erected in their honour. In addition, other examples of tyrannicide given by Law (2009) include the murder of the tyrant Phalaris of Acragas (in Sicilia) by Telemachos in 554 BCE and the assassination of Polycrates by Cambyses in 515 BCE. In Rome, Brutus lured Caesar to the Senate and was dealt a powerful blow in 44 BCE and this eventually climaxed in the collapse of the republic and the Roman Empire.

The concept of a tyrant in antiquity varied and was equivocal. A tyrant could be someone that was against democracy, a ruler that forced himself to power, or a despot. Johannes Dillinger (2015) opines that scholars during the classical period supported tyrannicide. Dillinger (2015) gives the examples of Plato who considered the killing of a tyrant an obligation as well as Aristotle who was against tyranny. During antiquity, tyrannicide was more common in Greece than in Rome because Rome had laws prohibiting tyranny. Therefore, it is tyrannicide that translates to terrorist political assassination during the French and Russian revolutions. However, Dillinger (2015) adds a twist to the argument of tyrannicide as a pre-terrorism form by opining that tyrannicide is not the forerunner of terrorism but the tyrants. He conceives a tyrant as an anti-order or anti-democrat who is synonymous with the current terrorists.

The line between tyrannicide and terrorism, especially during the Middle Ages, was very blurry due to the changing forms of terrorism. Laqueur (2002) holds the belief that tyrannicide provides the “inspiration for nineteenth-century terrorism thought” (p. 22). In the Middle Ages, many scholars wrote differing pieces on tyrannicide and even politicised it. John of Salisbury wrote in support of tyrannicide but argued against it towards the end of his life. Also, John Aquinas preached against tyranny but was ambivalent about tyrannicide and contended that it should not be the first option. Aquinas opined that tyrannicide might snowball to greater tyranny. Nevertheless, righteous killing featured among Christians and Muslims during the Middle Ages. The conflicts between the Church and the State also intensified the justification of tyrannicide in this era.

## **The Mongols**

The Mongols were a nomad society that practised terrorism against their enemies, especially under Genghis Khan (c. 1162 to 1227) and its successors between the 13th and 14th centuries. Khan united the Mongolian tribe in Eurasia. Since ancient times, terror had been employed during wars to make prospective enemies submit to the conqueror, without resistance. The Mongols believed they were “destined by God to establish His order all over the world” (Peter Bernholz, 2017: p. 27). The Mongols exhibited the first trait of state terrorism and absolutism pitched on the monotheistic supreme values of Islam. The Mongols believed their rulers were destined to rule the world and they appropriated terroristic tactics to expand their kingdom. The Mongols had the best organised army of their time and maintained Spartan lives to sustain their military prowess. They besieged cities and subdued their enemies most aggressively. They killed about one hundred thousand Assassins after they surrendered and destroyed Alamut to prevent the resurgence of the Assassins. The group also expanded beyond their homeland to the hinterland of China and the whole of Asia. The most notorious use of terrorism was by Tamerlane, a successor of Khan, who massacred civilian populations and arranged heads as pyramids to send fear to potential enemies.

## **The Thuggees**

The Thuggees rampaged in ancient India and perpetrated terrorism from 6 AD to the 1800s. They practised systematic killings of travellers as inspired by the worship of Kali, the Hindu goddess of death and destruction, according to Taylor (2002). They waylaid rich travellers, strangled them with a scarf, their symbolic weapon, and distributed their wealth among themselves. They practised these killings in the presence of their children hidden nearby and handed down the practice to them. Their victims were buried in shallow graves marked with a pickaxe to signify their brand of symbolic violence. It was the British that ended the terror of the Thuggees when it threatened their colonial administration. According to Taylor (2002), Captain William Sleeman of the British Army was used to eliminate the Thuggees’ menace between 1828 and 1840.

In conclusion, pre-modern terrorism featured more non-state terrorism than state terrorism and the terrorist acts of this period inspired the terrorists of the subsequent periods. The terrorist acts of this period were rooted in religious ideology, anti-occupation/colonialism, expansion of empire, and the like. These acts featured symbolic violence, the use of publicity by killing victims among crowds, and the use of ungoverned or remote spaces like the fortress of Masada and Alamut. These remote spaces are similar to Boko Haram's use of Sambisa forest in Nigeria.

#### **2.1.2.2. Modern terrorism**

The modern era was a period of astronomical increase in terrorism. The age witnessed the terror of anti-monarchism, anti-imperialism, ethnonationalism, far-right violence, far-left violence, slavery, colonial terror, and most predominantly religious fundamentalism. The provenance of this age has been traced by many, especially Western, scholars to the French Revolution and the State of Terror although slavery started before the French revolution. Modern terrorism is a significant period in the development of terrorism owing to the confluence of diverse factors namely the mediatisation of terrorism, the transnationalism of terrorism, the technologisation of terrorism, and the like.

#### **The Transatlantic Slavery**

Transatlantic slavery was one of the most horrible experiences of terror on a large-scale. It is apologetic that most Western scholars hardly mark this as the beginning of terrorism in the modern era or chronicle the terror that was employed in capturing and shipping slaves from Africa to the Caribbean and the Americas. The mercantile of slavery was the sequel to the discovery of the New World in 1492. With the discovery of the New World and the proliferation of plantations, slaves were acquired and commodified in different markets and used as mules to work the plantations. Achille Mbembe (2003) states that "any historical account of the rise of modern terror needs to address slavery" (p. 21). He expounds that the plantation systems are sites of the state of exception where masters possessed the power to make a slave live or die. Slaves were systematically acquired and shipped across the Atlantic under the most miserable conditions, some thrown into the sea and others sold to masters who subject them to terror. Mbembe (2003) asserts that a slave experienced three losses:

loss of home, loss of rights over his or her body, and loss of political rights. According to him, a slave “is kept alive but in a *state of injury*, in a phantom-like world of horrors and intense cruelty and profanity...a form of death-in-life” (p. 21). The lack of allusion of most Western scholars to the terror of slavery as part of the rise of modern terrorism is an instance of epistemic violence, aporia, blind spot, and the complicity between knowledge, commerce and power.

### **The French Revolution**

The French Revolution, also known as the Reign of Terror, was the time of the Jacobins when terror was unleashed through the machinery of the state. According to Taylor (2002), the Reign of Terror was a sequel to the economic hardship foisted on the masses by King Louis XVI and the extravagance of Marie Antoinette. In the late 18th century, in France, the monarchy was the source of all power and the profiteers were the nobles as well as the Catholic Church while the masses were subjected to abject poverty and unbearable taxes. Mike Rapport (2015) traced the genesis of the Revolution to the crisis that the monarchy faced and its reluctance to share its power with an elected National Assembly. Despite the fiscal, political and social impasse confronted by King Louis XVI, he believed in the absolutism of the monarchy and refused to submit to any electoral demands by the masses. The monarchy was later overthrown in August 1792 and a republic was declared in September which birthed the Reign of Terror in France.

After the dethronement of the monarchy, a National Convention was formed under the vanguard of Maximilien Robespierre while other Jacobins filled the assembly. They were driven by the Enlightenment principles of individualism and the superiority of reason. The Jacobins, after gaining power, developed theories of terror to support their policies of violence. The guillotine became a symbol of state repression of opponents, anti-state actors, pro-monarchists and the Girondins. King Louis XVI, for example, was convicted in January 1793 and guillotined in public. The Jacobins’ absolutism replaced monarchical absolutism and created ad-hoc state organs to terrorise its citizens and opponents. In addition, Stephen Sloan (2006) describes the French Revolution as characterised by mass oppression and mass execution. It is an example of state terrorism which is analogous to the Taliban regime in Afghanistan between 1996 and 2001.



The two institutions created for the execution of the top-down terror were Committee for Public Safety (CPS) and Committee for General Security (CGS). In addition, a revolutionary tribunal was established to try political opponents, named traitors, without appeal. The state instituted terror as its policy, executed numerous people in a day and sent many to prison under flimsy excuses of anti-state activities. The guillotine became a symbol of fear to the public. Terror was unleashed against those accused of speculation, hoarding, collaboration with France's foreign enemies and anyone associated with the old order (Law, 2009). Many were executed for expressing dissenting opinions about the administration and this made Edmund Burke invent the word terrorism to describe the reign of violence in France.

During the Reign of Terror, two types of terror subsisted (Rapport, 2015). The two were the top-bottom terror also known as state terror and the bottom-top terror which was executed by the masses. The masses wanted direct democracy while the Jacobins were adamant about preserving the republic governed by them. Hence, there were state terror and popular terror. This led to the emigration of many people from France. Violence became a state policy that was promoted by the local CPS and CGS. Members of the Convention became local dictators and the Tribunal passed numerous death sentences that led to the execution of at least 30 citizens daily.

Furthermore, France was in a battle against its neighbours during the reign of terror. Some of the countries bordering France saw the perilous anti-monarchy trend and decided to wage war against France to dissuade such insurrection within their borders. These countries formed a coalition and fought to restore the monarchical system in France. While within France, the Convention was against itself. Robespierre executed many of his opponents based on trump-up charges and this stirred severe opposition against him. The French Reign of Terror ended in July 1794 when Robespierre was guillotined. The psychological fear and the symbolic violence that was pervasive during the Reign of Terror were represented in "Ourika" by Lord Byron, a biographical short story of a slave, Ourika, caught in the revolution. According to Ourika:

Meanwhile, the revolution was making rapid progress;  
people were frightened to see the most violent men take over

all places. It soon appeared that these men were determined to respect nothing: during the dreadful days of June 20 and August 10, people had to prepare themselves for any eventuality. What was left of Mme de B's society scattered at that time: some fled from persecutions to foreign countries, the others went into hiding or retired into the country. **(No pagination)**

The extract above depicts the extent of the terror appropriated in France during the French Revolution and the relationship between terrorism and literature as a recorder of history and the nuanced layers that accompany the intersection.

### **America: native terrorism, colonial terrorism and racial terrorism**

There was a preponderance of terrorism in North America during colonialism. It was employed by various sides: the colonisers, the colonised and the natives. According to Matthew Jennings (2015), Europeans “relied on terror to keep a large enslaved population in check and at work” (p. 77). However, terrorism existed in America before the advent of the Europeans. Terror was utilised by the natives against their adversaries including the European invaders. The European invaders adopted hyper-terroristic tactics to counter the natives which included burning captives alive as symbolic violence. The Chaco and the Cahokia were among the natives that adopted terroristic violence to wade off invaders; they roasted some alive and mutilated others. These were native terrorism: terrorism performed by natives.

In addition, Spanish invaders engaged in terrorism in the mid-1500 by burning natives at the stake, setting dogs on people, kneecapping and cropping of noses of natives. The Spanish's aggravated adoption of symbolic violence was later designated the Black Legend (Jennings, 2015). The Spaniards, knowing that the natives of Northern America were belligerent, terrorised the natives to make them surrender their spaces and treasures. The Spaniards engaged in colonial terrorism.

Furthermore, English colonisation escalated terrorism in North America. There was an exchange of violence between the English and the natives. A vivid example was the extent of violence meted out to Native Virginians by slaughtering the royal family. The English that established New England were terroristic and the natives conducted terror attacks too

as reprisals against the English. The English set fire on surrounded villages and burnt natives alive; while natives captured different English servicemen and slaughtered them. Thus, “terror and colonization went hand in hand in North America” (Jennings, 2015:80)

The war for independence by the thirteen colonies of America was imbued with terroristic violence while American slaves faced various degrees of violence on the slave plantations as well. Independence was achieved by the use of terrorism which inspired the subsequent anti-colonial struggles of the mid-twentieth century that adopted terrorism as a strategy. After the July 1776 American independence, African Americans and other slaves continued to face terrorism in the hands of their white masters. Symbolic violence was wreaked on slaves to serve as examples for others. The Nat Turner saga of 1831 was an illustration of terror on the paths of slaves and their masters. Nat Turner was a Black slave that led several slaves on a terror rampage. They killed about 60 white men, including women and children, in Southampton, Virginia. Turner and members of his group were arrested and beheaded in the most gruesome manner in 1831. Their headless bodies were left on spikes for days to serve as communicative violence to prospective rebels.

According to R. Blakeslee Gilpin (2015), John Brown was a prominent and controversial figure that used “propaganda of the deed”, communicative violence, to trigger anti-slavery uprisings. His figure remained controversial on whether he should be described as a terrorist or a freedom fighter depending on the perspective of the viewer. The Thirteenth Amendment was passed on April 8, 1864, to abolish slavery and free slaves while the Fourteenth Amendment was passed in 1868 to grant citizenship to everybody born or naturalised in the United States including former slaves. The two amendments triggered racial terrorism and white supremacy. Ex-confederates especially white Southerners perceived Black freedom as despicable and they decided to engage in terrorism. This led to the formation of the dreaded Ku Klux Klan (KKK) in Pulaski, Tennessee, after the American civil war between the Unionists and Confederates.

Ku Klux Klan (KKK) was established during Reconstruction to entrench white supremacy through the use of terrorism. In 1867, according to Law (2009), when Blacks were to first vote, KKK members in white masks and black beards whipped blacks, rape women and burnt Black schools. They targeted Republican Blacks and leading Blacks, some were

maimed while others were killed to serve as communicative/symbolic violence to other members of the Black communities and deter them from voting. In 1868, various degrees of violence were perpetrated on the Blacks and some of their white supporters to dissuade other white apologists. Gilpin (2015) identified three faces of KKK: the first was from the 1860s to the 1870s until it was eliminated by the Southern Democratic Redemption of 1877, the second emerged during the 1920s and was quelled in the 1940s and the third was in the 1950s till date. KKK members were supported by many white supremacist paramilitary groups like the White Line, Red Shirts and the like. KKK members prevented Republicans from voting and incapacitated many leading Black figures. Some notable victims of the KKK terror include Abram Colby, Emmet Till, Edward Aron that was castrated, Willie Edwards, Medgar Evans, Viola Liuzzo, Michael Donald (Rachael Davis, 2016). KKK also accused Blacks wrongly of raping white women and used that excuse to castrate and hang many Blacks. The violence of the KKK was quelled by the Federal troops several times but the terrorist group usually re-emerged to intimidate Blacks and perform symbolic violence against leading Blacks. KKK's main objective is to facilitate the return to the slavery era and to continue to fight the civil war in disguise (Law, 2009). KKK countered the 1950s and 60s Civil Rights Movements with unprecedented violence to thwart the objective of racial equality in America. The KKK is still believed to be operating in some parts of America today.

### **Russia: terrorism from People's Will to Stalin**

Russia suffered and experienced tsarist despotism and this triggered revolutionary terrorism from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. Like France, the peasants suffered immensely under the different Tsars that reigned in Russia from the mid-sixteenth century to the late nineteenth century. However, in the case of Russia, both the state and the revolutionists engaged in terrorism; thus, there was top-down terrorism and bottom-top terrorism which makes the history of terrorism in Russia convoluted.

In Russia, from the mid-sixteenth century, the state terrorised its citizens through security agents. Martin A. Miller (2015) traces the etymology of this to the establishment of Oprichnina by Ivan IV in the mid-sixteenth century. The security agency terrorised Ivan's opposition including clerics. The history of the French Revolution was not lost on the

various Tsars and this made them institute tough security measures to repress and terrorise their opposition. In the early nineteenth century, the Northern and Southern Societies operated in Russia to subvert the totalitarianism of monarchism. Pavel Pestel, leader of the Southern Society, planned to eliminate Alexander I and the royal family. This led to the increase in terrorism of the security agencies under Nicholas I, Alexander I's successor. The police and the Third Section, a censorship organisation, during Nicholas' reign, harassed and exiled renowned writers like Alexander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, Fyodor Dostoevsky, among others. Censorship was extreme and, in consequence, some writers were kept in insane facilities for writing polemical pieces about the monarchy.

As a result of the extreme terrorisation of the citizens by the Russian monarchy, various anti-monarchical ideas and groups were formed and festered to the extent of adopting terrorism as a counter-tactic to confront the terrorism of the monarchy. Such ideas include anarchism, nihilism, populism and Marxism. These ideas precipitated the flurry of terrorist organisations that surfaced in Russia in the late nineteenth century. Anarchism was a phenomenon that was anti-government and it was transnational, leading to the assassination of key government figures across Europe in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Nihilism was defined by Michael Burleigh (2009) as the rejection of all religious and moral principles. Nihilism believed in radicalism and terrorism. The liberalism and ambivalence of Alexander II contributed immensely to the evolution of these ideas. According to Law (2009), populism and nihilism opposed the exploitation of the masses by the monarchy and the bourgeoisie. Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Demons* represents and critiques nihilism.

Land and Freedom was one of the terrorist organisations that thrived in Russia between 1861 and 1864. It was from this group that the People's Will, also known as Narodnaia Volia, was formed to aid peasant insurrection and assassinate key monarchical members. It was led by Lev Tikhomirov and the group was inspired by Sergei Nechaev's *The Catechism of the Revolutionarist* (Miller, 2015). The discovery of dynamite by Alfred Nobel in 1866 also contributed to the rapid development of terrorism and it gave the People's Will access to dynamite for instant extermination of their target.

Terrorism increased in Russia and the People's Will attacked only highly placed individuals. Most terrorist organisations of this period operated on the principle of "propaganda of the deed" propounded by Carlo Pisacane. People's Will made the first attempt on Alexander II's life but it was abortive. On March 13, 1881, Alexander II was assassinated with hand-held explosives after the abortive one that was thrown into his royal carriage by a team led by Sofia Perovskaya. The team and other members of People's Will were hanged. The group's main objective was to instigate popular revolt by the masses but it did not materialise. People's Will was replaced by the Party of the Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs). SRs terrorised Russia on a grand scale, assassinating anybody connected to the state. The group wished to establish a socialist state and formed its terrorist arm, the Combat Organisation.

Combat Organisation assassinated many politicians from 1902 to 1905 according to Law (2009). The members of Combat Organisation revolutionised themselves by reading and adopting revolutionary theories. Lenin took the baton from the Combat Organisation as well as popularised mass terror against the monarchy and its agents in the guise of Marxism. Lenin's ascendancy of power with the other Bolsheviks was the Russian Revolution that terrorised all the quarters of Russian society. He believed terror should be a revolutionary tool. Lenin led the Bolsheviks, a splinter group of Russian Social Democratic Workers (Chaliand and Blin, 2007: 198). The Bolsheviks hijacked power and instituted red terror. Red terror is based on the brand of Marxism that countered and repressed every form of the bourgeoisie's existence.

Lenin took hints from the Jacobins of the French Revolution. He established the Russian Extraordinary Commission to Combat Counter-Revolution and Sabotage (Cheka) in 1917. Cheka was a state apparatus that was used to repress and terrorise alleged and seeming enemies of the revolution. The Mensheviks, the royal family, and their close allies were terrorised, arrested and some were assassinated. Cheka was localised and the scale of the terror was colossal which instilled fear in the people. A decree in 1919 established concentration camps and labour camps (what Mbembe, 2003, denominates state of exception) at various strategic places. Dissents were sent to these camps for various

trumped-up charges. The red terror under the vanguard of Lenin was terminated by his death on January 4, 1924 (Chaliand and Blin, 2007).

Stalin replaced Lenin's reign of red terror and he followed his trend. He adopted state terror as a state policy and terrorism was deployed massively against his opposition and the population, at large, to implement his communist phenomena. Stalin used force to entrench his policies in the 1930s and precipitated the Great Terror of 1936 to 1938. To strengthen his policies, he used state apparatus to attack and terrorise the masses and the elite. Psychological fear was ubiquitous which included fear of the tribunals, knocks on doors, and sudden disappearances. Stalin maintained the concentration camps (Gulag) and sent many citizens there and adopted a totalitarian system hinged on state terrorism.

Stalin moved his terrorism to another level by using the military as a weapon of terror. He transformed Cheka into NKVD and it served as the apparatus for the repression of the monarchy, intellectuals, and the peasants. In addition, he terrorised other races like Jews, Turkish Muslims, among others. Paul M. Hagenloh (2015) defines Stalinism as a "highly militarized system" (p. 170) in which the various security agencies ruled the country through systemic terror. The conceptualisation of Stalinism by Hagenloh (2015) depicts the connection between state terrorism and the security agencies, especially the military as an agent of state terror. Therefore, the administrations of Lenin and Stalin underscore the argument made by Peter Bernholz (2017) that there is a nexus between totalitarianism and terrorism.

### **Anarchism and the internationalisation of terrorism**

The genesis of anarchism is remote but anarchism, in the political sense, can be traced to the nineteenth century. Although there are different accounts about the founder of Anarchism, according to Alex Houen (2002), it was formally founded by Mikhail Bakunin in September 1872 after his expulsion from the International Working Men's Association. Anarchism was instigated by the potpourri of numerous economic, social, and political issues that shook the foundation of Europe. The industrial and technological revolution benefited the bourgeoisie at the expense of the masses. Hence, anarchism is anti-state and anti-bourgeoisie. Taylor (2002) explicates the tenet of anarchism as believing that "injustice

and equality were caused by the state...an instrument to support and defend the privileged class” (p. 27). Anarchists support the destruction of state agents that enforce laws, like the military and police, to redistribute wealth.

Another account of the provenance of Anarchism according to Olivier Hubac-Occhipinti (2007) is that Anarchism, in its political sense, was introduced by Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809 - 1865) and conceived as the reorganisation of the state to respect the liberty of citizens. Anarchism believes in “propaganda of the deed” which engendered anarchist terrorism. Propaganda by deed was theorised by Anarchists like Carlo Pisacane, Carlo Cafiero, and Erico Malatesta (Burleigh, 2009) and means symbolic violence to undermine the state to instigate mass revolution. Anarchist theorists include Mikhail Bakunin, Pyotr Kropotkin, Sergei Nechaev, and the like. Anarchist terrorism was the first form of internationalisation of terrorism, it permeated Europe and North America in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The internationalisation of Anarchism was aided by the discovery of dynamite, technological changes, the growth of mass media which prompted the circulation of newspapers and journals, and mass migration, among others. Anarchists held international congresses in different cities across Europe and they adopted diverse means to subvert the state. These means included assassinations, dynamite bombing, banditry, and these acts were carried out across Europe except in Britain due to the British liberal value system and the asylum given to anarchists. Richard B. Jensen (2015) identifies four waves of anarchism viz. 1878 through the 1880s, 1892 to 1901, 1904 to 1914, and 1917 to 1934. The first phase was the era of violent acts related to labour uprisings, the second was the period of dynamite bombings, the third phase witnessed assassinations of tsarist officials, and the fourth was marked by extreme leftist terrorism.

The victims of anarchist assassinations in Europe and North America include The French President: Sadi Carnot in 1894 by Sante Caserio, King Umberto 1 in July 1900, President William McKinley of the United States in 1901, and others. Bombings and assassinations were carried out in France, Spain, India, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and a host of other countries. According to Thai Jones (2015), anarchism, due to the broad use of the term, was presumed to have been practised by different groups in the US like the KKK, Leninist



Weather Underground, among others. In addition, writers responded to the anarchist terrors and represented them in their novels. Anarchism is represented in Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, Emma Goldman's *Living my Life*, an autobiography, and the like. Anarchist terrorism was quelled through extreme repression by various governments in Europe.

### **Ireland: occupation, colonialism and terrorism**

The conflicts in Ireland in the nineteenth century were multi-layered. Ireland was gifted to England by the Pope in the twelfth century and this led to its occupation. The English resettled Protestant Scots in Ireland and this was considered an aberration by the Irish native majority because of their Catholic inclination. This, according to Law (2009), led to the conflicts between Irish Republicans and Britain – on the one hand – as well as the conflict between Irish republicans and Irish Unionists on the other hand. The English and Scottish occupants polarised Ireland into the Unionists, the Northerners and Protestants, and the Republicans, Southerners, and Catholics. This amalgam of conflicts led to the formation of the Fenians by a railway engineer, James Stephens, on 17th March 1858 (Burleigh, 2009).

The Fenians are sometimes interchanged for the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) because of their homogenous position on home rule. The Fenians originated from pre-Christian Irish warriors and instigated violence against Britain to attain Irish independence, and, consequently, adopted terrorism. According to Benjamin Grob-Fitzgibbon (2015), Britain first experienced terrorism in Ireland, and Law (2009) describes Ireland's form of terrorism as ethnonationalist terrorism. Grob-Fitzgibbon (2015) treats Fenians as a different entity from IRB. Fenians sourced money from outside Ireland to launch attacks against British institutions both within Ireland and in Britain. The United States subtly supported the Fenians against Britain.

The Fenians executed numerous offensives, attacked different places, and assassinated individuals connected to Britain. They attacked Chester Castle, an armoury, but it was foiled, Thomas Burke, a high-ranking British Official was killed in 1882. Fenians were against home rule but supported total independence and this led to the 1916 Easter Uprising led by Padraig Pearse and James Connolly to instigate mass revolt in support of

independence. The mayhem prompted Britain's reprisal terror which was the objective of the Fenians. Secret societies like Clan na Gael supported the Fenians and the Irish Republican Brotherhood. In addition, Fenians practised dynamite terrorism. Fenians like O'Donovan Rossa embarked on campaigns of terror and made fear metastasised throughout Ireland. Britain also countered the terror by arresting many Fenians, incarcerating them in some cases, and, otherwise, hanging them in public.

The Fenians and Irish Republican Brotherhood metamorphosed into Irish Republican Army (IRA). Ulster Volunteer Force, a militant protestant group, was formed to counter the IRA. In 1919, IRA launched a systematic campaign of terror by attacking the police and Irish Protestant minorities who were in support of unionism with Britain. High-ranking officers of Britain like Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson were killed. In 1921, twenty-six county Irish Free States were established while the remaining six, Northern Ireland, remained annexed to Britain. Various groups were formed on both sides of the republicans and home-rule supporters to counter one another.

After the independence of Southern Ireland, terrorism continued in Northern Ireland between the Ulster Unionist Community connected with Protestantism-cum-British rule and the Irish Nationalist Community, Catholics and Irish, who wished to be independent of British rule (Cillian McGrattan, 2015). This led to the formation of the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) known as the Provos. Provos terrorised British institutions in Northern Ireland and Ulster. The Ulster also used groups like Ulster Volunteer Front to terrorise Irish Catholics in Northern Ireland and were supported by Britain. Each ethnic group justified the use of terror to counter the terror by the opposing side. The arrival of the British Army provoked more violence because of the subtle support of the British Army for the Ulster society. The proclivity of violence and terrorism continues in Northern Ireland between the Ulster community and the Irish Catholics. The Irish Catholics have also been alienated from the state administration; this has aggravated the violence between the two sides.

### **Nazi Germany: terrorism against the other within Germany**

Germany is the home of right-wing terrorism and violence against other nationalities within its borders. It became a modern paradigm that connects dictatorship to terrorism. After

World War I, there was a preponderance of street terrorism and paramilitary terrorism in Germany. According to Paul M. Hagenloh (2015), “street violence and paramilitary violence led to the “Nationalist Socialist rise to power” (p. 162). The *Freikorps*, a paramilitary of young men, used violence to blame “soft civilians” – citizens of other nations within the German border – for Germany’s loss in World War I (Law, 2009). This was a manifestation of right-wing terrorism which David Koehler (2017) defines as “the use or threat of specific forms of...violence executed on the ideological premise of inequality between human beings and in order to challenge the political status quo...through the act of violence as a form of psychological and physical warfare” (p. 75). This means there is an identity construct of Self against the Other – other nationalities – and this construct engendered violence against the Other which culminated in the advocacy for Aryan racism and nationalism by the Nazis.

The *Freikorps* was later dissolved and this led to the formation of the notorious Brownshirts also known as *Sturmabteilung* (SA). The SA became a part of the National Socialist Party (NSP) or Nazi party and aided the party’s ascension to power. Adolf Hitler used the Brownshirts to clinch power by popularising street violence. Most Brownshirts joined the Gestapo, Nazi’s Army. The National Socialist Party’s regime inaugurated popular terrorism against the Other and employed street violence to terrorise other populations – citizens from other countries – both within and outside Germany. State terror became the state policy in the 1930s and pogroms became a tactic for eliminating the Other, considered as undermining the national body. Terrorism was deployed against Jews, Blacks and Turks. For example, Jews in Germany were transported to the East. According to Hagenloh (2015), there was national rhetoric to protect the Reich from hostile populations and cleanse the East of sub-humans. Properties were confiscated, Jews and Polish elites were executed en masse, communities were deported, and a wide-scale of violence was deployed against any dissenting voices. Communities were evacuated and resettled with Germans. In 1938, state-sponsored pogroms were executed that led to the mass emigration of Jews and paved the way for Germans businesses. According to Law (2009), Nazis were against Jews and communism and this culminated in genocide. Nazi Germany aimed to create a homogenous society which was also perpetrated in its colonial territory like South West Africa.

After World War II, Koehler (2017) expounds that right-wing violence and terrorism thrived in Germany based on the convention to continue the National Socialist regime, neo-Nazism proclivities. Parties such as Deutsche Reich Partei (German Reich Party), National Demokratische Partei Deutschlands (National Democrats Party of Germany), and others aided right-wing terrorism. Webrsporguppe Hengst (Military Sports Group Hengst) is regarded as the first German right-wing terrorist group established by Bernd Hengst. These parties continued the campaign of terror against “the others” within the German borders.

Lone actors also perpetrated right-wing terrorist acts according to Koehler (2017). Lone actors like Josef Bachmann, Uwe Begrendt, Gundolf Kohler, Helmut Oxner, Josef Saller executed terrorist acts ranging from assassinations to arsons. They terrorised “the others” and left-wing adherents that they perceived as an obstacle to the reign of right-wing ideology. Right-wing terrorism lingered until the 1980s and formed the foundation for the contemporary terrorism of the National Socialist Underground that rampaged throughout the 1990s. The group was uncovered in 2011.

### **Italian Fascism and terrorism**

Italy witnessed state terrorism during the totalitarian regime of Benito Mussolini. According to Law (2009), Italy after World War I (WWI) was disgruntled with the Treaty of Versailles because Italy gained little from the spoils of the war shared by the Allies. This led to the formation of paramilitaries similar to the German *Freikorps*. Mussolini established the Blackshirts or *squadristi* whose members were peeved veterans of WWI and they fought the Marxists/Communists which most times resulted in street violence. The street violence ushered in Benito Mussolini’s Fascist government which terrorised leftists and executed some of them. Although Fascists mobilised far less violence compared to Nazi Germany (Hagenloh, 2015), however, there was a clear connection between military violence and terrorism. The state employed variegated violence to control its population, to instil fear, and maintain control. State terrorism during this period was mainly performed by the military.

In addition, Italy used terroristic tactics in its colonies like Libya and Ethiopia. In Libya, the Italian colonial military slaughtered uncooperative natives’ cattle, poisoned their water, and

razed villages to enforce cooperation. In Ethiopia, between 1935 and 1936, the Italian military bombed military areas to create fear and symbolically executed rebels to spread fear. Italy adopted street violence within its border and in its colony and legalised violence to intimidate the natives and submit them to its colonial machination. After World War II, red terrorism evolved in Italy. Red terrorism was neo-Fascist violence, left-wing terrorism, that was opposed to the nascent Italian democracy. In the late 1960s and the entire 1970s, fanaticism developed in the universities that birthed extreme violence. The Red Brigade was formed in 1970 and became the fiercest antagonist of the Italian democracy (Burleigh, 2009). The Red Brigade was led by Renato Curcio and Margherita Cagol. The Red Brigade terrorists were anti-industrialists and anti-state. They fought against multinational companies and agents of the bourgeoisie. They kidnapped prominent citizens like Mario Sossi – a Judge, Bruno Labiate and the like.

There was an exchange of terrorism between the left wing and the right wing in Italy. Red Brigades were prominent owing to their ruthlessness. They kneecapped some of their victims and extended their campaigns of terror to the mass media. They dealt with anti-terrorist officers and kidnapped prominent judges adjudicating the cases of their members and terrorised scholars supporting the bourgeoisie. The Red Brigade terrorists kidnapped Aldo Moro, a former Prime Minister, and a renowned representative of the Catholic reformers; killed him, and dumped his body in the boot of a car. Prominent arrests were made and the incentive of reduced sentences for terrorists that confess as well as divulge the secret of the Red Brigade disintegrated the group (Burleigh, 2009). Patrizio Peci was arrested and his confessions led to further arrests of prominent members of the group. Others arrested were Prima Licea and Maurice Bignami. Red Brigade's aim to instigate a proletariat or mass revolution was not achieved and workers denounced their terrorist actions.

### **Palestine and the state of Israel: an exchange of terrorism from colonialism, Arabism to Zionism**

The fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War I (WWI) led to a great rupture in the Islamic and the Arab world. This rift affected Palestine and the crisis that followed lingers until today. The British in their colonial manoeuvring made a series of promises to the different sides that aided its victory over the Ottoman side that supported Germany during

WWI. One of these promises was the 1917 Balfour Declaration by British Foreign Secretary A. J. Balfour that the Jewish State of Israel would be established in Palestine (Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2015). Before the declaration, a few Jews were living in Palestine. They formed the minority and were living amicably with the Arabs until the declaration. The Balfour Declaration instituted Zionism formally, a plan to establish a state of Israel in Palestine that Jews could call their homeland.

Almost at the time of the declaration, Jews in Europe faced hostilities in the various countries they inhabited and these prompted massive immigration of Jews into Palestine. By this time, Britain had become the new colonial master of Palestine and the Jews took advantage of this. The influx of European Jews into Palestine coupled with Britain's support of the move put Arabs in Palestine on their toes. A complicating addendum to the Arab's perspective of the Jews was the Jewish immigrants' disposition as colonists, conceiving the Arabs as the Other in their native land. The Jewish immigrants bought and occupied vast areas of land owned by absentee Arab landlords domiciled in other countries; the Arab tenants were evicted from the areas of land purchased by the Jewish immigrants. The eviction bred conflicts among the Arabs in the 1920s. In addition, Haj-Amin al-Husseini, the grand mufti of Jerusalem and a Wahhabist, was opposed to the Jewish immigrants' occupation and perceived them as analogous to the immoral Western modernity.

The confluence of British colonialism and Jewish subtle occupation led to the Arab revolt of the 1920s. The Arab revolt started with an "urban-based general strike" (Law 2009: p. 181) which aggravated the tensed Arab-Jew relationship and turned into a peasant revolt. Arabs attacked Jews to instigate the British's promise of Palestinian independence. In response to this attack, the Arab and Jewish exchange of terrorism was birthed and many organisations evolved that adopted terrorism as a tactic for Zionism and Arabism.

Haganah was formed in 1921 to counter anti-Jewish violence (Burleigh, 2009). Haganah was an underground guerilla force created to protect Jews and their settlements when the British forces could not. They got weapons from Jewish sympathisers in Europe and used them to combat the Arabs. In furtherance of the violence against Arabs, Irgun was formed from Haganah by Ze'ev Jabotinsky and his followers. Concurrently, Jewish immigration

continued to increase leading to more occupation while Zionism evolved into the leftist or Marxist and the revisionist who were more combatant and bellicose.

Irgun was the nucleus of Zionist terrorism. They carried out violence against Arabs while Arabs formed groups too like Sheikh Hassan's army. In 1937, Arab terrorists killed the District Commissioner for Galilee. Furthermore, Arab rebel leaders engaged in brutal acts like flogging of informants and attacks on British colonial officers. To complicate the violence on both sides of Arabs and Jews, they targeted each other's civilian populations. Irgun adopted the Sicarii approach by kidnapping British officers.

Another Zionist terrorist group was LEHI, formed out of Irgun by Avraham Stern. The astronomical increase in the presence of Jews made Britain halt the immigration of Jews into Palestine. This move infuriated Irgun and other Zionist terrorist groups. In consequence, Irgun declared war against Britain. By this time, during World War II, Menachem Begin, a future Prime Minister of Israel, had become the leader of Irgun. All the Zionist groups effected actions that undermined and exposed the vulnerability of Britain. Haganah established Mossad to facilitate the transportation of illegal Jewish immigrants by sea to Palestine and engaged in acts that drew the world's attention to the plight of the Jews, like Exodus 47.

When WWII started, the Zionists joined the British military to combat its enemies and this gave them a comparative advantage over the Arabs with minimal support for the British. Between 1945 and 48, Irgun engaged in various terrorist activities against British colonial institutions and Arabs in Palestine. One significant attack claimed 22 RAF planes. In response to the Zionist terrorist attacks, the British colonial government launched "Operation Agatha" (Grob-Fitzgibbon 2015:183) which led to the arrest of many Irgun and LEHI members and the seizing of many caches of arms. Consequently, Irgun launched Operation Chick and blew off a wing of King David's Hotel in July 1946 which killed many Jews, Arabs, and British officers. The attack on King David's Hotel was significant because the hotel represented Britain's colonial heart. The British officers' club was also blown off in March 1947. The terrorist attacks undermined Britain's authority in Palestine and the British later left in 1947, leaving Palestine to the United Nations which mandated the

partition of Palestine into two states. This verdict was rejected by Arabs in Palestine and most Arabs in the Muslim world.

The exchange of violence between Arabs and Jews continued until early 1948. Israel later declared its state and independence in 1948. When the British left, Zionist groups made a shift from terrorist activities to military strategies, protecting Jews and their settlements. The Zionist groups like Irgun were integrated into the Israeli Army. Haganah, Irgun, and LEHI invaded and sacked many villages which led to an exodus of many Palestinians, turning them into refugees in the Gaza Strip, West Bank, and Jordan (this is narrativised in *The Woman from Tantura* by Radwa Ashour and Kay Heikkinen, Translator, 2010). Jewish immigrants were resettled in these sacked villages. Victimised Jews in other Muslim countries like Egypt, Iraq, and the like immigrated to Israel. The six-day war between Arabs and Israelis further established the authority of Israel in the Middle East. Arabs called the defeat *Nakba* or Disaster (Law, 2009).

The aftermath of the Arab-Israeli war led to the formation of many groups championing the Palestinian struggle. These groups adopted terrorist tactics and internationalised their terrorist acts. The Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) was founded and led by a prominent revolutionary termed terrorist turn activist: Yasser Arafat. Arafat established Fatah and the organisation launched terrorist attacks against Israel from bordering countries like Jordan. PLO operated through other quasi-groups like the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). According to Geraint Hughes (2015), PFLP engaged in international terrorism by hijacking airliners. In September 1970, PFLP hijacked three airliners. PFLP popularised terrorism by deploying female terrorists like Leila Khaled to its course.

Another prominent group associated with the Palestinian liberation from Israeli occupation is Black September sponsored by Arafat. Black September was most prominent for the infamous 1972 attack on the Olympic village. Hoffmann (2006) narrates that the event started at about 5:00 am on September 5, 1972. All the Israeli athletes were killed and most of the Black September terrorists died as a result of a failed escape plan. This made Israel launch Operation Wrath of God executed by Mossad to counter and execute the perpetrators



of the 1972 Munich attack. Terrorism as resistance between Israel and Palestine supported by other Arabian countries continues hitherto.

### **Anti-colonial terrorism in Algeria**

The colonial dispensation was perpetrated with overt terrorism and this ontology made the anti-colonial fighters adopt terrorism as a tactic to regain liberty from the colonial fists of most European powers. The colonial struggle against France in Algeria was an anti-colonial struggle coloured with terrorism as resistance of various degrees. According to Martin C. Thomas (2015), “rural dispossession, forcible relocation of populations, insurgency, and repression” (p. 218) characterised French colonialism in Algeria. France practised a double standard in Algeria using uncivil methods in contrast to its democratic principles in France. Algeria, after witnessing the humiliation of France in the Indo-China war, conceived France as vulnerable and adopted strategic terrorism to publicise the Algerian situation. At this point, Algerians were ready to confront the French hegemony that started in 1830.

National Liberation Front (FLN) was formed in late 1954 by nine leaders from the Arab and Berber world of eastern Algeria after splintering from Special Organisation. Algiers’ wing was led by Abane Ramdane while Saadi Yacef served as his deputy. FLN started targeting colonial infrastructures like the police, military, and communication installations. Terrorism was adopted by FLN to provoke France to respond repressively to justify the Algerian struggle. FLN’s first terror campaign was the attack on All Saints Day on November 1, 1954. FLN also maintained a military wing designated Army of National Liberation (ALN). FLN bombed government buildings, attacked miners in the Philippeville suburb, police outposts, electrical installations. The organisation based its campaign of anti-colonial terrorism on Islamic ideology and provided welfare services for the Muslim Algerian society. In addition, FLN practised socialist ideologies and maintained strict Islamic doctrines.

The French adopted a brutal counter-terrorist approach to the anti-colonial terror of FLN. This approach justified the terrorist motive of FLN which was basically to attract international attention. Writers like Francois Mauriac publicised the French colonial terrorism in Algeria while Frantz Fanon, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, added his perspective

of justified violence by the colonised native describing the psychological fear etched in the public when identified as collaborators. The French established corralled spaces and encampments that hedged in Algerian Muslims analogous to the present Israeli settlements and many of the Islamic sacred spaces were desecrated by the colonialists. The colons, French settlers in Algeria, complemented the struggle owing to their pauperisation of the Algerians. France tortured many captured FLN members and engaged in violent symbolic acts to terrorise the native populace. France summarily executed many suspects like Ali Boumendjel.

To gain immense publicity, the objective of terrorism and colonial struggle, FLN escalated its terroristic approach by focusing its attacks on Algiers; therefore, the Battle of Algiers commenced with FLN's call for a general strike in January 1957 and it was amply represented in Gillo Pontecorvo's 1966 film: *The Battle of Algiers*. The film depicted the exchange of terror between the French colonial government and FLN. One of the major battlegrounds was Casbah which was turned into a subtle prison where Muslims were searched and arrested. Saadi Yacef was the coordinator of the anti-colonial campaign in Algiers. He used female bombers who disguised themselves as Europeans to bomb European quarters and civilians. In response, the French colonial government in Algeria bombed Algerian civilians too. The tit-for-tat killing of civilians made Albert Camus intervene. Retributive violence from the French colonists widened the purview of the violence from Philippeville to Guelma. FLN aimed to attract the United Nation's attention and it achieved its political aim. The French colonial government invited General Massu's paratroopers who aggravated the terrorism on both sides. The Casbah was violated by paras, their popular nomenclature, and the paras achieved huge success in quelling the FLN anti-colonial terrorism which later was a pyrrhic victory due to the international backlash.

When the battle of Algiers was won, many paratroopers remained in Algeria to protect the colons, settlers, and this evolved into another phase of terrorism. By 1960, the French government had realised the futility of keeping Algeria as its colony but the paras were unhappy with this perception. They launched Organisation Armee Secrete (OAS) and started a treacherous campaign of terror against Algerian natives to undermine the peace negotiations between France and Algeria for the latter's independence. Charles de Gaulle

had to confront the paras menace by arresting the vanguard of the group like Roger Degueldre, Challe; some were executed in France and Algeria. In 1962, OAS killed Muslims and FLN responded, killing many Europeans. On the 3rd of July, 1962, Algeria gained its independence with Benyoussef Ben Khedda as the first President after an overwhelming campaign of terror between the French colonialists and FLN.

In sum, anti-colonial terrorism was adopted by FLN to counter colonial brutality and violence. Algeria is not the only example of the use of anti-colonial terrorism. The Mau Mau anti-colonial fight in Kenya and the battle against Apartheid in South Africa by the African National Congress (ANC) through Nelson Mandela's Umkhonto we Sizwe, a military wing of ANC, are other examples.

### **Islamic terrorism: Salafism, Wahhabism and the Islamic world**

All religions have one form of fundamentalism or the other. The historical development of religion has been coloured with absolutism, violence, strife as well as intolerance; therefore, Islam is not an exception. Islam is not homogenous and this has affected its existential development over time. The history of Islam is suffused with fragmentation and rivalries between one group and the other. The disintegration has led to the evolution of groups like the Sunnis, the Shiite, the Sufis, among others. Even within these main groups, there are further sub-groups with variances in their ideologies. It is pertinent to recognise these variations in the representation of Islam and Islamic terrorism. Edward Said (1997) in *Covering Islam* counters the prevailing Western representation of Islam and its adherents as monolithic, therefore, perceiving all Muslims as belligerent and terrorists. This misrepresentation translates to stereotyping only Muslims as the terrorists around the world. The West is portrayed as above others while Islam is reduced to monotheism, barbarism, and a horde of -isms. Khaled M. Abou El Fadl (2005) broadly categorised Muslims into the moderates and the Puritans. He conceptualises moderates as possessing Islamic roots yet dealing with the challenges of modernity while the Puritans have been labelled jihadists, fundamentalists, absolutists, and the like. They believe in the sacredness of the textuality and defend its puritanism.

Puritans detest Islamic jurisprudence and appropriate fatwas to control Muslims. They reject pluralist realities and contest competing points of view. They construct identities based on “us” and “them,” dubbing Muslims not in their circle as infidels. Puritans wield Sharia as an instrument of terrorising others while, historically, the Sharia laws have been compromised and do not represent unified, codified Islamic ordinances. Puritans, according to El Fadl (2005), utilise Sharia to mobilise Muslims and as a sentimental weapon to galvanise them into jihadi actions. In consequence, two ideologies have been preponderant in Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism namely Wahhabism and Salafism. These binary ideologies possess identical features and use similar approaches to proselytise their adherents. While Salafism is believed to be older, the genesis of Wahhabism can be traced to the eighteenth century.

In understanding Islamic terrorism and Salafism, its history has been traced to the 13th-century scholar Ibn Taymiyah (1263 – 1328) by writers like Mark A. Gabriel (2015: p. 57), Sudhanshu Sarangi and David Canter (2009: p. 39), Lucky E. Asuelime and Ojochenemi J. David (2015: p. 68), et cetera. Taymiyah – also written as Taymiyya – occupies a central position in the discourse of Islamic terrorism. He advocated the literal interpretation of the Quran and the repudiation of jurisprudence in Quranic interpretation. He supported the killing of fellow Muslims and he was against Sufism in Islam. According to Gabriel (2015), he founded the “mind-set of no tolerance” (p. 67). The tradition of a literal interpretation of the Quran has been passed on from one Jihad movement to contemporary times. Taymiyah was a philosopher and the author of *The Sword on the Neck of the Accuser of Muhammed*.

According to John Calvert (2015), Salafism draws inspiration from, *al-salaf al-salin* regarded as the precursors of Islam, the first three generations of Islam. Salafism condemns the human and modern influence on Islam and considers others not subscribed to its ideology as infidels or *Kaffir*. Taymiyya established it as a variant of Islamic revisionism and revivalism. Salafists employ identity constructs and imaginary division of the world in their proselytisation. The constructs comprise good versus evil, believer against the infidel, among others. Salafists believe that the Arab world and most Muslims are living in *jahiliyya*, an age of ignorance. However, Salafism has its variance; there is the peaceful variant and the non-peaceful. The non-peaceful one has been the more popular of the two.

Wahhabism is another ideology that has influenced modern and contemporary Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. The ideology developed from the campaign of Mohammed bin Abd al-Wahhab who had a puritanical zest. According to El Fadl (2005), Wahhabism is extremely hostile to all forms of intellectualism, mysticism, and sectarianism within Islam. Anything that does not emanate from Arabia is rejected. Wahhab and his cohorts assassinated jurists and consider other sects as infidels. Wahhab was pro-Arabism and coalesced the culture of the Bedouins of Najd with Islam and adopted it as the universal form of Islam. Abd Wahhab exploited the claim that Abu Bakr burnt heretical Muslims and non-Muslims (El Fadl, 2005). Wahhab followed the concepts of Taymiyya, selected those that suited his campaign, and this accounts for their similarities. In the 19th century, the Al Sa'ad family united with the Wahhabis to quell the Ottoman hegemony but it was abortive. However, the ideology was revived under King Abd Al-Aziz bin Al Sa'ud, the founder of modern Saudi Arabia who used the Wahhabis to eliminate his opponents and rivals to rule Arabia forever while the Wahhabis propagated their ideology across the Arabian Peninsula.

Not surprisingly, the British colonial government, with its expansionist intent, agreed to a subtle pact with the Al Sa'ud family and the Wahhabis. The British got oil concessions and protected the Sa'ud family while the Wahhabis eliminated all contenders to the throne and spread their brand of puritanical Islam as the sole brand of Islam in the whole of Arabia. Islamic diversity and pluralism were obliterated in Saudi Arabia, Sufi adherents and Shiites were slaughtered. The Saudi that emerged from the Sa'ud family and Wahhabi pact became a contrast to the Ottoman Saudi that permitted religious plurality. Since the 1970s, the Wahhabist ideologies have been exported from Saudi Arabia to other parts of the world through the construction of madrassas, mosques, scholarships, funding of pilgrims, and other strategic techniques for patronising prospective followers. Moreover, Saudi Arabia became a strategic place because of its control of Mecca and Medina. These two places represent one of the pillars of Islam. Therefore, Wahhabism is perpetuated through Saudi's sole control of these two Islamic cities. Wahhabism is different from Salafism owing to its more extreme ideology. Wahhabists and Salafists foreground the rule of the text over reason and made themselves authorities, issuing fatwas, without jurisprudential background. The Puritans, most times, force the lapses of modernity on the text.

In Africa, Islamic terrorism, in the dominant discursive sense, can be traced to the fall of the Othman Caliphate in 1924. According to Gabriel (2015), it started with the formation of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt by Sheikh Hassan Al-Banna in 1928, and the group aimed to restore pure Islamic practices in all areas of life and to form a caliphate. The Muslim Brotherhood since its establishment has perpetrated several terrorist acts in Egypt and transnationally. Its members have helped in the formation of groups like Al-Qaeda. One of its infamous members is Sayyid Qutb, the author of *Signs along the Road*, a radical book that promoted numerous extreme ideas and aided the establishment of many Islamist terrorist groups. Sayyid Qutb became an extremist after returning from studying in the United States. He became anti-American and brandished ideas that made Gamel Nasser, the Egyptian President in the 50s and 60s, arrest him. Qutb was radicalised more in jail; when he returned, he conceptualised Salafi-jihadism in his numerous writings (David Cook, 2015).

Qutb's ideas have a lingering effect on contemporary Islamic jihadists and their concepts, including al-Zawahiri. His theorisation radicalised many Egyptians and Muslims. His execution by the Egyptian government martyred him and contributed to the proliferation of his beliefs about Islamic revivalism. The offshoot of his ideas led to the formation of groups like Takfir wa-Hijra. Mohammed Abd Farag led one of its cells and eventually assassinated Anwar Saddat, the Egyptian President in 1981, for fraternising with non-Muslims and the Israelis. Other groups that emerged from the Muslim Brotherhood include al-Jama'a Islamiyya and al-Jihad al-Islami. These groups bombed tourists, attacked Coptic Christians in Egypt, tax Christians, and attacked the state.

### **2.1.2.3. Contemporary terrorism**

1979 marked a significant watershed in the history of terrorism. It fortified the hope in the prospect of jihadism after the success of Ayatollah Khomeini's led Iranian revolution. In addition, Egypt has exported numerous jihadists and puritans while the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has aggravated Islamic fundamentalism and anti-American precepts. In addition, Russia's invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was significant in Islamic fundamentalism. The war against Russia in Afghanistan, backed by the United States, culminated in the training

of numerous mujahideen; they were trained militarily, radicalised and bred for the following years. The other factors explained earlier have snowballed into the present time as well. Islamic terrorist groups have evolved since the Russian-Afghanistan war and they aim to establish caliphates alongside ultranationalist groups that seek the entrenchment of a national sense of identity against other (sub)nationalities within their borders. While the terrorist groups are inexhaustible, some are briefly discussed based on the dominant roles they play in the historical trajectory of contemporary terrorism.

### **Al-Qaeda**

The Afghan war produced Al-Qaeda and it was meant to serve as the base of the mujahideen or Islamic fighters who had lost their nationalities due to the war. Numerous reasons have been ascribed to the formation of Al-Qaeda by Osama bin Laden. According to Geraint Hughes (2015), Osama bin Laden, Abdullah Azzam – his mentor, and others formed Al-Qaeda to evict the West from the Islamic World, annihilate and destroy Israel as well as establish a global caliphate. Osama bin Laden's animosity towards the Saudi monarchy contributed to the formation of Al-Qaeda, coupled with the siege on the Grand Mosque of Mecca in 1979. Osama bin Laden's odyssey to Khartoum also radicalised him coupled with his discovery of the teachings of Ibn Taymiyyah. During this period, he met Ayman al-Zawahiri who furthered his radicalisation and later became the number two in Al-Qaeda. Also, al-Zawahiri's Egyptian group – al-Jihad merged with Al-Qaeda in June 2001 (Lawrence Wright, 2016).

Al-Qaeda practised Salafi-jihadism and its leader, Osama bin Laden, issued fatwas against the United States in August 1996 after his expulsion from Sudan by Hasan Al-Turabi. Al-Qaeda provided training bases for numerous jihadists and drew its members from volunteers that had little knowledge of the Islamic tradition and history. According to Daveed Gartenstein-Ross (2015), bin Laden operated al-Qaeda without branches while in Afghanistan and he had tight control over the structure of the group. The first series of al-Qaeda attacks were on August 7, 1998, against American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salam, Tanzania (Law, 2015). The blasts killed and maimed many people of various nationalities with Africans as the larger population. In continuation, Al-Qaeda bombed the USS Cole in 2000 and killed American sailors. America foiled some of Al-Qaeda's terrorist plots and arrested many of its members. The grandest and most disastrous Al-Qaeda attack

was the September 9, 2001, attacks on the twin World Trade Centres and the Pentagon. These birthed the most colossal anti-terrorism coalition that led to the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan. Osama bin Laden later moved to Pakistan where he was killed by the US Naval Seal on May 2, 2011. Al- Qaeda radicalised many mujahideen and supported numerous quasi-terrorist groups to achieve its aim.

### **The Taliban Government (1996 – 2001)**

The Taliban Government was an example of state terrorism that appropriated Sunni fundamentalist ideology to restrict and terrorise its citizens, the Afghans. According to Law (2009), the Taliban instituted a puritanical regime that restricted women from politics. The Taliban Government formulated extreme policies and implemented Sharia laws that entrenched terror, stoned offenders and operated an absolutist system of the Islamic Caliphate. The Taliban Government was under the vanguard of Mullah Mohammed Omar who invited bin Laden to Afghanistan after he was expelled from Sudan as a form of compensation for his fight against Russia during the Russian-Afghan war. This thesis contends that war against foreign invasion and occupation radicalised the mujahideen like the Sicaris of the first century in Judea who revolted against the Roman occupation of their native homeland.

The Taliban Government reigned between 1996 and 2001 before its second coming; it was recognised by the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. The Taliban Government was later dethroned in December 2001 by the US-led coalition after the September 11, 2001 attacks by Al-Qaeda. This invasion led to the escape of bin Laden to Pakistan. The cruel and brutal rule of the Taliban Government is represented in Yasmina Khadra's *The Swallows of Kabul*. At present, the Taliban have regained power in Afghanistan after the withdrawal of the US and other NATO troops but the Taliban are reinstating the former harsh/extreme violent policies against women and other Afghans. Similarly, the Taliban's power is being contested by a new terrorist group, the Islamic State in Khorasan Province (ISIS-K/ISKP).

### **Hamas**

Hamas was an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt and a reformed group. It was founded in December 1987 by Sheikh Ahmad Yassin at the beginning of the first Intifada



according to Cook (2015). The first Intifada was resistance against Israel's occupation of Palestine, especially its hegemony in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Hamas acts like a parallel government creating a social wing that provides welfare services to the Palestinians and a military wing that perpetrates terroristic attacks against Israel and its forces. Its military wing, the al-Qassam Brigades, launched numerous attacks against Israel, especially its civilians, and ascribed the attacks to Israel's terrorisation of Palestine. Hamas was not ready to accept the two-state settlement in Palestine.

Hamas had been and, still, is the rallying point behind the organisation of Intifada. Hamas launched rockets to Israel, the rockets were named Qassam after the progenitor of Palestinian radicalism: Izz al-Din Qassam. Hamas rivalled with PLO but recently agreements have been signed between the two groups on the administration of the Gaza Strip and West Bank as well as the renunciation of terrorism.

#### **National Socialist Underground (NSU)**

Right-wing terrorism re-sprouted in Germany in the early 1990s. These terroristic acts were perpetrated by National Socialist Underground (NSU). The group was formed by Beate Zschape, Uwe Mundlos and Uwe Bohnhardt and its ideology was neo-Nazism, right-wing extremism. It operated in Germany throughout the 1990s and 2000s. They killed ethnic minorities like Enver Simsek, Abdurahim Ozudogru. Some of their victims were Muslims and of Turkish background. The group had many support networks and it engaged in crimes like robbery to finance its terrorist acts. The group perpetuated terrorism until it was dealt with in April 2007. The two Uwes committed suicide while Beate Zschape was sentenced to life imprisonment in 2018. The terrorism of the group lingered because of the racist proclivity that subtly affected its prompt detection. The terrorism of the group was previously blamed on the far-left and Islamist fighters, not right-wing extremists (Al Jazeera News).

#### **Boko Haram**

The group's genesis can be traced to puritan Islamic groups and crises like Al Sunna wal Jamma, Muhajirun and the Yan Tatsine led by Mohammed Marwa. Boko Haram calls itself "*Jama'atu Ahlus-Sunnah Lidda'Awati Wal Jihad* or People Committed to the Prophet's

Teachings for Propagation and Jihad” (Hussein Solomon, 2015: p. 86). The group’s popular name Boko Haram was assigned to it by the people for its rejection of western education. It operates mainly in the Northeastern States of Nigeria viz. Borno, Yobe, and Adamawa, although it has extended its campaigns to part of Cameroon and Niger.

Boko Haram commenced violence in July 2009 after the sect’s leader, Mohammed Yusuf, was extra-judicially killed by the police, on the 31st of July 2009, coupled with the death of Alhaji Buji Foyi, a seeming financier of the group. Boko Haram’s adoption of terrorism against the state is an illustration of a state’s terror act that prompts further terror coupled with other postcolonial factors. Helon Habila (2019) contends that the shrinking of the Lake Chad basin by ninety-five percent, which has affected the economic activities of the North East and has culminated in the migration of many “unskilled and uneducated” young men most of them turning into disciples of Muhammed Yusuf, has contributed significantly to the emergence of Boko Haram. Habila’s extrapolation about climate change and its effect on Lake Chad expounds the nexus between the environment and economic factors that contributed to the evolution of Boko Haram.

After the leader’s death and that of some of its members, Boko Haram sent its members to training in Niger and other countries in the Sahel. The terroristic campaigns of the group were led by Abubakar Shekau, a violent Salafist-jihadist, and the group started attacking state institutions like police stations, army barracks, etc, in 2009. The group later forged a connection with Al-Qaeda (Ayo Osisanwo [2016] in his linguistic representational analysis refers to Boko Haram as al-Qaeda affiliates), the Taliban, and Al-Shabaab in Somalia. This has made the group escalate its violence from the national front to the global by attacking the United Nations headquarters in Nigeria on the 26th of August, 2011. The Nigerian state’s political/leadership ineptitude and the corruption of the military whose members were, or are, sometimes, ill-equipped, have aggravated Boko Haram’s campaigns.

The sect has kidnapped many Nigerians, especially girls, women and children. The most globally mediatised kidnapping it executed was the April 14 Chibok Girls’ kidnapping in Borno state. The group has released some of them based on negotiations while some are still with the group. In addition, the group has suffered internal wrangling and has been combated jointly by the Nigerian, Cameroonian, Chadian, and Niger Armies. The group

has, since the pummeling of the coordinated military efforts, retreated into Sambisa forest, Borno State, Nigeria. Equally, the group fractured into two, one remains Boko Haram while the other is aligned with the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) and has renamed itself the Islamic State of Nigeria while it continues sporadic attacks on villages in the outskirts of Borno and Adamawa. The latter faction is also rumored to have killed Abubakar Shekau, the leader of the former group, which has made many Boko Haram members seemingly surrender to the government.

### **Al Shabaab, Somalia and the terror of clannism**

The politics of clannism has dominated Somalia since its independence. The clans are based on male ancestry (Solomon, 2015). Clans in Somalia include Darod, Dir, Hawiye, Isaq, and Rahanweyn. Some of the clans are nomadic pastoralists while others are sedentary. The politics of clannism is based on the rivalry between the different clans which, most times, lead to violent clashes. Each clan is analogous to a family unit that bonds on everything including avenging its member's death. The social, political, and economic debacles of the state have aggravated the conflicts in Somalia. Many times, one clan dominates the other in the political space and this creates rivalry. For example, President Abdirashid Ali Sharmarke was assassinated in 1969 by one of his bodyguards based on a supposed clan rivalry. It is important to note that the Rahanweyn are an arm-carrying group and the most marginalised in Somalia. The clan has the highest number of members in Al Shabaab.

The collapse of the Somalian Central Government in 2006 led to the control of South-Central Somalia under the auspices of the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC), a confluence of sharia courts and Islamic groups. The military wing of the ICU is Al Shabaab which later splintered from the body. The group's ideology is rooted in Wahhabism and the implementation of jihad. Adnan Hashi Ayro was the first leader of the group (Solomon, 2015) and he was from the Ayr sub-clan. Al Shabaab is also influenced by the politics of clannism; therefore, there is a crossroads between Islamic ideology and clan politics in the group. However, the group is unified against the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia and the proclivity of Ethiopian occupation of the Somali territory. Al Shabaab's Wahhabist ideology makes it attack the Sufi Islamists who are dominant in Somalia. The group practises takfiri

that declares Muslims that do not belong to their sect apostates and carries out deadly attacks against them to terrorise as well as make them submit to the sect's caprices.

Furthermore, Al Shabaab has perpetrated transnational terrorism as reprisals for attacks on its members. The group attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, on the 21st of September 2013 and killed many civilians including Kofi Awoonor, a popular Ghanaian writer. As part of Al Shabaab's effort to wield more power, it formed alliances with Al-Qaeda and Boko Haram. Al Shabaab's acts in the areas it controls include flogging women who do not cover themselves well with thick, heavy robes, executing adulterers like the stoning to death of a girl that was gang raped. All these practices are symbolic violence committed to instil fear in the populace. Al Shabaab, like Boko Haram, has moved from the local to the global.

### **ISIS: from Islamic sectarian terrorism to the establishment of a global caliphate**

The roots of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) or the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL), also known as Daesh in Arabic, can be traced to Ahmad Fadeel al-Nazal al-Khalayleh popularly known as Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. According to Joby Warrick (2015), al-Zarqawi was born on the 30th of October, 1966, "and had been troubled since childhood" (p. 43). He was from Zarqa, a poor region of Jordan, a part of the Bedouin tribe, and he was from a poor family. His nom de guerre, al-Zarqawi, was coined from his place of origin, Zarqa. He lived a criminal life from childhood and travelled to Afghanistan in 1989 to join the mujahideen to end the Russian occupation of the country but got there when the war had ended. He joined an Islamic terrorist group but later returned to Jordan where he was incarcerated with his mentor, Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi "who transformed him from a foot soldier in jihad to a leader who rivaled bin Laden" (Wright, 2016: p. 122). The two spent five years together in a Jordanian prison but were inadvertently released by Jordan's new ruler, King Abdullah II. It was believed that al-Zarqawi was radicalised in prison. The prison system in the Middle East has radicalised many Salafist-jihadists like Sayyid Qutb in Egypt and al-Zarqawi in Jordan.

After his release from prison, al-Zarqawi first went to Pakistan and then left for Afghanistan again during the Taliban government. He sought partnership with bin Laden but their ideologies differ which made bin Laden establish a separate camp for him miles away from

Al-Qaeda's training camp. The camp swelled astronomically with foreign jihadists from different parts of the world, especially the Middle East. However, everything was scuttled by the United States' invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 which made al-Zarqawi escape to Iran and then to Iraq where he established a group called al-Tawhid wal Jihad (which means Monotheism and Jihad) in May 2004 (Wright, 2016). According to Warrick (2015), al-Zarqawi saw fertile ground for terrorism in Iraq and joined forces with a bellicose Islamic group called Ansar al-Islam and merged with other smaller groups in Iraq. Before the union, al-Zarqawi had played the sectarian card by deploying violence and terrorism along the Sunni-Shiite fault lines. He attacked the Shiites and bombed many of their sacrilegious sites to unify the Sunnis against Shiites in Iraq. He also bombed foreign embassies and killed Journalists like James Foley. He believed in the apocalyptic Salafi-jihadi creed and instituted the takfiri ordinance as a religious identity politics to exclude Shiites and Yazidis from his pan-Sunni ideology.

Al-Zarqawi bombed Shiites mosques and killed the most popular Shiite in Iraq, Ayatollah Mohammed Bakr al-Hakim, as well as blew up the Canal Hotel and the United Nations headquarters in Baghdad. By this time, al-Zarqawi has set the Sunnis against Shiites. In addition, al-Zarqawi's terrorism in Iraq was festered by the United States invasion of Iraq. According to Warrick (2015), the United States used the presence of al-Zarqawi in Iraq as an alibi to invade the country coupled with other sundry allegations. Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State to George W. Bush, made a speech at the UN that globalised al-Zarqawi's name. However, al-Zarqawi still coveted a more pronounced global image; this made him approach bin Laden again, swore *bay' ah* (pledge of allegiance) to him and this culminated in the formation of al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI). It is important to state that al-Zarqawi aimed to obliterate the colonial-foisted borders in the Middle East since the fall of the Ottoman Empire as well as to depose apostate rulers that connive with the West like the King of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, *et cetera*. He perpetrated extreme and symbolic violence that included broadcasting gory videos of beheaded victims, sexual slavery, sexual exploitation of the Yazidis, and extreme violence against the Shiites. Al-Zarqawi was killed in 2006 when his Iraqi spiritual adviser, Sheikh Abd al-Rahman, mistakenly led the US to his hideout in Hibhib, Iraq. The death of al-Zarqawi did not translate to the demise of Zarqawism and the desire to perpetuate violence against the Shiites which was supported by the former generals

and officers of the deposed Saddam Hussein. The new Iraqi government instituted by the US, after its invasion, marginalised the Sunni population in Iraq and made them gravitate towards terrorism. This led to the emergence of a cruel leader in the person of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi who pioneered the formation of ISIS and its spread to Syria.

ISIS creed, according to Fawas A. Gerges (2016), was based on three books: *The Management of Savagery* by Abu Bakr al-Najj, *Introduction to the Jurisprudence of Jihad* by Abu Abdullah al-Muhajir, and *The Essentials of Making Ready (for Jihad)* by Sayyid Imam al-Sharif. The Mujahideen Shura Council and Mutayabeen Front declared the formation of Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) in 2006 after the demise of al-Zarqawi. The first leader of ISI was Abu Omar al-Baghdadi who was killed in 2010 by a US airstrike. He was replaced by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi whose real name was Ibrahim Ibn Awwad al-Badri al-Samarrai (Gerges, 2016). Like his predecessors, he was incarcerated in the notorious US Camp Bucca prison in Iraq where he was radicalised. He was never an ideologue nor a jihadist foot soldier until then but he studied Islamic Studies.

Al-Baghdadi exploited the political tyranny in Iraq and filled the institutional vacuum created by the US invasion of Iraq. He maintained an extreme Salafist-jihadist ideology and possesses a totalitarian worldview that employs beheading and burning as terrorist tactics to create fear. ISIS continued the Sunni Islamic identity despite the rupture between the group and the Sunnis in Iraq who despised the group's despicable brutality. ISIS used religious doctrines to justify its killings; murdered many Yazidis too and sold many of their women and children into sexual slavery. It also appropriated the takfiri creed to create an identity for its members and to exclude other identities not part of its monotheistic creation. Al-Baghdadi, a shrewd strategist, tapped into the political violence under Bashar al-Assad in Syria. He sent some of his lieutenants to form Jabbar al-Nusra in Syria – which means Support Front for the People of Greater Syria – to bolster other Islamist groups against Assad. Al-Baghdadi's goal was to establish a global Islamic caliphate without borders starting from Iraq. In 2013, al-Baghdadi announced the formation of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) which al-Nusra under Abu Mohammed al-Julani repudiated. This led to ripples between the two groups and al-Qaeda too. However, ISIS, under the vanguard of al-Baghdadi, continued to rampage and extend its tentacles by claiming territories from

Raqqa to Mosul. These territories were subjected to ISIS's brand of Sharia law and terrorism. ISIS fighters left bodies on the streets to rot; closed schools and established their variant of Islamic schools to indoctrinate young minds. The claiming of territories by ISIS made the US enter the fray it did not want to, coupled with other Western allies and, at present, most of the territories occupied by ISIS have been reclaimed while al-Baghdadi is still at large. Al-Baghdadi was killed in 2019 and Abu Ibrahim al-Hashimi al-Qurashi replaced him.

### **2.1.3. Terrorism and literary expressions**

The history of terrorism and the conceptualisation of its discourse are hegemonic, based on its purview as designed by the Global North. Therefore, it is pertinent to commence this review with the argument that terror is more encompassing than terrorism itself. David Simpson (2019) opines that the extreme violence that existed before the French Revolution was generally known as terror therefore terrorism was birthed during the Reign of Terror while this may not be necessary owing to the politicisation of the term by the West, his argument that terror has numerous nuances that make its purview pervasive holds. Simpson (2019) believes terror should be described in different forms in terms of male violence against women, police violence directed at "Black" Americans in the United States and furthers his argument that these forms of systemic violence within constituted authorities are neglected and identified "with the enemy other" (p. 10).

The extent of terrorism and its scope requires the deconstruction of the power of naming being wielded by the West with the United States of America (USA) at its vanguard. The Israeli-Palestinian relationship brings to mind the power of naming those against the dominance of the US as terrorists while those within its circle are described as defending the security of their borders. To return to the argument of terror and terrorism, terror is the reification of what terrorism constitutes as the use of systemic violence, a politicised term, and its discourse. In addition, terror is within terrorism but in its depoliticised sense, broader than terrorism in its materiality. Robert Young (2010) conceives terror as multi-faceted. Terror is violence, affect, aesthetics, suspense, and farce. Terror, from this perspective, accounts for the actual systemic violence of the act, the psychological feeling of the act which means terror as trauma, and the aestheticisation of the act. Terrorism, therefore, is

the systemic and symbolic use of obvious or subtle violence – terror itself – perpetrated by state or non-state actors to instil fear in a designated audience based on peculiar motives ranging from religious to secular. Terrorism, apart from the materiality of its systemic violence, comprises the textuality of terror from the dominant perspective.

Although it is pertinent to raise the caveat at this point, that no definition of terrorism is universal and all-encompassing because of the politicisation of the term, terrorism and terror, in this thesis, will be deployed as Siamese twins with the underpinning of terrorism as a dominant term and terror as a deconstructed appellation of the nuances that terrorism as a term may not account for. For example, a legal state may adopt terror tactics as a security measure to control its citizens, terrorism in its dominant political frame may not account for this, but in its deconstructed sense, the terror of the state will be perceived as state terrorism. The State of Israel may not be categorised as a terrorist state in the dominant discourse of terrorism; however, the terror that the State of Israel unleashes on Palestinians in the Gaza strip and West Bank is state terror disguised as state security. Simpson (2019) argues that terrorism in association with the state has almost disappeared “outside of limited countercultural subgroups and specialists” (p. 166). Though Simpson’s argument seems exhaustively correct, it does not consider the discursivisation of terrorism concerning dissent states like Palestine and Iran by the United States. However, terror and terrorism are appropriated interchangeably in some contexts.

Terror, in this thesis, is conceived as “fear” wielded by the hegemonic structures of the state to subjugate the Other. One important feature of terrorism, however, is its formulation in rhetoric which galvanises the act of terror itself and this runs in parallel with the materiality of terror. Furthermore, terrorism as violence is mostly othered and communicative or symbolic while terror as violence pervades all borders and phases of life in its extremity.

The discourse of terrorism is complex and permeates different fields in different ways. To postcolonialist critics like Elleke Boehmer and Stephen Morton (2010), the epistemology of terrorism possesses a hegemonic perception that constructs the enemy other as the terrorist. This enemy other includes formerly colonised populations, other religions especially Islam that Said (1997) criticises the West of homogenising. The corollary of this is that terrorism, in most cases, is the West’s hegemonic discourse while, in the postcolony,



it takes the form of different power structures that subjugate dissenting voices. Margaret Scanlan (2001), a postmodernist critic, conceptualises terrorism as “both actual killing and a fictional construct” (p. 2) which translates to the second aspect as literary portrayal and the ruptures and ripples caused by literature or artistic creation like the popular Salman Rushdie’s affair. It is sufficed to mention, at this juncture, that terrorism as discourse is dynamic and complex depending on the perspective and the phenomenality behind its construction.

The history of the relationship between arts, novels in this case, and terror(ism) can be traced to the eighteenth century and nineteenth century, especially from the Gothic fiction writings to the Russian and English fictional works. Examples of terrorist novels include novels written by Fyodor Dostoevsky, Joseph Conrad, and his contemporaries. Blessington (2008) using the appellation “modern” argues that the “modern novel of terror was born during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century when terrorism emerged as a threat in Europe” (p. 123) while Frank and Guber (2012) believe it “goes back at least 140 years” before but this contrasts the difference between the literary history of terrorism and terror which is a point to register like Simpson (2019) contends. However, Young (2010) traces the aetiology of literary representations of terrorism in the novel genre to Jane Austen’s *Northanger Abbey* (1818) which was in the early nineteenth century unlike the arguments of Blessington (2008), Frank and Guber (2012). Austen describes an impending “shocking” event that will happen in London and the effect on the citizens especially the female characters, thereby conceiving terror as a feminised affect.

In the Russian literary tradition, the most significant novel that narrativised terror is Dostoevsky’s *Devils*, “initially translated as *The Possessed*” (Gudrun Braunsperger, 2012: p. 27). Braunsperger’s analysis connects Dostoevsky’s *Devils* to the Russian youth terror during the tsarist regime of the mid-nineteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. The novel narrativises the Sergey-Nechaev-inspired terror of the Russian revolutionary terror group that led to the death of Ivan Ivanov through the character of Peter Verchovensky, the protagonist of the novel. However, Braunsperger (2012) explicates that Dostoevsky’s “knowledge of the historic Nechaev was limited” (p. 33) and that his portrayal of Nechaev’s was based on newspaper reportage which in itself might be biased. This

argument evinces the concatenation between the literary narration of terror and media representation in which newspaper reports influence the literary creation of characters. It is also pertinent to note that Dostoevsky deploys religious allusion through the title: “devils” to portray the terrorist theme in the novel. This foregrounds the parallelism between religion and terrorism.

Frank (2012b) traces narratives of terror to the literary writings of the late eighteenth century, especially Gothic fiction writings whose plotting is prompted by the Reign of Terror in France. Gothic fiction like Matthew Lewis’ *The Monk* describes mass terror linked to the Jacobin terror. It is essential to note that the notion of the origin of modern terrorism as rooted in the Reign of Terror is based on Western epistemology and comprehension of the Self which relegates others and can be regarded as a form of “epistemic violence” that turns a blind eye to the terror of slavery and colonialism of non-European peoples at that same time. Albeit Gothic fiction is no longer regarded as terrorist fiction, Frank (2012b) contends that the “narrative of terror” should be envisioned not as a fixed genre but as “a transgeneric mode” (p. 44). The cause of this can be linked to the shift in the meaning of terrorism over time based on different historical developments and power shifts. Frank (2012b) argues that each ‘historical understanding of “terror” produced new types of terror narratives’ (p. 44). The implication is that the narratives of terror are intertwined with history as well as power shifts and world order, oscillating between the real and the imaginary modes of terrorism and ossifying what Frank (2012b) designates our “cultural imaginary” about terrorism. The significance of power and world order in the conceptualisation of terror(ism) and narratives of terror is neglected by Frank (2012b), these formulations are germane in the apprehension of terrorism whether as resistance or as terror in postcolonial spaces.

How literature aestheticised terrorism is debatable as early novels like Henry James’ *Princess Casamassima*, and Joseph Conrad’s *The Secret Agent*, either magnify terrorism in some cases or reduce it in others. The terrorism of the middle and late nineteenth century is ascribed to ideologies like anarchism, nihilism and mainly the question of Britain’s occupation of Ireland, neglecting other colonial terrors in Africa. Blessington (2008) concludes that the terrorist novel, in our age, “may have a long history and further

developments” (p. 124) which this study agrees with considering the further publishing of terrorist novels since 2008. However, from the postcolonial perspective, Blessington’s history of terrorism is limited based on the examination of the emergence of terrorist novels as a result of the threat of terrorism in Europe which makes Europe seemingly the only continent that experienced terrorism at the time. Almost at the same time, colonial terror was ongoing in different parts of Africa and other colonised spaces. Also, novelists’ exploration of terrorism only in Europe at that time is hegemonic in representation too, neglecting other colonised spaces that Joseph Conrad describes as “heart of darkness” in his novel: *Heart of Darkness*, therefore justifying colonial terror in the garb of civilisation. This hegemony is analogous to what Ademola Dasyuva (2017) designated “Western epistemic intolerance” (14) that sets Europe as the fountain of all epistemological materials, hence, neglecting other sources as secondary or subordinators.

Conversely to the diachronic provenance of literature and terrorism as solely novelistic, Robert Appelbaum (2015) presents an earlier historical trajectory of literature and terrorism in the drama genre. Appelbaum contends that there is a link between “Shakespeare's oeuvre and terrorism” (p. 26) which is an alter-history of arts and the tracing of terrorism to the seventeenth century. Appelbaum conceives terrorism as communicative violence which subsists in many Shakespearean plays like *Julius Caesar*. Although terrorism as a term was not in existence during that epoch but, in my opinion, terror or terroristic violence was a reality then. Appelbaum cites the use of horror and terror interchangeably in a closet drama *Darius* (1603) which engenders the argument of Simpson (2019) on the terror-cluster words that include horror and fear. The excavation of fear as a weapon of intimidation in Machiavelli’s *The Prince* by Appelbaum is noteworthy. In this case, extreme fear is deployed as a state mechanism for curbing dissents. Appelbaum gives an example of state terrorism in *Henry V* when King Henry executed three conspirators in a terroristic manner.

Appelbaum’s (2015) reading of Shakespeare’s play as a representation of state terrorism connected with the use of “awe” and publicised force is the reading against the grain of the trauma of victims of state terrorism. Appelbaum (2015) also valorises Shakespeare’s ideological underpinning of the difference between illegitimate violence by Macbeth and the legitimate violence of Macduff and Malcolm. This reading depicts the need to

deconstruct earlier literary texts that depict violence and how the different forms of violence represented can be interrogated as terrorism or otherwise. Shakespeare's plays portray sacrificial violence like in *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* and this sacrificial violence is parallel to the present campaigns of terrorism in different parts of the world like the Boko Haram campaign of suicide bombings in Nigeria and ISIS's in Iraq and Syria. Therefore, Appelbraum's campaign for analysing the nuances of terrorism in Shakespeare's plays through the lens of "its symbolic and communicative violence" underscores the need to interrogate violence perpetrated in the name of the state and the nexus between legitimate violence and terrorism.

The narrativisation and thematisation of terrorism in fiction continued through the twentieth century across different nation-states and terrorist novels have recorded the different facets of terrorism and the historical developments. In the twenty-first century, such instance lingers in the 9/11 terrorist novels (the designation for novels about September 9, 2001, attacks on the US by Al-Qaeda). The question Frank and Guber (2012) raise is whether there is a continuity in the history of the literary representations of terrorism or a rupture but they postulate two paradigms hinged on the trauma-theoretical framework of 9/11 narratives and the "ethical obligation to bear witness" (4) which characterise fiction as a mediating agency. However, this thesis conceives the literary representation of terrorism after 9/11 as a continuity of the Western hegemony that mediated terrorism in its borders as pronounced and as a synecdoche of one for all while terrorism in the former colonised spaces is considered normal, though this is not to dispute the scale of 9/11 which makes it a "master signifier" in McClintock's (2015) term.

The aestheticisation of terror(ism) since the late nineteenth century has aroused numerous arguments such as the connection between the figure of a novelist and a terrorist, the connection between novelistic narrativisation and the media's representation of terrorism, and the influence of other discursive fields on literary representations of terrorism as continuity, disjuncture or stereotypical. At this juncture, to deduce the relationship between terrorism and literature, it is imperative to reconsider the paradigmatic typologies of "terrorist narratives" by Anthony Kubiak (2004).

Kubiak (2004) postulates three types of terrorist narratives with a bracketed notice on how the relationship between the types can be overlapping. He adopts the term “terrorist narratives” as a generic term to enclose the summation of the different forms of narratives of terrorism. The first typology is conceptualised as “writing of terrorist groups themselves” (p. 296), for example, the writings of Al-Qaeda, Anarchists like that of Sergei Nechaev, Islamic States, and the like. They are mostly full of propaganda and the rhetoric of terror that Simpson (2019) designates “terror-talk”. Frank and Guber (2012) rename this mode of terrorist narratives “literature by terrorists”. However, Daniel Beer (2007) contends that literature by terrorists serves more than just propaganda and justifies this in his analyses of Boris Savinkov’s *The Pale Horse* (1909) and *What never Happened* (1912). Boris Savinkov was the leader of the Socialist Revolutionary Combat Organisation, a terrorist military wing in Russia, between 1903 and 1908. Savinkov appropriated his novels as a denunciation of terrorism and “a morally indefensible pursuit of political objectives” (p. 29) which subverts terrorism. Therefore, Savinkov’s novels are narratives of atonement for his years of terrorism which he described as irrational and unjustifiable. Savinkov’s type is unique and rare as this category of novels is more appropriately described as literature by repentant terrorists.

The second typology of terrorist narratives in Kubiak’s theorisation is narratives about terrorism which Frank and Guber (2012) designate “terrorism in literature” with the bracketed explanation of “terrorism as literary theme”. However, this thesis contends that the classification of terrorism in literature as just “terrorism as literary theme” is simplistic and neglects the complex nature of terrorism in literature as theorised by Scanlan (2001) which analyses the relationship between a novelist and a terrorist among other dimensions. Kubiak (2004) claims that this category “would include...any form of literary discourse that sets out to explore the motives and ideas behind the socio-political and psychic act of terrorism” (p. 296) and will include polemical works that examine these intersections. This second typology is the primary concern of this thesis.

The third typology by Kubiak is narrative terrorism which Frank and Guber name literary terrorism. Literary terrorism exhibits “critical excess” (Kubiak, 2004: p. 297) and disruption of narrativity in terms of linearity, plot mapping and characterisation. While Scanlan (1994)

analyses this mode of literary categorisation as a manifestation of political aggression like Salman Rushdie's affair with Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran, Kubiak contends that it is more of psychic terror that relates to inexorable storytelling based on his conception of narrative preceding language. Although Kubiak further argues that the real interplay between fiction and terrorism is in the "ability of narrative (fictional or not) to construct a world that is fearful, uncertain and dangerous" (p. 298) as its link to terror which is a form of subtly merging the second typology and third typology, this study opines that the third category of terrorist narratives should have a link between text and context, like *The Satanic Verses*, for specificity. Treading along disruption of linearity, plotting and characterisation as narrative terrorism may make the argument of the typology broad and slippery, therefore, making it difficult to pin down to a particular corpus of narratives. For a narrative to be terroristic, there should be a link between the text and a rupture in the reality of the material world which can be designated as context. These texts will violate conventional norms like Salman Rushdie did in *The Satanic Verses* and will cause bubbles in the socio-political context of the material world whether locally or globally.

Christina Milletti (2004) provides a typical example of the conflation of the second and third typologies of terrorism and literature in her analysis of Kathy Acker's novels. She argues that Acker deploys terrorist characters, themes and terrorist prose styles in her novels like *Blood and Guts in High School* and *Empire of the Senseless and Pussy* to represent the Global Other as well as interrogate the interplay between language and power. Milletti (2004) conceptualises terrorist aesthetics as employing language as terroristic to shock the Western, capitalist hegemony, in Peter Widdowson's (1988) description. Acker, according to Milletti, uses language to create terror in the minds of the readers through violent sexual content, obliteration of the gulf between speech and acts, and expresses rape and incest in obscene manners. Although the analysis pivot on terroristic language, the style merges the typologies of subtle terror and terroristic styles that disrupt societal balance.

However, to further the theorisation of the typology of narratives about terrorism, this thesis theorises narratives about terrorism as broadly based on three categories viz. narratives about terrorism modelled on fact or an actual event, narratives about terrorism based on pure imagination and narratives about terrorism based on the future or surrealism. The first

category is therefore fiction narrative of terrorism which can be conceptualised as narratives whose plots, events and characters are based on actual terrorist attacks like the Boko Haram kidnapping of the Chibok Girls and 9/11 novels. This first category mixes imagination with real terrorist events to provide perspectives and engage the narratives and effects of terrorism. A good example of this type is Adaobi Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* and Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*. The second category is imagined narrative of terrorism whose plot is purely based on imagination, not based on any actual terrorist attack, event, or character. In this typology, the plotting is based on observations and insights from history but not an actual terrorist event that occurs in the real world. The last category is surreal/prescient narrative of terrorism which bases its plot, events, and characters on a future attack or surreal future that might be impossible to imagine. In most cases, this type of narrative may not be analysable until such imagined events occur or something close to it. This typology comprises elements of surrealism, terrorism, and futurism that are beyond contemporary times. A close example is Basma Abdel Aziz's *The Queue*.

#### **2.1.4. Representations and tropologies**

Representations constitute what is portrayed in a narrative, how it is depicted, the angle from which a subject/object is portrayed or formed, what is left silent and what is over-represented or exaggerated. Representation, in this thesis, is conceptualised as the mode through which a subject and an object are portrayed from the postcolonial perspective and how subjectivity is formed based on what is depicted, taking into cognisance the inherent politics that pronounces one over the other. A subject in this theorisation refers to a focalised phenomenon while an object comprises the "subaltern" phenomenon, what the subject acts on as the receiver of its concentration. The object is an othered figure due to its positionality in the spatial setting of a text. There subsist germane questions on representations that have generated intense debate in postcolonialism, the major theoretical framework for this thesis. Such questions, according to Neil Lazarus (2005), include

Who speaks? Of and for whom? How, where and to what ends? In which languages? Through means of which concepts and categories? On the basis of which problematics and epistemological assumptions? (p. 81)

These questions underpin the interrogation and contestation of how terrorism is represented in the selected texts. Terrorism comprises the tripod of the perpetrators, the victims, and those connected to the victims. Representations of terrorism, in this thesis, will examine the phenomenology of the subject, how it is constituted, its identity, the politics behind the formation of its identity, and the unrepresented as a gap.

“Tropologies”, the second terminology and plural form of tropology, is coined from tropes. Tropologies examine the tropes and recurrent motifs adopted in the “figuring” of terrorism in the selected texts. The tropologies of terrorism accentuate textuality over materiality and engage terrorism as the deployment of literary devices such as symbolism, metaphor, synecdoche, hyperbole, simile and tropes of madness and animalisation. Critics like Alex Houen (2002), Baudrillard (2001) have argued that objects of terrorism and the victims of terrorism are symbolic and synecdochic of a larger scheme. For example, the two World Trade Towers, according to Houen (2001), are symbolic objects of imperialism that the terrorists intentionally destroyed to undermine what the United States imperialism represents. Religious metaphors as tropes have been deployed as tropes of inclusion and exclusion. Religious metaphors like *kafr* and infidel have been used as terms of exclusion and tags for victimisation. Also, Houen (2002) cites examples of Fenians attacking buildings in Britain based on symbolism and synecdoche while Graham Matthews and Sam Goodman (2013) describe this type of analysis, quoting Slavoj Zizek (2008), as “symbolic violence,” the category that constitutes language and “structures of discourse” (p. 5).

Tropes, therefore, operate in the realm of signs and semiotics as it concerns events and their constructions either by terrorists or states. For example, the death of a victim that belongs to a class may represent a part of a whole to instil fear and communicate to the group that the victim belongs to. This is the synecdoche that an event may signify beyond its material effects. An addendum to the tropologies of terrorism in literature chronicles frequent motifs like the “Judas motive,” (Laqueur, 1977) and “sacrifice motive” that have become indispensable in literary expressions about terrorism.



## **2.2. Review of empirical studies**

This section entails the review of related critical studies in African, Asian and North American prose works as well as general discourse.

### **2.2.1. Critical works on the representations of terrorism in literary expressions of Africa, Asia and North America**

There is a symmetrical relationship between the representations of terrorism in discourse and cultural works. Discourse, in this sense, covers a corpus of epistemologies formulated by experts in a particular field of study, in this case, terrorism and other related areas. Discourse is virtually influenced by dominant perceptions about different phenomena and is influenced by the state or dominant institutions. In some cases, discursive framings may be wrong or stereotypical but they are constructed in a normalised way and sublimated form for acceptability. Cultural products like films, memoirs, autobiographies, novels, artworks, and others are greatly influenced by the dominant discourse on terrorism. Representations of terrorism in a cultural text impact the others too, therefore, representation could either be on the paradigm of continuity, which most times is stereotypical and hegemonic, or a disjuncture, which could be a form of engagement with dominant frames of terrorism.

Amanda Third (2014) states that “terrorism is a fundamentally intertextual phenomenon” (p. 157) and the public’s perception of terrorism is influenced by its representations in both fictional and non-fictional texts as determined, most times, by the state. Therefore, the representation of terrorism in novels is complex and entails different epistemic dimensions. However, the history of terrorist novels reveals that narrativising terrorism in novels starts with exploring the motivations and psychic configurations of terrorists. Some of these motivations, according to Mashhoor Abdu Al-Moghales et al (2018), include “poverty, wealth accompanied with excessive leisure, improper religious education, frustration resulting from psychological and social factors and the sense of injustice of all kind” (p. 370). All these form the structural factors causing terrorism although the alibis differ based on contexts. Cultural works like novels have interdependent relationships with different fields of disciplines like media studies, history, religious studies, among others. These relationships will be examined based on the framework of identity formulations along the lines of othering based on nationalities, religion, gender, transgression, and stereotyping.

Representations will be analysed along the borders of continuity, disjuncture and limitations.

In Africa, the critical studies of terrorism in African literature is inadequate which I conceive as a gap; however, there has been a surge since the late 2000s. African literature, relating to colonial violence and in extension colonial terrorism, requires close reading. The representations of postcolonial dictatorship and military terror also needs adequate attention to analyse the framing and historicity of literary representations of terrorism in African literature. The terror of the South African Apartheid regime as represented in African literature deserves close reading not as violence but as terrorism-as-resistance, not overlooking the terroristic tactics of the African National Congress (ANC) too. Boehmer and Morton (2010) advocate the necessity to “turn back to the colonial archive of violence and repression, to records of colonial formations of sovereignty, policing, and surveillance, which finds such prominent afterlives in counter-terroristic formations today” (p. 7). They designate it postcolonial terror which necessitates engagement with metamorphosed forms of imperialism which Jean Baudrillard (2001) constructs as globalisation owing to the phenomenology of terrorism as a form of resistance. These concern counter-terroristic approaches in both the West and the postcolony.

Ranka Primorac (2010), quoting Achille Mbembe, describes a postcolonial terrorist state as seeking “to turn all their citizens into either soldiers or informants” (p. 255) which brings to prominence the Mugabe context in Zimbabwe where citizens were classified as informants or sell-outs. The Mugabean institutionalised fiction is designated the “master fiction” by Primorac, quoting Mbembe, a type of fiction that engenders the wrong history as the right one. However, it is curious that the first example mentioned by Primorac in the Zimbabwean violent intervention and “patriotic history” is the “third *Chimurenga*” in which ‘white-owned farmland is “liberated” by being distributed to land-hungry indigenous Zimbabweans” (p. 255). The use of the phrase “land-hungry indigenous Zimbabweans” is insensitive to the historical trajectory of the land ownership tussle between white settlers and the natives; nevertheless, this does not justify the terror visited on the white settlers and landowners by Robert Mugabe. Therefore, fiction in Zimbabwe politicises state terrorism by keying into the Manichaeian paradigm of “patriots” and “sellouts”. However, critical

studies like Primorac (2010) do not pay attention to the deployment of necropolitics as war against terrorism in the postcolony. Other studies like Susan Dauda (2016) pay close attention to non-state terrorism but overlook the critique of war against terrorism in prose works.

The representation of terrorism and its perpetrators as the enemy Other has pervaded numerous inter-national spaces and is championed by the imperialism of the West. This notion mostly operates on the framework of identity in which perpetrators of terrorism are “naturally” ascribed to certain nations that are outside the Euro-American Self. Identity is a major epistemological frame that has generated diverse debates on racism, nationalities, ethnicities, and gender. Beverly Allen (1992) argues that identity “depends on...differentiation” which Israel Adeleke (2016) traces to the Hegelian binary tradition and yin/yang philosophy as well as the African folkloric tradition of comparing sun and moon, dry season, and the rainy season, among others. Identity is the formulation of a self against the other, a subject against the object, a nation against the foreign, an Occident against the Orient, or what one could designate “afrocent”, the African identity. Identity is formulated along the Manicheanism of perception, the binary of one against the other and a being as mirroring the other. W. E. B. Du Bois (1968) appropriates this duality in his formulation of the African American double consciousness in *The Souls of Black Folk* which borders on racism and the African American identity crisis in America. However, it is significant to state that identity construct is mostly imaginary and arbitrary with discursive formulations subtending them. This is what Bigger Thomas contests in Richard Wright’s *Native Son*. Because he is an African American, he is deprived of the existential need for survival because of his identity and treated as a foreigner within the national consciousness of the white supremacist American society which he resists in a sublime violent way by committing what the white American society of his time considers a hypercrime.

Representation of terrorism as othering is examined majorly as the Western hegemony that perceives terrorism as being the major action of the “enemy other” (Simpson, 2019) and this has permeated diverse discursive fields including literary productions. The Other, in this section, is within the discourse of international configurations and what Edward Said (2003) designates the ‘imperialist stereotype’ which employs generalisation as a mechanism

for representing the Orient. Therefore, Said (2003) raises a caveat on a representation that seems normal, especially those bequeathed by “authority and authoritative ideas” (p. 300). Also, Boehmer and Morton (2010) argue that Edward Said questions the “way in which the discourse of terrorism is used by powerful states such as the United States and its allies to describe and condemn violent acts of resistance to imperial occupation, instead of addressing the violence of occupation itself” (p. 10) like the case of Israel versus Palestine. Basuli Deb (2015) contends that the United States as part of its othering identifies men with Arab, African, and South Asian backgrounds as terrorists, therefore, exonerating its Self as the normal image against the Other’s image of dissidence and violence. The historical othering of the terrorist figure in the United States does not start from the racial Other but the ideological Other. Paolo Simonetti (2011) explicates that some terrorist novels have presented leftists as terrorists but this transposed to Middle Eastern fanatics at the end of the Cold war. This form of hegemonic discourse of terrorism influences the representations of terrorism in cultural works like novels, films, paintings, *et cetera*, and this thesis contends that it is a form of Freudian defence mechanism to exonerate the Self from any blame.

When terrorism is perpetrated in the United States and other constituents of the Global North, fingers are pointed at the Other nationals occupying its nation space as perpetrators and collaborators and this has prompted the dichotomy between the domestic and foreign. In American literature, Richard Hardack (2004) adopts this template for analysing Don DeLillo’s *Mao II*. According to him, DeLillo in *Mao II* depicts the battle between ‘the individual Western identity and that of a “mass-produced” foreign consciousness’ (p. 374) that he ascribes to xenophobia and paranoia. This image is mediated and popularised by Western media that subtly support the dominant epistemology. Hardack (2004) contends that there is a portrayal of the individualist Western versus mass terrorist stereotypical Eastern. Bill Gray, a character and writer in the text, is contrasted with the Eastern image which Hardack (2004) argues is DeLillo’s form of a western fantasy of the Other. His argument about DeLillo’s representation as western fantasy reifies the writer’s complicity in adopting the mediated image of the Other as the terrorist.

Therefore, the Other is framed as homogenous and this mass identity framed by different forms of episteme prompts the Western construction of the Other as a terrorist. This operates

within representation as stereotypical which will be expanded shortly. This representational othering is open to deconstruction that reveals the contradiction between the West always adopting a defence mechanism of accusing the Other as the source of terrorism while neglecting those within its borders, like white supremacists, coupled with the West's "war on terror" as imperial terror and its military engagements as parallels of terrorism.

The representation of the Other as a terrorist in different contemporary cultural works also intersects with religion. Considering the historical trajectory of Christianity which makes the West dominantly Christian though not homogenous too, the dominant West frames its identity against Muslim nations, especially the Middle East. Thus, there is the Christian/Muslim paradigm between the West and its Other. The corollary is that the Christian image is perfect while the Muslim image is violent and corrupt. Blessington (2008) argues that popular terrorist novels "often represent the status quo as unflawed" (p. 119), illustrating that, in Tom Clancy's *The Teeth of the Tiger* (2003), the United States and its military are represented as perfect in contrast to the corrupt world of Muslim terrorists.

In addition, Blessington (2008) interrogates the identity of hyphenated identities of terrorists who are conceived as liminal or hybridised subjects in American prose works. These liminal characters mostly have Muslim fathers-cum-other-nationals and Christian-cum-western mothers which this thesis contends is another form of othering that exonerates the Western unhyphenated Self as pure and uncontaminated. As an illustration, Blessington analyses the figure of Ahmad in John Updike's *Terrorist* (2006), one of the primary texts of this thesis. Ahmad has a Muslim father and an Irish mother who has meagre time for him. One point to flag here is the identity of the parents of Ahmad – the father is a Muslim while the mother is Irish – taking note of the Irish provenance of Ahmad's mother as linked to the Northern Ireland question that has contributed to the historical trajectory of terrorism. The representation of Ahmad is a subtle adoption of the paradigm of the Other as a terrorist in literary cultivations which is a form of continuity of stereotypical representations. However, while there is the identification of the liminality of the terrorists, critical attention is not paid to this representation as a form perpetual orientalisering of the postcolonial subject.

Furthermore, Ahmed Gamal (2012) analyses Updike's *Terrorist* and Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* in the same line, especially about the post-9/11 epoch that surged the misrepresentation

of the Other or the representations of terrorists in novels as citizens of selected nations and followers of a particular religion, especially in American literature. Updike, according to Gamal, explores the postcolonial relation between the US and its Arab others in the construction of race, ethnicity, sexuality, and religion. Terrorism, as a discourse, is used to label the non-western Other. Gamal (2012) notes that Updike and DeLillo explore the tension between strangeness and the modern in their novels with both representing terrorists as linked to Islam rejecting modernisation and globalisation. Globalisation brings to the fore Baudrillard's (2001) argument that terrorism is a weapon of resistance to globalisation, which we conceive as imperialism, considering the one-sidedness of globalisation that entrenches the Western culture as the dominant one for others to adopt. Therefore, Updike and DeLillo depict Jihadists as being ambivalent towards modernity. However, the question will be why the deployment of characters relating to Islam as being ambivalent towards modernity and whether there are no Western characters ambivalent to modernity and secularism. This means that novelists employ certain characters to legitimise popular and dominant frames. One other question is why the terrorists in most American novels are constructed as characters from the Middle East and Muslims. The extrapolation is that the formerly colonised subject is used as an object of legitimising dominant frames about the West's Other as violent, irrational, and strange. While Gamal (2012) concludes that the two novelists attempt to reconstruct the "impaired relation between the self and the other" (p. 114) like the redemption of Ahmad, the argument will be how efficient is the reconstruction without relapsing into only the Other as a fountain of violence. However, one should not forget Peter Widdowson's (1988) argument that terrorism "may be in itself a 'charade'; but the sign and symptom of a reaction to the terroristic behaviour of the Western liberal democracies" (p. 19). Also, Gamal (2012) does not perceive the representations as a continuity and the intentionality of satisfying American readers.

On Israeli/Palestinian literature which has been dominated by Western representations, Toine van Teeffelen (1994) argues that most bestsellers novels construct their characters based on an identity that pronounces the duality of Western versus non-Western, Jews/Israeli against Arabians, thereby lumping together the complexities of the Other as homogenous and supporting them with discursive episteme. He opines that the identity construct of Self against the Other is cloaked in metaphors that serve "political aims or

interest” (p. 385). Teeffelen (1994) interrogates the deployment of metaphor in its literariness and its appropriation that “feed upon self-other western dualities” (p. 385). Hence, these metaphors naturalise particular accounts of reality that may be misrepresentations. Such metaphors include invasion, plague, cancer, and pollution associated with certain regions or nation-states in the world. Teeffelen (1994) gives an example of “desert” as a metaphor for the Arab world in most bestseller novels representing Palestine which we contend is similar to the representation of Africa as a jungle. As Jayne Steel (1998) argues that representations, using Irish women in this case, “exist in relation to other representations produced by other nations” (p. 276), one would contend that this form of institutionalised metaphoric representation engenders generalisation which nurtures misrepresentation.

Representation of terrorism as othering in the inter-national spaces is dominant in the Israeli-Palestinian relationship both textually and contextually. While the Israeli occupation of Palestine is supported by the imperial military force of the United States and its allies and perceived as security, the Palestinians are represented as terrorists deserving to be curtailed even under occupation. Teeffelen (2004) analyses the stereotypical representation of Palestine in bestselling Western novels and argues that narrative representations can either be dialogical or reductive. While much attention will not be paid to the stereotypical representation here, it is imperative to mark the link between identities and nationalities as it concerns Israel and Palestine. However, Teeffelen (2004) categorises the representation of terrorism by Western bestselling novels into three modes of technological disaster, political conspiracy, and psychological spy novels. However, Teeffelen (1994) does not connect his analysis to the perpetuation of a colonial present from both discursive and corporeal levels.

The first typology of Teeffelen’s (2004) categorisation encompasses the use of weapons of massive destruction, combating its inventors and world destruction and he situates this framing between the 1960s and 1970s; the timeframe was the apogee of the tension between the Eastern and Western blocs during the cold war. The mass weapons are always situated in the hands of Arab leaders like in Colin Forbe’s *Year of the Golden Ape*. The second type depicts the conspiracy of the Third World against the West while the third mode portrays

Western spies living in non-Western geographical spaces offering fantasised understanding of terrorism. Teeffelen (2004) emphasises that stories in these novels framed Palestinians as primitive, vindictive, and envious while Israel is portrayed as civilised. This representation parallels the dominant discourse of terrorism operating on the identity construction of the Western subjectivity against the non-Western image predominant in international consciousness.

While the representation of terrorism and its perpetrators through othering has been examined as international subjectivity or national consciousness against foreign objects within its borders, this consciousness also operates within the national space between major ethnic groups and minority groups. This form of representation is rife in postcolonial states as Deb (2015) argues that dissident groups have been designated terrorist groups as a form of politicisation of differences. This will be a site of analysis of the African texts selected for this thesis. The politicisation of identity will be deconstructed to accentuate the gaps and aporias in the representations of terrorism. A caveat is essential at this point that representation of terrorism as othering does not undermine the perpetration of terrorism by the Other, however, the contradiction is prominent in the overt representation of one at the expense of the other and the relegation of the neocolonial conditions created by the dominant Self that prompts resistance. The non-representation or the under-representation of the systemic terror perpetrated by the United States and its allies within their borders against minorities in its spaces and those orchestrated on foreign soils as “war on terror” coloured with extra-judicial killings and illegitimate torture is a signification of the contradiction in the representation of terrorism as othering while in the postcolony the military and democratic authorities adopt systemic terror to quell dissension, naming the resistance of minority or dissent Other as terrorism which is a duplication of the international order of representation of terrorism as othering.

Thus, the deployment of identity based on othering subsists on various layers of epistemological and ontological spaces which can be inter-national or intra-national as the case may be. For example, there is tension between religious sects like the Sunnis and the Shiites in countries like Nigeria in which the minority has been branded terrorist while the terroristic violence of the majority to curb the minority is a “mimetic doubling”, what



McClintock (2015) conceptualises as the discourse of terrorism and counter-terrorism that reflects one another. This can be extended to the terroristic violence styled on communicative messages to intimidate and violate the dissident within the postcolony. This will be a major argument that will be pursued in the analysis of the African literary texts selected for this thesis.

The next paradigm of representation of terrorism in cultural works is representation as gendering which has attracted polemical attention from scholars in gender and terrorism as well as transnational feminism. Laura Sjoberg and Caron Gentry (2011) conceive gender as the “socially constituted behavioral expectations, stereotypes, and rules that construct masculinity and femininity” (p. 6). This means gender is subjective. It is based on stereotyped gender relations that have been passed down from one generation to the other, therefore becoming institutionalised in the process. Gender operates along with corporeal human representation and national configuration that key into the body politics. The physical human representation explores socially construed roles or qualities of the male gender against the female gender while the national configuration operates on the phenomenology of some countries as masculine while others are perceived feminine based on military prowess. Hence, gender refers to social roles and transactions ascribed to individuals biologically classifiable as male or female that have become the currency in different discursive and corporeal ontologies. The social construction of males and females also overlaps with representation as stereotypes which means most of the gender configurations of ontological relations have been stereotypically based and institutionalised formulations.

The first point of this review is what Amanda Third (2014) designates “the normative understanding of terrorism” (p. 159) which is “reproduced in popular cultural representations” (p. 159) that the popular terrorist is male which is a mode of gendering and frames the victims as female. This dominant representation has engendered the underrepresentation of female terrorists and the institution of the episteme of transgressive character of the female terrorist. Third (2014) illustrates that the gendering of terrorists is personified in the range of masculine figures like Carlos the Jackal, Colonel Qaddafi, and Osama bin Laden. Therefore, it is not surprising that most literary representations of

terrorism like Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* (2015) centres on the male as a terrorist and depicts the female as victims which has received little critical attention in African literature.

Another layer of gendering terrorism representation in cultural works and discourse is analysed by Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) as gendering the motivations of female terrorists as personal and that of male terrorists as political. Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) commence their engagement with women and terrorism based on critiquing the gendering of motivations of terrorism. Women are believed to engage in violence and terrorism for personal reasons while men engage in violence and terrorism for political reasons. The question is why personal motivation is ascribed to femininity and political to masculinity. This type of gendering of terrorist motivation is stereotypical and syncs with the subjective ontology of women as emotive beings while their male counterpart is considered rational. Such stereotypical motivations for women in terrorism include the loss of a loved one, being raped or drugged, or being forced. Few, according to them, account for the political motivation for women in terrorism.

In addition, Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) contend that “women and femininity remain less powerful than men and masculinity in almost every area of global, social and political life. Women remain underrepresented in the...structures of the world” (p. 3). Their argument is valid considering the subtle legitimisation of men as apposite for some roles while women are not. They argue that in terrorism, women are given some stereotypical prescribed roles like mothering terrorists, providing logistical support to men as exemplified in the film: *The Battle of Algiers* (1966), and providing administrative roles in terrorist organisations. Others that engage in combat and violence are rarely represented or viewed as transgressive or queered characters that cross the socially defined roles of gender. This is the crossroad between the representation of terrorism as gendering and representation of terrorism as transgression.

Furthermore, gender relations occur between members of terrorist groups as patriarchal domination. Some women in terrorist networks are violated and used mainly as sexual objects. Women are also perceived as victims while men are construed as perpetrators. However, Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) conclude that it is imperative to “focus gendered

lenses on a number of different issues...including women's participation in terrorist organizations, gender dynamics among members, gendered relations between terrorist organizations and target states" (p. 21). They opine that women and men do not engage in terrorism differently "based on their biological makeup" (p. 235). While taking note that men and women do not engage in terrorism differently based on biological features, Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) do not pay attention to women in terrorism that have accepted these stereotypical and subordinated roles and do not challenge them, therefore maintaining the status quo as seemingly natural. Also, this perspective has not received any significant attention in critical studies of literary expressions, except Houen (2002).

Their argument, however; although they work in the area of women, gender and terrorism; upholds the initial recommendation in this chapter that interdisciplinarity is essential for the apprehension of literature and terrorism. The gender relations that Sjoberg and Gentry (2011) dissect, which is dominant, influence the representations of women in terrorist novels whether through the depiction of the victimisation of women or the portrayal of women in terrorism as stereotypes or transgressive. Therefore, these narrative representations should be closely read and deconstructed while polemical attention should be paid to terrorist novels that depict women in terrorism as active and combative participants.

On the underrepresentation of women in terrorism and combat, Farhana Qazi (2011) historicises the "mujahidaat," female warriors whose account has been mostly relegated to the background in Islam. Qazi (2011) argues that what motivates women to participate in terrorism varies like their male counterparts and that they are also susceptible to social, economic, and political factors that drive people to terrorism. Therefore, she adds variability to the argument of women in terrorism. Qazi (2011) explicates that the "mujahidaat" were women that protected the Prophet during early Islamic battles in the 7th century and observes that in the Quran few female fighters are mentioned like Nusayba bint Ka'ab which may translate to either few female fighters existed at the time or they are underrepresented based on the patriarchal order in Islam as in most religions. The same runs parallel in the Bible where few female fighters like Deborah are mentioned which may be due to either of the two binary factors of few female fighters' ontologies based on patriarchy or underrepresentation.

Houen (2002) provides an alternative narrative of feminine perception in terrorism by quoting Stepniak (Sergei Kravchinsky) as eulogising nihilism for equating women to men in violence similar to the Sri Lankan women in terrorism. Nihilism in Russia in the 19th century was a counterforce for societal norms and ethos. It placed men and women on the same pedestal in terrorist activities. However, violence by female radicals was perceived as a threat to the social order and the male hegemony which made female terrorists a threat to their male counterparts who did not want to be framed as effeminate. In addition, women who contravened social order were designated female nihilists which made it a political and elastic term like terrorism has become in contemporary times. Houen (2002) gives accounts of how female terrorists were tortured by the police not based on their participation in terrorism but on their sexual identity linked to terrorism. The female terrorist was also reconfigured as male which was a transgressive form of subjectivity. Houen (2002) gives examples like that of Anna in Joseph Hatton's *By the Order of Czar: The Tragic Story of Anna Klosstock, Queen of the Ghetto* (1890). On the contrary, Anna's account as given by Houen (2002) runs on the template of personal or emotive motivations of females in terrorism. Stepniak's novel, *The Career of a Nihilist* (1889), features numerous female terrorists. All these literary representations are a testament to the influence of female Nihilist terrorists during the late nineteenth century, although that is one out of many hitherto.

The representation of terrorism as gendering has been shaped by "a bourgeoisie understanding of terrorism as fundamentally masculine" (Dominique Grisard, 2014: p. 82) and is connected to the "masculine gaze" of the mass media. Grisard (2014) provides a materialist interrogation of the representation of women in terrorism. Women are dehumanised in the mass media as phallic terrorists, psychopaths, unfit mothers according to Grisard quoting Clare Bielby (2012). The West Germany of the 1970s is analysed by Grisard (2014) as coding violence as masculine, neglecting the feminine lens of the violence. The Red Army Faction orchestrated terrorism in West Germany in the 1970s and deployed females in various terrorist campaigns. These women are perceived as contaminating history which favours the monopoly of men in terrorism. Grisard (2014) argues that the West Germany mass media framed terrorist women as irrational to deflect the audience or readers from West Germany's socio-political context which the female

terrorists reacted to and calls for a multidimensional understanding of gender, especially the female terrorist, in terrorism like Sjoberg and Gentry (2014) do.

With regards to stereotyping and gendering in the representation of terrorism, Sylvia Schraut and Klaus Weinbauer (2014) propose the same position as Grisard (2014) as well as Sjoberg and Gentry (2009). Gender relations, according to Schraut and Weinbauer (2014), are stereotypically constructed based on the tradition of “male=active=fighting and female=passive=peaceful” (p. 18). Although Schraut and Weinbauer (2014) claim there is no historical evidence to substantiate this associative chains, which may not be correct considering the dominant patriarchal history in most societies, they later trace the history of less representation of female terrorists to patriarchy with roots in the French revolution whose dominant male Convention perceived women as possessing low knowledge, educator of children and home builders. The French Revolution is conceived as the period that developed the gendered model of representing male terrorists and female terrorists. This argument seems real considering the French Revolution as the probable origin of modern terrorism.

Schraut and Weinbauer (2014) excavate the history of female terrorists during the French Revolution like Qazi (2009) does for the “mujahidaat” in Islam. The account of female terrorists during the French Revolution has mostly been relegated considering the Western patriarchal tradition. The first example they gave was that of Charlotte Corday who assassinated Jean-Paul Marat in 1793 which Corday described as symbolic to instigate mass action. In addition, the French Revolution set the stage for the transgressive representation of terrorists. Deb (2015), like Schraut and Weinbauer (2014), Qazi (2009), reveals the relegated history of the “fidayate” (women fighters) of Algeria. Deb (2015) argues that the Algerian history of the fight against colonisation with the use of terrorism has been majorly dominated by the male, thereby erasing the contributions of female fighters, and argues that revolutionists during colonialism in Algeria replaced colonialists – acting in similar ways like them, within revolutionary movements.

Also, female terrorists encounter the same inhumane and gendering treatment within terrorist movements. Deb (2015) analyses the violence against women within insurgent movements as portrayed in *I, Nadia, Wife of a terrorist* (2006) an anonymous memoir about

Nadia who is married to Ahmad and faces different kinds of violence as well as other girls under the rule of the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) in Algeria. The terrorists entrench patriarchy through different religious modalities that veil women and confine them to the margin, making them objects in the process or killing female dissidents in the crudest way to communicate to others. Nadia recounts her life between 1992 and 1996 coloured with gender exploitation in which women went through onerous house chores for the terrorists. The same is recounted by Farida Khalaf in *The Girl Who Escaped ISIS* (2015). Khalaf was captured by the Islamic States in Kocho, Iraq, and sold into slavery. This connotes what this thesis designates the *prejudicial patriarchal doubling* from terrorists fighting against supposed ills in societies while engendering the same forms of ills in their occupied spaces. This perception of patriarchy underpinning terrorism has mostly been neglected in the analysis of females' experience in terrorism.

Deb (2015) argues that women have borne the brunt of post-colonial politics of terror, while this is real, Deb though a transnational feminist should have included the word "more" because post-colonial Algeria's terrorism is not exclusive to females. However, the argument of women being exploited within revolutionist movements and terrorist movements is valid. This is a symptom of "prejudicial patriarchal doubling." Therefore, terror is inherent in colonial and post-colonial Algeria which is a form of continuity from colonialism to postcolonialism.

Another dimension to the gendering of the representation of terrorism in cultural works is the gendering of nation-states. This is connected to the body politics that perceives some nations as feminine while others are seen as masculine. Masculinised nations are mostly Occidental nations with imperial military prowess while the feminised ones are those with inferior military power. Hence, feminised nations endure the stereotypical social construction of femininity as weak militarily and economically in international relations. Allen (1992) links the "traditional gendering procedure" (p. 167) of literary practice in Italy to its feminised national identity which evolved from the Florentine literature that represents Italy as feminine. He perceives this as "the female gender of the nation as victim" (p. 167) and this translates to equating nations that suffer defeats during wars or conflicts as females which is stereotypical of construing women as the only victims of violence and weak. We

contend that, although women may suffer more during violence, that does not dismiss the suffering of men during violence too. Allen (1992) argues that the Italian nation in many literary texts is constructed as a silent majority gendered as female. Therefore, femininity is a subjective phenomenon that can be deployed on various imaginary planes.

Furthermore, Deb (2015) describes the privileged masculinity of Israel as against the “feminized Palestinian population of refugees” (p. 69). The machismo of the Israeli security state of authoritativeness is ubiquitous in various publications about Israel, describing its military strength as supported by the military machinery of the United States, which is engendered by the 1648 Westphalian political system that recognised the sovereignty of European-states as against the feminine non-European Other like Palestine. This thesis contends that Israel symbolises and positions itself as a phallus that possesses the right to penetrate and acquire the feminine Other. Israel, therefore, occupies a subjective position backed by the United States and other Western states while Palestine remains in the objective position with limited military strength – except for assemblages named terrorist groups like Hamas.

The conclusion on the representations of terrorism as gendering is that it pervades the discourse of terrorism and influences cultural works like novels and films. Also, representation as gendering operates on numerous layers and sites that require close analysis for its comprehension. Lastly, the representation of terrorism as gendering overlaps with stereotypical representation which has been entrenched in various discursive fields based on Western and religious patriarchal order.

The next site of review on the representation of terrorism in discourse and cultural works is representation as stereotyping which crisscrosses gender and othering. Representation of terrorism as stereotyping underscores generalised forms of portrayal underpinned by institutionalised epistemologies on terrorism. Such stereotyping includes gendering terrorism as being perpetrated predominantly by males while the victims are the females, Muslims or Non-European Others are terrorists and nation-states as defending their borders while employing terrorism in contrast with dissident groups (named terrorist groups) resisting the terrors of imperial nation-states.

The first point of review is the stereotypical gendering of the motivations of female terrorists as personal which has been reviewed before. Claudia Brunner (2007), while analysing the intersection between Occidental framing and female suicide bombing, explains that “the supposedly clear distinction between the personal and the political” (p. 963) in association with femininity and masculinity respectively “permeates scholarly and journalistic explanatory discourse” (p. 963). Therefore, the question should be why associate personal motivations with female terrorists and the political with their male counterparts. Is the male gender unemotional and impersonal during terrorism? Why is a female character considered devoid of political motivations for engaging in terrorism? It is based on stereotypical portrayal underscored by gender which conceives the female as emotive as well as an agent of children tendering as against the male that is conceived as political and a leader of activism. Brunner (2007) in the review of Rosemarie Skaine’s *Female Suicide Bombers* (2006) analyses the stereotypical gendering of female (suicide) bombers around the world as lacking “the plurality and complexity of women in different regional and national conflicts” (p. 963). The plurality and complexities of the circumstances of females in terrorism undermine the stereotypical gendering of their motivations and the “occidentalist pattern of othering”, in Brunner’s (2006) term, which critics should pay close attention to in analysing the literary representation of female terrorists or females in terrorism.

Another mode of representation of terrorism as stereotyping is portraying all Muslims as terrorists or the dominant framing of all terrorists as Muslims in discourse and literary works which is preponderant in African, Asian and American prose works. Meenakshi Bharat (2013) analyses that in most novels, of Kashmir provenance, the terrorist is stereotypically a Muslim while the non-Muslim is associated with state terrorism like the soldiers in Mirza Waheed’s *The Collaborator*. In DeLillo’s *Falling Man* and Updike’s *Terrorist*, American novels, the terrorists are Muslims. The prominence of the Islamic terrorist frame is dominant and steers attention away from other forms of terrorism as perpetrated by agents of the state, the state itself, and other imperial agencies which are usually neglected in critical studies of American and Asian prose works. The conclusion, here, will be that all terrorists are not Muslims if one shifts the lens away from the Occidental construction of terrorism.



Similarly, the representation of terrorism as stereotyping constructs terrorism along gendered and racial lines. Terrorists are usually represented as male while the victims are female and this operates along the racial dichotomy of Western males versus non-Western males as well as Anglo-American females against non-Anglo-American females. The western personality is represented as rational while the non-western is portrayed as irrational and ambivalent. Bharat (2013), using India as a case study, ascribes the dominant representation of males as terrorists to the ontology of more male writers than female writers, especially those examining terrorism in their works, this argument will be extended in this research. The ubiquity of male writers has engendered stereotyping, thereby, configuring female characters to particular domains as stock characters. Theodore Sheckels (2010) describes the stereotyping of female characters during terrorism in Richard Flanagan's *Unknown Terrorist* (2006) as sex objects while men are depicted as emotionally distant. Men are stereotypically active while women are passive. In the case of a woman as a terrorist, Neluka Silva (2010) explicating gendering in Sri Lankan literature argues that the female militant, within a terrorist movement, act based on the directive of the male leader which translates to functioning within the normative order, what one can contend as stereotypical order.

Stereotyping only the female character in terrorism as emotional also accompanies employing sentimental frames. Anne-Marie McManus (2013) critiques the use of sympathy, a form of sentimentalism, by journalists and novelists from the United States about Middle Eastern women which stereotypically is geared towards appealing to the Western audience without examining the contextual nuances of terrorism. McManus (2013) argues that female terrorists are framed sympathetically to justify their violence. She critiques Barbara Victor's use of sympathy as the only ground to connect the readers to Middle Eastern or Palestinian female suicide bombers in *Army of Roses* (2003) and depicts men as manipulators. According to McManus (2003), Yasmina Khadira's *The Attack* (2005) adopts the same style portraying the female terrorist, Sihem, through the Western gaze of dressing, beauty, and fidelity – a bridge to sympathetically connect the character to Western readers – while the male character, Amin, is rational. Therefore, the appeal is to deconstruct narratives that conform to stereotypical portrayals through the Western gaze and valorise the pressing factors that precipitate violence. It is essential to conclude this part by stating

that 9/11 has contributed significantly to magnifying the stereotypical representation of terrorism through the hegemony of Occidental frames by the United States and its allies.

Representation of terrorism in discourse and literary works as transgressing or queering is another mode. Representation of terrorism as transgressing or queering operates on diverse levels. The most prominent, however, is gender transgression in which male terrorists are transgressed as feminine men, homosexuals, or misogynists while female terrorists are queered as masculinised females or possessing hyperfemininity. Transgressing or queering the image of a terrorist aligns with the othering of a terrorist as a leftist, a Muslim, an Arab or African, a feminised man, or a masculinised female who should be evicted from a society, therefore, relegating the pull/push factors responsible for terrorism. This has received little critical attention in literary studies.

The history of gender transgression evolved during the French Revolution according to Schraut and Weinbauer (2014) and they conceive that women and men that perpetrate terrorism, especially against their government(s), “transgress their gender roles” (p. 21). They trace the history of transgressing a terrorist figure to Carl Ludwig Sand who fought against European restoration of monarchism in France and killed August von Kotzebue and was mediatised as a feminine man, a man whose emotion was too strong and educated by his mother. Hence, the man who acts under the state’s guided order is rational and masculine while the reverse is feminine. The feminine man is weak and resorts to violence as a voice to air his grievances. This means gender-transgression acts on subjectivity and serves as politicisation for a state’s legitimacy and “monopoly of force” (p. 22). Charlotte Corday was represented as a hermaphrodite and a masculinised female. However, the female terrorist is queered more than her male counterpart because she is considered a threat to the social order. Third (2014) extends the argument about the transgression of a female terrorist image as “not only non-feminine but also as...hyper-terrorist” (160). She is more terrorist than her male counterpart because of her gender and she possesses “a madness that is coded peculiar to women” (p. 160). It is madness more than that of the male terrorist based on societal gender bias or patriarchal order. Thus, the female terrorist image suffers double jeopardy of being deprived of her gender identity through queering as masculinised and being stamped with hypermadness than a male terrorist.

Representation of terrorism in terrorist novels also includes representation as continuity or disjuncture. Representation of terrorism as continuity entails depicting the status quo without interrogating the frames through which they are mediated. Such frames include stereotyping, othering the non-Western as the (only) terrorist and gendering terrorism as strictly male. These representations rest on the epistemologies of established discourse to engender continuity as a normative perspective. However, meta-events like 9/11 cause ripples on whether there is continuity or a rupture in the representational constructs of terrorism. Frank and Gruber (2012) debate how 9/11 has served as a “narrative of rupture” or “narrative of continuity” which they opine some writers combine through breaks in individuals’ lives against the continuity of historical trends. The combination of “narrative of rupture” and “narrative of continuity” is highly debatable considering the differing frames from which both operate. Most critical studies of prose works do not connect the old frames of representation to continuity or discontinuity, which this thesis aims to establish. Also, most do not connect terrorism to counterterrorism between the Global North and the postcolony.

Representation of terrorism in literature as disjuncture or rupture entails departing from established, discursive, or normalised representational frames to deconstructive ones that are apposite for the socio-cultural context of literary engagement, taking note of the contextual factors that shape the realities of literary explorations of terrorism like in Elnathan John’s *Born on a Tuesday* that debunks the homogeneity of Islam through its representation of Islamic sectarian violence and terrorism. This form of representation questions stereotyping, othering and gendering of terrorism by focalising on the exceptions that subvert these modalities of generalised thought engendered by Occidental discourse.

Similarly, Martina Wolff (2012) focalises religion as a “key element in interpreting the literary representation of terrorism” (p. 103). This is significant as religion especially fundamentalist religion has become an essential site for propagating terrorism. In most novels, fundamentalist religion is the window through which terrorism is represented. Wolff (2012) gives vivid examples in her analysis of John Updike’s *Terrorist* and Don DeLillo’s *Mao II*. She explicates the appropriation of fundamentalist religion as a medium to challenge “modernity and its prerequisites” (p. 110) whose features include uncertainty, perhaps in

social values and ethos which Wolff does not explain beyond constructing social accordance and the “ongoing discourse of instability” (p. 110). However, Wolff is correct in that modernity and its values in terms of materialism, consumerism and liberal ethos are issues usually challenged by fundamentalist religions.

In all, representations of terrorism in discourse and other media influence its representation in terrorist novels. Representation of terrorism comprises othering, stereotyping, gendering, queering, continuity and disjuncture. These frames of construction operate on different nuances of gazes that overlap with each other sometimes. It is the literary duty of a critic to dissect these layers of representations and discover the mode employed by a novelist.

### **2.2.2. Tropologies of terrorism in literary discourse**

Tropologies, as discussed earlier, study the common motifs of terrorism in terrorist novels and the tropes that are figured as devices as well as the textuality of terrorism. M. H. Abrams (1999) defines tropes as figures of thoughts and figures of speech considering how words change from their palpable meanings to a connotative import in the rhetorical sense. On the contrary, in this case, tropes, in their deployment in terrorism, examine the connotative message or meaning of a terrorist act. This means a terrorist act on a particular building may be because of what it symbolises and the corollary of the attack on such a building carries a metaphor beyond the attack. In addition, Abrams (1999) considers motif as “a type of incident, device, reference, or formula, which occurs frequently in works of literature” (p. 169). In this thesis, the main concern is the tropes of terrorism that have become motifs in literary cultivations. Thus, a recurrent trope in itself becomes a motif in terrorist novels. Motifs or motives in Laqueur’s (1977) use, in this mode of analysis, differs from the motivations of terrorism. Hence, tropologies conflate tropes and motifs of terrorism in a symbiotic relationship that figures the two in terrorist novels.

Laqueur (1977) reviews the various motives he has observed in different terrorist novels. The first motive he analyses is the “Judas Motive” (p. 19) which relates to betrayal, for example in Joseph Conrad’s *Secret Agent* and *Under the Western Eyes*. This is a dominant motif that runs in terrorist novels like the betrayal of Sheikh by Mallam Abdul Nur in John’s *Born on a Tuesday*. However, the motif could be a reconfiguration of a traditional one that

mainly explores the betrayal of the terrorist group by a member. Another motive, according to Laqueur (1977), is that of an intellectual who wants to be a terrorist but cannot be a good one. This motive has emerged more dynamically on the paradigm of a writer as a terrorist double or rival that Scanlan (2001) engages in DeLillo's *Mao II*.

The trope of the foreign as the terrorist, what Michael Dutton *et al* (2004) designate the "anti-foreigner tropes of inundation" (p. 3), runs through many terrorist novels and imbricates representation as othering and migrations that carry harmful diseases like the figures of Africans, Palestinians. In terrorist novels, there is a common motif of the outsider, rebellious, and psychopath as the terrorists. These figures are considered foreign to the normal local body system of a nation and are analogous to the "trope of infection" that Ruth Mayer (2007) explores as a mix-up in the virus discourse of contamination in bioterrorism. The foreign is analogous to a virus that inhabits a body as a foreign agency to disrupt the body system. Muslims, Arabs, and Africans as foreigners in Western nations portrayed as terrorists is a recurrent motif of the foreign that contaminates a national body system and this overlaps with the representation of terrorism as othering. Such figures like Ahmad in *Falling Man* and Mallam Abdul Nur in *Born on a Tuesday* represent the foreign, in other words, the Other figure, in the local body.

In addition, terrorist motifs include "undergoing training, establishing support networks, hiding or going for the kill" (p. 441) according to Van Teeffelen (2004). These motifs serve as a means of unearthing the links between terrorist novels and engaging them in terms of novelty or stereotyping. Terrorist novels about religious terrorism also employ the motif of the "promise of a glorious afterlife" using the phrase of Salim Bachi and Alison Rice (2011) and this motif is linked to martyrdom as well as sacrifice.

Tropes of terrorism are based on the symbolism and the communicative tendency of the act. Allen (1987) examines the trope of simile in Italian terrorism which signifies similitude. The victim or victims, as the case may be, of a terrorist act, are identifiable with a group and this makes every member of the group a potential victim which is the communicative aim of a terrorist attack. Although Allen (1987) critiques this mode of similitude as prone to being generic; however, Allen's description is more of a synecdoche, one that affects all psychologically. The kneecapping of a member of a class of people, for example,

magistrates, is an injury to all psychologically. The dynamics of this analysis transcend the corporeal effect of terrorism and extend to the psychological. However, Allen (1987) criticises the generic nature of the trope of simile that moves beyond the class it represents.

Furthermore, symbolism constitutes the most appropriated trope in terrorist attacks. The significance of a target and what it represents are very imperative for terrorists whose main objective is to communicate a message through their sublime violence. A close example is the Boko Haram kidnapping of the Chibok girls in 2014 at Chibok, Nigeria, meant to undermine the people's belief in the Nigerian government's protection of schools and the safety of students – especially girls – in schools. The terrorist act operated within the trope of symbolism. Baudrillard (2001) analyses the attack on the World Trade Centre as having “the greatest symbolic impact” (8). However, Baudrillard's analysis makes the symbolic attack seem unpremeditated by the terrorists by reverting to the “internal fragility” of the building and the building “collapsing on their own” (8). This argument is invalid considering the years of preparation that Al' Qaeda invested into the 9/11 attacks. Beyond the symbolism of the collapse of the World Trade Centre, Baudrillard (2001) opines that the exchange of death between the terrorists and the global system is symbolic. The sacrificial death of terrorists and their victims is symbolic and is connected to the symbolic collapse of a system of global signs and power. Beyond the symbolic death of the global system, there is a symbolic mirroring of the death of the 9/11 victims as a reflection of the earlier deaths of various victims of American military imperialism in foreign spaces.

The hyperbolic effect or spectacle of terrorism in the wake of 9/11 is also explicated by Houen (2002). The argument of the trope of hyperbole in terrorism is the exaggerated mode through which the attack is mediated to the audience which makes the event hyperreal and surreal, making it seem like the only event that has ever existed. The event is like “fiction”, which Houen (2002) describes as “surpassing the normal limits of experience and expression” (p. 2). Although this form of the hyperbolic modality of thought concerns the audience of a terrorist attack, one should be careful of the dearth of empathy that might accompany such analysis. Thus, this category of analysis which one may consider unethical and emotionally inconsiderate is best discursive than the materiality of violence.

The trope of religious Manichaeism of good and evil is discussed by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam (2014). This underscores “the trope of light/darkness” as tropes of Imperial order deployed by colonisers to represent the colonised. However, this figuring of the dyadic representation of the good/evil, believer/unbeliever, faithful/infidel is a common tropological paradigm often deployed in terrorist novels and discourse, especially when representing religious terrorism. Words like *kufir* and infidel are appropriated as identity constructs of the Others and they portray those believed to be living in a world “blind to moral knowledge” (Shohat and Stam, 2014: p. 140). This is parallel with colonisers’ beliefs about the colonised. Also, Kolb (2021) historicises the appropriation of the trope of epidemics for terrorism and critiques it as a ploy of naturalising terrorism to securitise counterterrorism. This is the only recent extant work on the trope of terrorism in literature and its material implication. However, Kolb’s (2021) focus still remains on the war against terror by the empire. The corollary is that little attention has been paid on the simulation of the empire’s war against terrorism in the postcolony.

To conclude this sub-section, in this thesis, the focus will be on how novelists adopt these discursive tropes to construct terrorist acts in novels about terrorism. Underlying these tropes will be a close reading of their implied signification, for example, the beheading of the Sheikh in John’s *Born on a Tuesday* which is a symbolic trope of removing and decimating the head of a sectarian movement by a rival which eventually leads to the end of the movement. The textual application of these tropes will be analysed in parallel with the underlying motifs that connect the different narratives in the texts selected for this study.

### **2.2.3. Critical works on the sampled texts**

Elnathan John’s *Born on a Tuesday* (*BOAT*), one of the African prose works, has received significant critical attention from Susan Dauda (2016), Ajibola Opeyemi (2018), Oluwakemi Emmanuel-Olowonubi and Chinaza Ogbonna (2020), Lola Akande (2021), among others, Dauda (2016), Emmanuel-Olowonubi and Ogbonna (2020) and Akande (2021) interrogate *BOAT* from the perspective of religious fundamentalism, extremism and terrorism but overlook the mechanics of the representations of the perpetrators and the victims as well as the necropolitical dimension. Akande (2021) furthers the argument by connecting the ambience in the text to anarchy, accentuating the diversity in Islam and

giving a synoptic analysis of Dantala's rejection of stereotyping but neglects the state terrorism undercurrents and the intentionality of John's politicisation of representations as continuity of literary narrativisation of terrorism, while Opeyemi's (2018) critique of John's fiction concerns the traumatic affects of terrorism. All these studies do not pay attention to the tropes of narrativising terrorism in *BOAT*.

*Buried Beneath the Baobab Tree (BBTBT)* by Adaobi Nwaubani has received little critical attention in comparison to *BOAT*. Davidson Mbagwu and Abigail O. Oaikhenana (2019) expatiate patriarchy as a product of culture and religion which is a veritable point but they underemphasise the essence of patriarchy underlying terrorism and the tropes deployed by Nwaubani in valorising the experiences of females in terrorism. Yasmin Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* has also not received much critical attention. Mohammed Senoussi and Ithem Serir Mortad (2019) argue that Khadra employs the "wolf metaphor" to exploit "man's barbarism, an incarnation of savagery, an emblem of ferocity, treachery and bloodshed" (p. 503) and to depict the terrorists. They interrogate the figuring of the terrorism in *Wolf Dreams* and expounds tropes like wolves, however, they also overlook the representation of state terrorism that saturate the text. Mohammed Khoudi and Amar Guendouzi (2021), in their textual exegesis of Khadra's *The Attack*, justify the Western-based sentimental portrayal of female terrorists in his narratives, however, this is a continuity of dominant lens of depiction that pander to Western readers. This is also sustained in Khadra's representation of female terrorists in *Wolf Dreams*.

Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones* has received significant critical attention. Kamil Naicker (2017) perceives *Crossbones* as a crime fiction and examines the appropriation of detective figures as national allegories in the text but does not consider the representational strategies deployed in narrativising non-state terrorism and Farah's critique of imperial war against terrorism. Harry Garuba (2017) posits that Farah's trilogy, in which *Crossbones* is the third, possesses the "teacherly aesthetic" (p. 17) [decolonisation to postcolonial and then globalisation] that encompasses numerous subject matters and thematic preoccupations. He remarkably foregrounds the link between the diaspora and home broadly and the legacies of colonial imperfection that affect the present but adopts a broad approach in dissecting the teacherliness of the trilogy within African postcolonial criticism. This broadness, however,



may undermine the focused and microcosm attention that certain issues like terrorism, piracy, necropolitics and the colonial present requires. *Crossbones* becomes necessary to draw vivid links between neo-colonialism, resistance, terrorism and necropolitics. Conversely, Eleni Coundouritis (2016) characterises Ahl as an improbable figure within the realist frame and appropriates the improbable character as a motif that is “key to Farah’s oeuvre” (p. 251). While elucidating the interventionism of Ahl as an improbable figure of a loving father within the historical realist frame, Coundouritis (2016) underestimates the interventionism of Ethiopia and the centrality of the empire’s colonial tendencies to the whole argument. Other works include Nicole Rizzuto’s (2017) reading of *Crossbones* through “the lens of sonic ecologies and media infrastructure” (p. 395) and F. Fiona Moolla’s (2018) allusion to Farah’s consideration of the complexity of terrorism and piracy in *Crossbones* which is extended to postnational cosmopolitanism in Farah’s (2014) *Hiding in Plain Sight*.

Consequently, in most of the critical works on the sampled African prose works, emphases are on religious fundamentalism and non-state terrorism, at the expense of the guises of state terrorism perpetrated by governments of various postcolonial states. Most of the sampled texts obviously represent the necropolitical proclivities of governments in the postcolony to critique the euphemism of state terrorism as war against terrorism. Equally, little attention is paid to the links between the narrative strategies deployed by postcolonial writers in narrativising terrorism and their Western/American counterparts, especially from the postcolonial perspective.

Khaled Hosseini’s *The Kite Runner*, one of the sampled Asian prose works, has received significant critical attention from different perspectives. David Jefferess (2009) reads the novel as an allegory of global ethics from the humanitarian perspective. Jefferess (2009) reflects on the diverse dimensions that the Hosseini’s work (from ethnography to the universality of the novel) has been examined and settled on the novel as “a morality tale” (p. 392), subtly justifying interventionism that appeals to Western sensibility. Albeit the argument for need for healing of the Afghan nation as an allegorical undercurrent in the prose work, the contradiction is that the healing for Sohrab is in the US which still panders to the empire. This overlooks the state terrorism deployed by the Taliban, the need to

apprehend it and the necessity of saving Afghanistan for itself and not outside itself. Sarah O'Brien (2018) also interrogates the novel as a national allegory and trauma. The trauma from Hassan's rape is framed as a trauma experienced by Afghanistan from the coup in 1973 to the Russian invasion in 1979. There is the perception of Afghanistan being abandoned by the West in O'Brien's exegesis which problematizes her interrogation from the postcolonial perspective and still poses the West as the saviour of the Third World. It is not surprising that Amir's return of Sohrab to the America keys into this argument which panders to the Western audience. However, she summarises Amir's effort to expose the protracted crisis in Afghanistan caused by the mutation of the Taliban from saviours to state terrorists. Hiqmar Nur Agustina (2015) examines the text as a testament of brotherhood during crisis in Afghan's culture, while Akram S. Hosseini and Esmail Zohdi (2016) investigate the ethnic prejudice and oppression depicted in *The Kite Runner* and conclude that Afghanistan can be united using the friendship between Amir and Hassan as a metaphor. Juan Du (2017) also focalises the journey of Amir in the novel and metaphorises it as the return of humanity of the whole human race. This argument, nevertheless, does suffice the extant state terrorism in Afghanistan and the silence of Sohrab in the empire. At the micro level, this argument seems genuine but, at the macro level, it is tenuous.

Conversely, Abdul Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban* has received little critical attention, except for meagre reviews. Rosheen Kabraji (2010) delineates the autobiography as the first of its kind "to shed some light on the Islamic militant movement from within" (p. 1455) and its origin but criticises it as less "objective or balanced" (p. 1456). Zaef's autography requires critical attention to apprehend the metamorphosis of groups from a resistant to a terrorist one, especially from the Islamic extremist perspective. Equally, the Palestinian-Israeli sampled prose works have received little critical attention. Emma O. Polyakov (2018), though not analysing Chacour's *Blood Brothers* directly, alludes to the bottom-up identity construction expressed by Chacour who perceives his homeland as Palestine and a Holy Land. Michael Prior (2001) also comments briefly on Chacour's *Blood Brothers* intersects with the Palestinian community's project to expose "the human cost...of the Zionist enterprise" (p. 523) on Palestinians. Mallard's *Stillpoint* has received no known critical attention based on surfing databases like Jstor and online platforms like Google and Google Scholar. However, in this study, *Stillpoint* and *Blood Brothers* are investigated

based on their sui generis representations of the Israeli-Palestinian crises and the proposing of humanist non-violent alternatives to terrorism, a shift from the dominant modes of questioning representations in literature and terrorism.

Updike's *Terrorist* and DeLillo's *Falling Man* have received significant critical attention. Wolff (2012) explicates the appropriation of fundamentalist religion as a "key element in interpreting the literary representation of terrorism" (p. 103) in *Terrorist* but does not consider the continuity of this depiction as politicisation to orientalise the Other as well as the tropes deployed to achieve these literary objectives. Furthermore, Gamal (2012) analyses Updike's *Terrorist* and Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* as misrepresenting the Other. Gamal (2012) notes that Updike and DeLillo explore the tension between strangeness, modernity and Islam, but does not employ it as continuity nor examine the tropes deployed for orientalising the Other. Also, Joseph M. Conte's (2011) observes that in DeLillo's *Falling Man* does not perceive Islamic terrorism as political, Margaret Scanlan (2010) contends that popular American novelists like Don DeLillo, John Updike, and Sherman Alexie present a limited representation of Islam. Similarly, Richard Gray (2011) deplores this portrayal by many 9/11 American/western authors like John Updike as apolitical. This study extends this argument by positing that these representations are intentional and a perpetual way of orientalising the Other as irrational.

Studies, like Sonia Baello-Allue (2016), Margarita Estévez-Saá and Noemí Pereira-Ares (2016), Sini Eikonsalo (2017), Paula Martin-Salvan (2017), have examined Waldman's *The Submission* from the cultural trauma perspective. Baello-Allue (2016) localises Waldman's *The Submission* as a shift to the political and cultural/collective trauma model. While she observes correctly the shift to the political, she does not examine the implication of the shift on the depiction of characters like Mohammed Khan and Asma. This thesis furthers Eikonsalo's (2017) exposition of Waldman's deconstruction of the stereotypes to other characters like Asma. Conversely, Yee's *For God and Country* has not received any significant critical attention which may seemingly be attributed to the nature of the "war on terror" memoir as "an act of whistleblowing" (Lisa Lynch, 2006: p. 213). This thesis fills this gap.

### **2.3. Theoretical framework**

The history of postcolonialism is not linear and it is indeterminate owing to the dearth of agreement between postcolonial critics on the actual date that postcolonialism can be traced to coupled with the contestation of the meaning of the prefix 'post' attached to postcolonialism. Henry Schwarz (2005) traces the genesis of postcolonial studies, which in this case means colonialism, to 1492 and examines it as 'the analysis of the historical, technological, socio-economic and cultural links between Europe, Asia and the Americas since 1492' (p. 2), therefore interrogating the emergence of European dominance on the world stage. One great omission by Schwarz (2005) is the non-inclusion of Africa in his description and this undermines his broad historical temporality of postcolonialism. Similarly, Couze Venn (2006) also contends that the questions about postcoloniality are founded in the historical provenance of modernity and modernisation traceable to the discovery of the New World in 1492. His argument is that there is a parallelism between Enlightenment and capitalism which birthed the various categories of othering by Europe and concedes that "new forms of colonization are at work in transforming the world today" (10) which is analogous to what Boehmer (2010) designates the after-effects of colonialism.

In a similar dimension, Quayson (2005) defines postcolonialism as the "studied engagement with the experience of colonialism and its past and present effects, both at the local of ex-colonial societies, as well as at the level of ... global developments thought to be the after-effects of empire" (p. 93-4). Quayson's description is more relevant and less-geographically biased compared to Schwarz (2005) who omits the whole African contact birthed by the European expansionism that saw many Africans shipped out of the continent to service Europe's capitalism. However, one may concur with Schwarz (2005) that the genealogy of postcolonialism is further than what is regarded as its formal institution by Edward Said. However, the centrality of colonialism to postcolonialism, especially in Africa and other continents, cannot be overlooked. Homi Bhabha (1994) enunciates postcoloniality as a "salutary reminder of the persistent neo-colonial relations within the 'new' world order and the multi-national division of labour" (6) and conceives it as a reference for the evolution of resistance against a capitalist order that exploits the human value.

Similarly, Bill Ashcroft *et al* (2002) provide a clearer insight by explicating the hyphenated concept of postcolonialism in two dimensions: the first conceives “post-colonialism” as covering “all the cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present” (p. 2) which means there is continuity by subverting the temporality of the “post” in postcolonialism. The second conception of “post-colonialism” by Ashcroft *et al* (2002) is based on “cross-cultural criticism” (p. 2) which is underscored by concepts of hybridity, syncretism, and the like. Therefore, in this thesis, the scope of the postcolonial will cover cultures or spatialities that were colonised and are still being colonised in different forms by the European powers of Britain, France, Portugal and Spain. However, the concentration, in this thesis, will be on texts from former British and French colonised spaces.

On the semantic implication of the “post” in postcolonialism, there are various controversies. One argument about postcolonialism is whether the prefix ‘post’ signifies temporality or transcendence of colonialism (Quayson, 2005: p. 88) and this parallels the debate on the ‘post’ in postmodernism too. Alfred J. Lopez (2001) debates the different significations of ‘post’ as what has happened or a conception of the future, a glimpsed future of multiplicity. According to Said (2003), Ella Shohat also contends that the ‘post’ in postcolonialism is an emphasis on “the new modes and forms of old colonial practices” (p. 351) and this position signifies a contested present. In this thesis, the conundrum of the ‘post’ in postcolonialism is in its hybridity of the conditions of the past, present, and the desired future anchored on undermining (neo)colonialism in all its nuanced forms. The past impulses are the interrogations, the present are contestations, and the future are desired conditions projected and recommended. Thus, ‘post’ in postcolonialism should not be referenced in terms of temporality but a condition that is imbued with numerous contestations for desired humanism.

Lopez (2001) explains three levels of contestations against postcolonialism which comprise ‘objections to the term ‘postcolonial’ as a wary epistemological category’ (p. 10), ‘questions of postcolonial agency and the subaltern’ (p. 11), and ‘the question of postcolonial hybridity and the critique of hegemony’ (p. 11). The first class contends that postcolonialism is an ambivalent term in which the ‘post’ is contested while the second group on postcolonial

agency debates whose interest postcolonial critics that dominate the field are serving and their real and teleological connection with the subaltern they ‘claim’ they represent. Whether these critics or human agents truly represent the subaltern is a question that begs for answers considering the elitism and distancing registers of postcolonialism. The third group questions the efficacy of postcolonial concepts like hybridity, ambivalence, and mimicry as theorised by Homi Bhabha and how complicit these cultural conditions are with Western hegemony and the elitism that accompanies it. Postcolonialism’s affection for the diasporas is criticised as being premised on the dominance of global capital that attracts people, especially skilled ones, from developing countries, and sometimes leads to the neglect of the subaltern.

However, Lopez (2001) responds to these contentions on three levels too. First is that postcolonialism is eclectic and encompasses all the discourse that shapes ‘nations and nationalisms’ (p. 17) and argues that (neo)colonialism is beyond economics but extends to the body and the psyche. Lopez’s justification of the agency question is feeble and denotes a partial realisation of how disconnected postcolonial agents are from their subjects of representation. In his words, there is “a willingness to stand for something, even if that agency and its object or focus are more ambivalent and qualified than their critics let on” (p. 18). This is subtle self-realisation by Lopez that the question of postcolonial agency and its partial disconnection from its subject of analysis is real. Lastly, Lopez argues that postcolonialism ‘does not lack historical specificity’ (18) which one can concede the logic. Postcolonialism’s counters and revision of colonial history and colonial misrepresentations typify a historical specificity nestled with the colonial epoch itself. Postcolonialism’s principal task is to counter colonialism in its previous effects and its present forms which include hegemony and imperialism but this does not limit its purview to the colonial effects. Postcolonialism engages slavery, migration, resistance, agency, difference, representation, identity, place, the diasporas, and ‘the relationship between dominant and subaltern formations’ (Bart Moore-Gilbert, 2005: p. 460).

In sum, postcolonialism is the theory of engagements with the extant conditions of (neo)colonialism in formerly colonised spaces both in its real forms and aesthetic categories

as well as the interrogation of (neo)colonial realities faced by citizens of these spaces or their descendants in different diasporic geographies.

### **2.3.1. The postcolonial project: violence, resistance, representation, and identity**

The genealogy of postcolonialism is remote and has been traced to various sources by different scholars like Schwartz and Ray (2005), Ashcroft et al (2002). Edward Said (2003) traces the earliest study of postcolonialism to Abdel Malek, Samir Amir, and CLR James, however, his omission of Frantz Fanon, Aime Cesaire, Leopold Senghor, Kwame Nkrumah, and other Africanist figures of the earliest twentieth century is questionable. This thesis will therefore discuss Frantz Fanon as the frontier of postcolonialism through its nexus with resistance and violence, especially in a colonial setting, reifying issues that birth the connection between postcolonialism and terrorism, treating terrorism as an arbitrary concept that is self-serving. Fanon conceives violence as imperative and cathartic.

### **2.3.2. On Violence: Frantz Fanon as the frontier of postcolonialism and terrorism**

Frantz Fanon's seminal work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, provides an opening to the colonial terror that breeds counter-terror as well as bottom-top resistance and contends subtly that colonialism, as well as its apron string capitalism, thrives on violence which prompts counter-violence. Fanon (1963) analyses, dissects and reveals the contradictions and paradoxes that engender violence in colonised spaces, using Algeria as a case study, although Fanon is generalist in his approach to colonial violence and its generated forms.

Fanon (1963) analyses the brazen use of violence by the colonialists to dehumanise the natives, not only physically, but in terms of their traditions, language, and culture and these actions affect the natives psychologically. The colonialists adopt violence to conquer territories and subjugate the natives, thus, making violence a means of communication, and turning violence into an instrument of power. The founding of the colonial society on terror and violence communicated its potency to the natives, and "turns inward in a current of terror among the natives" (18) which not only imbued fear in them, according to Jean-Paul Satre (1963), but also produced "suppressed fury" that would later find an outlet.

One important instrument appropriated by the colonialists, according to Fanon (1963), is the compartmentalisation of the colonial world which produced a Manichean system of ours versus theirs based on the identities of Europeans versus natives. Fanon (1963) expresses it as “a world cut in two” (p. 38) although this strict binarism may not be hard as Fanon analyses it owing to the fluid nature of identity at the base level because some natives became Westernised and enjoyed some similar rights like Europeans. However, this surface dyad is sustained by colonial agents of force characterised by “barracks and police stations” (p. 36). Therefore, the colonialists created a lifestyle of force, violence, and terror and sustained it through the same means. This lifestyle was coveted and abhorred by the natives simultaneously and this precipitated ambivalence. In the colonial world, using Algeria as a case study, not exempting other examples like Nigeria, Ghana, and other former colonial spaces, identity was constructed along the settler-native binary, hence, creating privileges for the settlers and depriving the natives of theirs through “rifle butts and napalm” according to Fanon. This form of identity construct has been a fundamental premise on which contemporary terrorists and states operate, despite the fluidity of the identity system that might make it difficult to create a pure “us” versus “them” category.

Fanon (1963) reveals the contradictions and the paradoxes that govern the colonial world by interrogating the principle of all men are equal which was not implemented in the colonial system. The colonial space employed ordering based on human identity to sustain its imperial and capitalist agenda and at the top of the list were the colonialists or settlers. Thus, Fanon concludes that the “violence which has ruled over the ordering of the colonial world” (p. 40) which the colonialist-settlers have manifested would later be “claimed and taken over by the native” (40) to reclaim the “forbidden quarters” that have given the settlers more advantages over the natives. Hence, colonial violence and terror stimulated anti-colonial terror in Algeria which made Fanon (1963) generalise that “decolonisation is always a violent phenomenon” (p. 35) which might not be the case in some countries like India and Nigeria. Although the suppressed violence witnessed by the natives in some former colonial spaces, like Nigeria, and Ghana, would later be employed by state apparatus who substituted the colonialists during the immediate years of post-colonialism, this accounted for the eruption of various military coups that destabilised the postcolonial world in the 60s, 70s, and 80s, not dispelling the fact that some of the postcolonial governments



were stooges to the former colonialists and were ready to maintain the status quo through the same terror and violence employed by the colonialists.

The “colonised elite” that took over from the colonial bourgeoisie had learnt the colonial terror and violence that sustained the colonial world and deployed the same mechanism of colonial policing and military tactics to govern the postcolonial world. Fanon (1963) attributes this to the compromising of the “colonised bourgeoisie” by the prejudiced Western values that the Europeans defend in their territories like in France but suppressed in colonial spaces like in Algeria and Congo. The Congo experience of commodifying a people and their land by the King of Belgium and its translation to a colonial enterprise and postcolonial charade that has plagued the Republic of Congo is analysed in David Van Reybrouck’s *Congo: The Epic History of a People* (2014).

Furthermore, Fanon (1963) opens the frontiers on the interrogation of agency and the veracity of authority. Through the postcolonial propagation by Fanon, the palimpsest of history by colonialists is brought to the consciousness of the natives and lays the foundation for what Edward Said designates the *orientalising* of discourse in *Orientalism*. Fanon (1963) reveals that the coloniser writes the history of the colonised in a colonised space which makes history itself compromised and the “colonised elite” represent a compromised agency too. Some metaphors are also appropriated for describing natives viz. savages and the use of zoological terms to dehumanise the natives.

Colonial violence awakens the consciousness of the natives to the mechanisms of violence and this engenders postcolonial violence. Although this does not mean that natives have not been violent, which is part of human nature, however, colonial terror, as well as violence, exposes the native to the power of guns and bombs which would become the instruments of contemporary terrorism. It makes the natives realise weapons as important in political relationships and negotiations. Violence, according to Fanon (1963), which may also be generalist, has unified the natives and served as a reaction to colonial violence. The settler who has undermined the native’s culture and engendered fear through the terror of guns and bombs has become a victim of its stratagem of violence. Similarly, David Richards (2010) contends that violence, for Fanon, was perceived as a “political strategy for independence” (p. 13) and a psychological, liberating tool for the minds of the colonised. Therefore, Fanon

(1963) conceives violence as both necessary and therapeutic, which makes Bhabha (1994) designate Fanon as a transgressive.

Hence, through *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon interrogates colonial and anti-colonial terror and provides the frontier for apprehending the after-effects of colonialism that have served as the subterranean elements intersecting postcolonialism and terrorism. Fanon has revealed how colonial violence, as well as terror, translates to postcolonial violence and terror, therefore serving as continuity. The substitution of the colonial group with the postcolonial bourgeoisie does not imply rupture but continuity in another form of colonial and imperial terror.

Despite being the progenitor of interrogating colonialism and violence, and opening the doors for the connection between postcolonialism and terrorism, Fanon is criticised by Bhabha (1986), in his preface to Fanon's *Black Skin*, as homogenising the colonial oppression which parallels the earlier argument of Fanon's generalist proclivity in his analysis. Furthermore, Bhabha (1986) accuses Fanon's writings of being divisive which, in itself, is subjective. What Fanon does is provoke our consciousness to reveal the violence and terror that underlie colonialism and how they have engendered postcolonial terror.

### **2.3.3. Edward Said and Postcolonialism: Resistance/Terrorism?**

The question of whether resistance or terrorism is an essential one that is interrogated by postcolonialism, considering the subjectivity of the two words, and their self-serving nature. However, the argument is that the borderline between resistance and terrorism is imaginary and based on context. While Fanon considers 'postcolonial terror' as a continuity of colonial terror and examines it from the physicality and praxis of terror and violence, Said (2003) sets agenda for humanism by conceiving it as the final "resistance...against inhuman practices and injustices that disfigure human history" (xxiii), while Said should not be removed from context, he opines that humanism should analyse texts by divorcing itself from state power and authority. Therefore, the resistance that Said refers to is in terms of discursive analysis and interrogation of human agency based on received and "falsely unifying rubrics" like Islam, America, *et cetera*. Although resistance in Said's analysis of humanism is discursive, Fanon's resistance is based on actual violence against institutions

of injustice. This serves as the departing point between the two critics. Considering Said as a sequel of Fanon, which in this thesis's argument is pertinent, makes one realise the parallelism between their ideas, despite both focusing on subtly different geographies.

One important point proposed by Said (2003) in *Orientalism* is the situation of humanistic analysis in interdisciplinarity and its contextualisation in “history, culture and socio-cultural reality” (xviii) which Boehmer (2010) also supports by arguing against any ahistorical analysis of postcolonial terror. This is to apprehend the myriads of entanglements that complicate textual analysis which cannot be divorced from power and its structures. This relates to resistance too and terrorism in which contradictions are manifested in the subjectivity of naming of actions by both “quasi-state” actors, using Wole Soyinka's (2010) term, and the state. Certain actions are designated terrorism when perpetrated by non-state actors, outside the corridors of instituted authority, while the same actions are perceived as “state security” when executed by the state. This, in itself, is the paradox analysed by Said and Fanon and this is characterised in (mis)representation, creating of imaginary geographies – like East vs West, West vs Islam, Occident vs Orient – for differentiation of identities premised on essentialism, racial thought and ordering of human culture and thought.

Said (2003) also centres his analysis on a parallel binary pivot as Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*. Said identifies the division of the world into geographies viz. Occident and Orient; identities –ours versus theirs, Westerners vs Orientals/Africans – in which this categorisation is imaginary and based on “power, domination and hegemony” (p. 5) culturally, politically, and discursively. Therefore, the Occident dominates the Orient by archiving it, writing about it, and, most times, misrepresenting it, by maintaining a static representation of it through metaphors like deserts, in the case of Africa, jungle, and the like. This means there is a connection between knowledge and power in which the Occident maintains dominance over the Orient through its authoritative archiving. These authoritative archives, “the ensemble of relationships between works, audiences and some other particular aspects of the Orient” (p. 20), are interrogated by Said as partial and associated with the colonial project, thus, making knowledge prejudiced. Hence, some identities, especially those outside the Occident Self, are constructed as violent, irrational, and

primitive. This parallels the identities of terrorists in most novels that are premised on popular culture and Occidental representation as well as stereotyping. However, instead of homogenising identities of terrorists, which is the objective of popular representation, this thesis argues that identities should be conceived as fluid, multi-layered, and based on socio-cultural and socio-economic circumstances without misappropriation and generalisations like Africans are violent, Islam is violent, Orient is distant, among others. These types of imagery are appropriated in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. The master-slave trope is used to describe the relationship between Robinson Crusoe and Friday. Robinson Crusoe represents the rational Westerner while Friday depicts the primitive and cannibalistic Other.

Furthermore, Said (in *Orientalism*) identifies representation, in its generality, as exteriority based on fantasy. In his argument of representing the Orient, the Orientalist constructs images, not for the consumption of the Orient but the West. Therefore, the circulated images are not true but a mere fantasy based on mass-mediated images, popular cultures, among others. Also, these exteriorised representations become preponderant that any alternative is considered lacking authority and unacceptable. Such representations are mostly premised on negativity, irrationality, weakness, and primitivism underlain by "institutions, traditions, conventions, agreed-upon codes of understanding for their effects" (p. 22) and canonical Western literature whose images are extracted from the Oriental cultural repertoire. This is analogous to Abiola Irele's (2001) allusion to the literature of exoticism in his explication of the Western influence on African Literature and he explains that European works deploy Africa as a setting and a source of themes that are mostly based on fantasies with examples in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and Graham Greene's *The Heart of the Matter* (p. 13). The corollary is that representation is virtually imaginary as well as static to maintain certain conventional frames but not based on actuality or factual existence. Irele (2001) ascribes this to "indifference or outright antipathy" (p. 14) which is "the basis of a hegemonic discourse" (p. 14). One can, thus, opine that representation can be a form of resistance against dominant construction and appropriation of identities, consciousness, idioms, and images for racist subjectivities.

Agency is another compromising factor in literary and popular representations. Agencies include literary critics, authors, philosophers, and institutions whose ideas serve as the

discursive fountain from which others tap. Said (2003) portrays agency as compromised and an appendage of power. Through the methodology of “strategic location” and being, Said (2003) contends that the identity of the person defining implicates the object of definition; for example, an American writing about Africa or the Orient will most likely be affected by the strategic location and political mooring of the United States. However, Said’s opinion may be generalist owing to his argument that a critic or agency cannot be wholly objective which has indirectly implicated him too. This does not refute the claim that most American novelists like John Updike, Don DeLillo depict terrorists as Muslims and immigrants. Thus, agency tends to maintain the status quo in the representation of a subject – making representation purposeful and consistent with received ones – countering this magisterial representation can be a form of resistance in its stance or deconstruction of traditional frames of representation.

Another form of representation of terrorism in the postcolonial is repressed representation. In this case, Said (1980) historicises the repression of the Palestinian voices in the struggle against Zionism. According to Said (1980), the Palestinian voice is not listened to but repressed. Hence, the Palestinians are represented by surrogate subjects like the Egyptian and Israeli representation of Palestine in the Camp David Accord that would institute peace in the Middle East through the ‘establishment of an autonomy regime in the West Bank and Gaza’ (online source). The criticism is that Palestine was not represented in the meeting, therefore, agreements were signed on behalf of Palestine by Egypt and Israel which is coterminous to repressing and silencing the Palestinians. In document No. 17853 titled: Israel and Egypt – Framework for Peace in the Middle East Agreed at Camp David (with annex), registered by Israel on 14 June 1979, it is stated that they (Muhammad Anwar Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and Menachem Begin, Prime Minister of Israel and Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, ‘invite other Parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to adhere to it’ which means adhering to agreements signed on their behalf. This type of project depicts repressed representation to indirectly maintain the status quo or maintain a favourable colonial model for the participants at the expense of the repressed. This type of circumstance precipitates getting alternatives to representing the wishes of the repressed.

One important factor in the representation of terrorism in postcolonialism is the use of distinctions and categorisations which have been appropriated for various self-actualisation and interests. Edward Said explicates this in *The Question of Palestine* (1980) and connects it to the perception of Westerners about Palestinians who have been connected to the greatest source of terrorism. According to Said (1980), Friedrich von Schlegel categorised the human languages into “Indo-Germanic (or Aryan) languages on the one hand and, on the other hand, the Semitic-African languages. Schlegel describes the former as creative, aesthetic, and pleasing while the latter is passive and unregenerate. This type of distinction has been used to categorise human beings too into civilised versus primitive, greater versus lesser beings, superior versus inferior and Occident versus Orient. It is this distinction that underlies the binary opposition of human categorisation alluded to by Fanon in the colonial world and what Said referred to regarding the relationship between Jews and non-Jews in contemporary Israel, formerly Palestine. The essence of focalising these distinctions is that, following the historical trajectory of categorising and distinguishing between the human race, this model has been adopted by terrorists too (or in the apprehension of terrorism) to classify those for them and those against them or using the popular parlance of ‘infidels’ in religious terrorism. Therefore, these distinctions have been used to create hostility and divisions for hegemonic self-actualisations and have prompted appropriation of religious metaphors like monsters, devils, and infidels. This causes what Said (1980) designates ‘minority provincialism’ (p. 148). However, it should be noted that these distinctions are imaginary, fantastical, and arbitrary. The impulse will be to interrogate forms of distinctions and categorisations to apprehend the motive behind such divisions and the violence they may engender.

In the reading of Said’s *The Question of Palestine* (1980), the representation of terrorism as resistance and an inevitable option for voicing the repressed is presented as the Palestinian contestation against Zionism. Said (1980) traces the historical trajectory of Palestinians’ dispossession of their land, their denial of their rights of return, and the Zionist misrepresentation of the Palestinians as primitive and violent to the declaration of the State of Israel in 1948 which is premised on Occidental colonial gaze. Equally, Said (1980) compares the Zionist terror and the Palestinian terror but describes the Palestinian terror as lesser and a response to the Zionist terror. In addition, he asseverates that Zionism has been

speaking for and (mis)representing Palestinians while Palestinian voices are relegated and regarded as anti-Semitism which Occident Jews have been deploying as an alibi/motivation to terrorise non-Jews or Arabs in Israel. The corollary of this 'blocked presence' is the resort to terrorism which 'can "speak" directly, can represent directly' (p. 39) to the world the Palestinian contestation against Zionist occupation and expansionism. This means terrorism becomes an instrument of resistance and a platform for voicing the repressed. Hence, is terrorism an option for representing colonial after-effects? How does the postcolonial effect influence the representation of terrorism? What is the borderline between resistance and terrorism? What are those analogies that have been learnt from colonial structures that serve as an alibi for terrorism? What is the symmetrical relationship between the representation of terrorism in the postcolonial world and power whether internal or external?

The response to these questions is to draw some parallels between the structures and organisation of terrorism in the postcolonial world and (neo)colonial projects. The first is that there is always an alibi for terrorism in the Postcolonial world and it is virtually linked to (neo)colonial interventionism or occupation like the case of Russia in Afghanistan between 1979 and 1989 as well as corruption, nepotism and government ineptitude at the local/national level. There is a history behind using alibis for terror, subjugation, and hegemony. For example, the colonial project of the West in Africa and Asia was premised on the alibi of civilising mission while, at the same time, siphoning resources to their territories for development. This alibi has been adopted by 'terrorists' in the postcolonial world to contest corruption, poverty, and western influence. Secondly, the framework of distinction has been adopted by 'terrorists' or those named terrorists to create a binary identity construct of us versus them, adherents versus the faithful. This is bequeathed through the colonial structures that once dominated the postcolonial world. However, it should be stated that this identity construct is fluid and mostly imaginary. Thirdly, the subject of who is a terrorist and who is not a terrorist remains imaginary and, most times, is based on popular media and hegemonic power representation. This makes the subject of who a terrorist is a contestation between dominant structures and dissenting epicentres. Thus, the definition and designation of terrorism are associated with power as well as hegemony, which means, there is a need for closer interrogation of who is defining, what is being defined, the history behind the definition, and the contextual circumstances.

It is pertinent to explicate culture and its intersection with terrorism from the perspective of resistance. Said (1994) in *Culture and Imperialism* dissects culture on two levels. First, he perceives culture as the “practices, like the arts of description, communication, and representation that have relative autonomy from the economic, social and political realms and...exist in aesthetic forms, one of whose principal aims is pleasure” (p. xii); however, his delineation of culture on this spectrum, which translates as discourse, is undermined by his argument that the practices are relatively “autonomous” of economic, social and political realms. Considering one of Said’s arguments in *Culture and Imperialism* that novelists, ethnographers, philologists and the like, in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, contribute tacitly to imperialism through their works, culture – itself – is interwoven with these “realms” and work implicitly to achieve their objectives, aside from the aims of pleasure. On the second level, Said (1994), citing Matthew Arnold, conceptualises culture as the “refining and elevating element” together with each society’s reservoir of the best that differentiates it from another. These differentiations underlie the national culture of “us” versus them” which serves as a source of identity and a form of “returns”, according to Said (1994), that have produced “varieties of religious and nationalist fundamentalism” (p. xiii) in the post-colonial world.

Therefore, this study positions that “terrorists” or “supposed terrorists” strive to create a culture of differentiation based on religious or secular ideological codes, inherited from those they consider as their best, to form a particular identity that separates them from those designated as outsiders. Consequently, culture becomes a terrain for engaging religious, social, and political issues in terrorism or resistance, not occluding that these realms are also sub-fields of cultural codes. Similarly, terrorism and resistance are systematised based on the various practices in mainstream societal affairs both locally and globally. On this note, terrorism is also a culture of codes for differentiation which is in line with binary categorisation to form group identities. The bottom line is that this sort of cultural orientation creates absolutism that prompts fundamentalism.

Similarly, Boehmer (2007), in a parallel argument as Said (1994), enunciates the necessity of perceiving terrorism from the perspective of the neo-imperial order (the coloniser) and the colonised and links this to postcolonialism and its writing. She conceives



postcolonialism from two vantage points “a globalised and hybridised inflection and the ‘resistance’ inflection” (5). The former is projected by Homi Bhabha’s proposition of cultural hybridity in migrant spaces while the latter is in line with the argument of terrorism as resistance which Boehmer conceptualises as “revolutionary expression of a counter-modernity” which signifies terrorism as a contestation against modernity and this is expressed in postcolonial spaces and writing in different forms. However, generalisation should be avoided when articulating terrorism as resistance as this can undermine the argument of postcolonialism against the War on Terror. In analysing postcolonial terror, history, as well as socio-political context and location, should be considered as significant factors in the interrogation of terrorism. The analysis of the Palestinian struggle against Israel, for example, will be different from the Boko Haram terrorism in Nigeria. Thus, terrorism and postcolonialism have an ambivalent relationship: one keeps the eyes open against state-prompted and neo-capitalist terror in which movements resist violently as was the African National Congress (ANC) during the Apartheid Government in South Africa while the other is to denounce arbitrary use of violence by both state and non-state groups against the subaltern.

Boehmer (2007) sets the agenda for postcolonial writing about terrorism by explicating that it provides “an understanding of what is at stake subjectively and sequentially for the different parties involved when terrorism takes place...it supplies ways of thinking through and beyond terror, and of developing workable political responses to it” (p. 7). This is the crux of her argument about postcolonial writing and terrorism which means postcolonial texts should provide answers to the questions of terrorism and the conditions that prompt them, elucidate the history that underlies these conditions and the socio-political as well as the global economic order that drives them and the changing forms from the colonial epoch to the after-colonial effects as well as conceive a future beyond terror. Although Boehmer (2007) explicates her argument with postcolonial novels of subversion that grasp the now of their societies like Tayeb Salih’s *Season of Migration to the North*, it is expedient that in apprehending the nuances of postcolonial writing and terrorism, focalisation should be on texts that narrativise terrorism in its real sense and that deploy their plots in capturing the grief and the pains on both sides of the tormentor and the victims, suggesting a future out

of the conundrum of terror, not texts that create a similitude of terrorism in terms of subversion of textual order.

#### **2.3.4. War on terror, religious fundamentalism and the postcolonial text**

While terrorism has been denounced as the enemy of humanity, the war on terror has taken a parallel form. This is evident in the torturous episodes of dehumanisation at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib, spaces operated by the United States to counter terrorism. Robert Spencer (2011) articulates War on Terror as the newest form of imperialism that is rooted in torture and examines this in J. M. Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*. He contends that torture is an integral part of the war against terror by the imperialists based on "a widespread and long-lasting ideology of dehumanization" (p. 112) that anything could be done to the Others and that the Others do not deserve the "moral and legal status of human beings" (p. 110). Although Spencer's analysis of Coetzee's text is based on the relationship between the West and its Other, it is not surprising that the principles of torture and dehumanisation have been domesticated and emulated even in the postcolonial world by the state to counter its Others or those considered dissidents within its national spaces. It does become imperative to conceptualise torture and dehumanisation not only within the limited purview of imperialism but also as intricately connected to power and human nature.

Another significant issue raised by Spencer (2011) is religious fundamentalism and its connection to textuality and by extension terrorism. While novelists like Salman Rushdie conceive holy texts as open to criticism, fundamentalists hold these texts as sacred and close to any critique which Spencer explicates as "undeviating allegiance to doctrines, traditions, and beliefs" (p. 143). Anybody against these sacred beliefs is subjected to violent opposition and this is the basis of the fatwa issued against Rushdie for writing *The Satanic Verses* which challenges the sacredness of the Quran and considers it a fallible text.

Similarly, there is reciprocity between terrorism and the war against terror approach which deploys "state of exception" strategies, therefore, making the fight against terrorism unjustifiable. Therefore, it is expedient to interrogate the representation of "war against terrorism" strategies in postcolonial novels too.

### **2.3.5. Models of interrogating post-colonial literatures**

This subtitle alludes to Ashcroft et al's (2002) subsection titled: critical models of post-colonial literatures. Their models of reading postcolonial literature are very insightful for this thesis. They discuss four models which can be abridged into three. The first model is the national or regional model, which can be extended to a continental model. This model valorises national literatures like Nigerian, South African, Indian, and the like and comprises parallel traits in terms of form, themes, and narrativising of national experiences. This model, in this thesis, can be extended to the continental category of African Literatures, which are sometimes homogenised but possess their contextual differences. Equally, the national and regional categories should not be homogenised too despite their parallels, they possess variations based on ethnic, socio-cultural, religious, and ideological differences.

The second model is based on race which evinces the experience of the Black Diaspora through Black writing. Writers and critics that operate within this rubric include Henry Louis Gate Jr, Richard Wright, Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, among others. The overlapping interest between postcolonialism and racial studies is broad. The themes engaged include the relations between Whites and Blacks, the institutional discrimination of Blacks, the relics of slavery, and the alienation of Blacks like Bigger Thomas in Richard Wright's *Native Son*. The third model is the comparative category that delineates the "varying complexity which seeks to account for particular linguistic, historical and cultural features across two or more postcolonial literatures" (p. 14). This type of analysis dissects, for example, the oral features or forms appropriated in certain African Literature and Literature of the Black Diaspora; the thematic parallels between two postcolonial texts by different writers from different regions. The fourth is similar to the third which Ashcroft et al (2002) designate the comprehensive comparative models which examine features such as "hybridity and syncreticity as constitutive elements of all post-colonial literatures" (p. 140). However, in this thesis, it is more appropriate to abridge the models into three namely: national/regional/continental model, racial model, and the comparative model. Why is the explication of these models imperative? Ashcroft et al's (2002) modified models provide a purview for this thesis and a methodological approach for this study's postcolonial exegesis. Therefore, this thesis will appropriate the comparative model of postcolonial literatures that

is connected by the theme and plot of resistance, violence, and terrorism. The postcolonial literatures in this thesis are literary texts from former British and French colonies.

### **2.3.6. Theorising postcolonial terror: state hegemony and non-state actors' resistance**

Boehmer and Morton (2010) theorise that postcolonial terror represents the continuation of colonial forms of sovereignty, policing, and surveillance in the postcolony. These “forms of reappearance” (p. 8) manifest in the establishment of detention centres and the introduction of emergency police powers, especially in the postcolony. While they perceive and enunciate these forms of terror as they are employed by the imperial powers, especially the United States, close attention should be paid to the appropriation and the imitation of these methods by many governments in the postcolony who function as appendages to Western powers. These governments deploy state terror to quell resistance or any form of dissent. Also, the bottom-up terrorism of non-state actors in the postcolony should be interrogated more. What conditions prompt this bottom-up terrorism? When does resistance become terrorism? How does postcolonialism interrogate the conditions and corporeality of terrorism by non-state actors in the postcony? How are the identities of postcolonial terrorists formed? How have anti-modernity and anti-western conceptions contributed to the different forms of terrorism in the postcolony or postcolonial terror? While Boehmer and Morton (2010) contend that there is “a historical relationship between imperialism and the discourse of terrorism” (p. 10), in furtherance of their argument, there is a concatenation between power and the naming of a terrorist.

Similarly, there is the theory of terror on both sides that starts from Fanon's delineation of colonial violence and extends to the theorisation of the necropower inherent in the sovereignty of postcolonial states. Before delving into necropolitics and necropower, it is essential to dissect Boehmer's (2010) argument that terror resides in hegemony and resistance. She contends that “state power and its enemy's power are both terroristic” (p. 156). The terror of the state resides in its hegemony, while that of its enemies (non-state actors) is couched in its resistance to state hegemony. The state has made other sites of resistance unavailable and terrorism has become, most times, the only mode through which the subaltern is made to speak and air their grievances. Therefore, terrorism is expressed as

violent anti-modernity and in some cases anti-western cultural tendencies that are equated with modernity in most postcolonies.

Achille Mbembe (2003) theorises sovereignty as a source of necropower, “the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who may die” (p. 11) which makes the state a harbinger of violence whose constitutive elements of governmentality, rooted in colonialism and modernity, employs violence as it wishes based on the law that sustains it. Hence, sovereignty is connected with power and mortality, however, the argument is that states create hegemonic situations through their machinery like the police where they step out of their laws to quell resistance at all costs. Walter Benjamin (1978) observes that violence is couched in the law itself which is contradictory because natural law believes in violent means for a just end while positive law believes in a just means and disregards the end. The point is, in some cases, the law is used to justify violence but it must be noted that the law itself is an instrument of the state to deprive the individual of its sovereignty, considering that sovereignty can denote freedom of the individual or the state. Thus, the critique of the war against terror is manifested in the arbitrary use of power to determine who lives or dies – creating cases of exception analogous to states of exception like “Nazism, totalitarianism and concentration/exemption camps” (Mbembe, 2003: p. 12) – to force state sovereignty. The history of secession and how states like Nigeria and Cameroon have quelled it brutally is an example of necropower.

While this is not a project to subvert the state’s prerogative to defend its sovereignty, which in most cases, especially in the postcolony, is forced by colonialism and is lopsided, how the state perpetrates this defence must always be interrogated to prevent the use of necropower. The contention is that misappropriation of necropower, especially against a “political enemy”, can breed extremism and terrorism. A good example is the extrajudicial killing of Mohammed Yusuf in 2009 by the Nigerian Police which started the Boko Haram insurgency and terrorism against the Nigerian state. The conflict has not been won till now and has degenerated into various human crises of displacement, horror, and mass killing. Hence, necropower and necropolitics (subjugation of life to the power of death (Mbembe, 2003: p. 39) by modern states) create conditions that breed extremism/terrorism and connect non-state terror, resistance, and death. Although necropower is conceived as negative by

Mbembe (2003), this thesis conceives it as inevitable and the compulsory power of death and subjugation of life vested in contemporary states by history and modernity that nation-states, especially the postcolony, cannot avoid but need to exercise great and cautious patience in its deployment to promote humanism and a terror-free society. For example, a state may legally kill a murderer or criminal that is dangerous to the state. From extrapolation, every state in this modern and contemporary time uses necropower and necropolitics whether directly or through proxy to further their socio-economic, political, and national interests.

#### **2.4. Chapter summary**

This chapter details the essence of interdisciplinarity to apprehending literature and terrorism. From the empirical review, it is obvious that there is a subtle link between colonial terror and postcolonial terror, however, there is a need for postcolonialism to pay more attention to socio-economic, political, and religious issues within the postcolony. The predominant trend in most postcolonial polemics is on the diasporic and exilic conditions, favouring hybridity, syncretism, and other multicultural modes. The local in the postcolony should figure more in postcolonialism.

On terrorism, there is a need to pay attention to the alibis, the conditions, in the postcolony that terrorists or revolutionaries allude to as prompters of terrorism and that form their ideologies. Similarly, the assigning of the word terrorist to an individual or group, in the postcolony, should be done warily and those whose figuring has been within this framework should also be interrogated. Therefore, the borderline between resistance and terrorism is thin which means that the naming of any organisation as terrorist should be done with caution and devoid of prejudice. Terrorism as a word has been politicised by various governments and this makes it difficult to interrogate the concept without compromising one's position.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.0. Chapter overview**

This chapter details the methods adopted in this study, from the study setting to the data analysis. It comprises the rationale for the selection of the texts and their settings.

#### **3.1. Research design**

This research employed a qualitative research design that examined how terrorism is represented and the tropologies deployed in the selected prose works. The qualitative design aimed to determine how state and non-state forms of terrorism are represented, especially the religious and political subforms and to examine the various representational strategies deployed by the authors. This will reveal the prejudices and biases that accompany representations of terrorism, the significance of place as determining the form of terrorism and the concatenation among the texts. The research design was largely phenomenological by connecting textual representations to historical events that prompt subtle or obvious representations. This research appropriated the literary research method that engaged in the textual analysis of the selected prose works. The literary research also means secondary data or library research and harnesses data that is already published (Kehinde, M. A. et al, 2019, p. 119). This research method was supported by the Postcolonial theory through the aspects of Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Achille Mbembe.

#### **3.2. Study setting**

This research examined prose works from three continents namely: Africa, Asia and North America. The prose texts represent countries that are experiencing or have experienced terrorism. The prose works depict both state and non-state terrorism and span modern and

contemporary terrorism. This research also extends to the war against terrorism and its parallelism with terrorism.

### **3.3. Population of the study**

The population of this study is twelve sampled prose works, four from each of the selected continents and the works represent different countries, depending on the scale of terrorism. In Africa, two prose works were selected from Nigeria, one from Somalia and one from Algeria. This selection was also based on the availability of the prose works on terrorism in English. Also, two prose works were selected from Afghanistan and two based on Israel/Palestine. It is expedient to note that it may be difficult to demarcate clearly the borders between Israel/Palestine without falling into the controversial colonial imaginary. Lastly, four prose works were selected from the United States of America because of the centrality of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The works from Nigeria were Adaobi Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree (BBTBT)* and Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday (BOAT)*, Yasmin Khadra's *Wolf Dreams (WD)* was from Algeria and Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones* from Somalia. The texts from Afghanistan were Abdul Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban (MLWTT)* and Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner (TKR)*, Collin Mallard's *Stillpoint* and Elias Chacour's *Blood Brothers (BB)* from Israel/Palestine. The texts from the United States of America were John Updike's *Terrorist*, Amy Waldman's *The Submission*, Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* and James Yee's *For God and Country (FGAC)*.

### **3.4. Sampling method**

This research adopted purposive sampling. Purposive sampling involves a researcher using their judgement to select the desired materials or people to meet the research objectives of a study (Kehinde, M. A. et al, 2019, p. 121). It is a form of non-probability sampling. Hence, the prose works for this study were purposively selected from designated countries and continents to meet the research objectives.



### **3.5. Methods of data collection**

This research primarily collected data from secondary sources and deployed the data in the textual exegesis of the selected prose works. The data for this research is from online journals from reputable databases (like Jstor), academic books and the selected prose works.

### **3.6. Method of data analysis**

The literary analysis was deployed in this study. The selected prose works were subjected to interpretive analysis through the postcolonial theory. The literary analysis was both text-bound and society-bound because terrorism is eclectic and relational. This study deployed postcolonial theory through Frantz Fanon's, Edward Said's and Achille Mbembe's aspects. Postcolonial theory is broad and variegated. For this study, Fanon's idea of colonial violence breeding counter-violence or resistance was examined and Said's conceptualisation of the West's stereotyping, generalising and Orientalising of the Other was considered as underlying the representations of terrorism in many Western narratives about terrorism, while the postcolonial deconstruction of this monolithic view was adopted. Mbembe's concept of necropolitics and necropower as brutal death and decimating the Other's culture was examined as underlying America's war against terrorism and the postcolony's war on terrorism.

### **3.7. Chapter summary**

The research methodology is explained. The selected prose works for this research were purposively sampled to meet the research aim of this study. The data for this research was primarily sourced from secondary sources and was deployed for the interpretation of this study. The prose works were subjected to interpretive analysis through the postcolonial prism of Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Achille Mbembe,

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF STATE TERRORISM AND NON-STATE TERRORISM IN POSTCOLONIAL AFRICAN FICTION

#### 4.0. Chapter overview

After the liberation of most postcolonial countries from colonialism in the 1950s, 1960s, and 70s, the predominant subforms of terrorism in Africa are religious and political. State terrorism is perpetrated by state actors against its people or the Other and funded by the government, while the non-state category is executed by non-state actors. Examples of non-state terrorist organisations include ISIS, Boko Haram and Al Shabaab. These forms of terrorism are based on “varied colonial legacies”, adopting Teju Olaniyan’s (2005) description. These legacies comprise socio-economic, political, religious, and cultural factors that have morphed into different complex circumstances that intertwine one factor with another. However, the most prominent is the use of Islam as a site of resistance, violence, and terrorism which is due to the rancorous rivalries and suspicion between the West and various sects of Islam, considering that European countries colonised Africa and that most Europeans are Christians. These colonial legacies, therefore, foreground various sects in Islam as sites of resistance and terror in/against modern African states. Equally, Islam, in this chapter, will be examined as heterogeneous and striving against its ideological internal wrangling among different sects. This contention between the sects is based on ideological differences due to various interpretations of the Quran which range from puritanical Salafism to Wahhabism to Sufism and Shiism. These variations in interpretations of the Quran have birthed various gradations of violence that have snowballed into jihadi campaigns and terrorism. For example, the Izala and Boko Haram split in Nigeria represents Islamic ideological differences that degenerated into extremism and terrorism.

Similarly, state terrorism and the appropriation of necropower have been dominant in most postcolonial African states. Most African states have witnessed different wars, genocides –

like Rwanda (represented in Boubacar Boris Diop's *Murambi: Book of the Bones*), coups, and quasi-democracy. These are based on various colonial machinery and policies bequeathed to most African states, like the colonial policing system, governmentality, and other modern institutions. State repression by the police and the military in different African states, like the South African Apartheid State and Nigeria, has led to the evolvment of resistance and terrorism in different forms. These countries employ necropower, a term conceptualised by Mbembe (2003), that means the "power to dictate who may live and who must die" (p. 11) to quell dissension within their borders and use power to inscribe absolutism and monotheism parallel to most religions.

In this chapter, religious (non-state) and state terrorism, the latter which will be interchanged with necropower in certain analysis, have formed part of the African ontology and are represented and mediated in postcolonial African novels. These representations have proliferated after the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centres and the Pentagon. Also, many Islamic sects on the African continent support and advocate the liberation of Palestine from the Israeli colonial occupation. Therefore, the representation and tropes of terrorism is explored in the following African novels: Yasmina Khadira's *Wolf Dreams* (2007) translated by Linda Black; Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones* (2011); Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* (2015) and Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* (2019). These novels are examined through postcolonial theory to interrogate the figuring/representations of terrorists and terrorist identity, the appropriation of the self/other binary for identity construction, stereotyping, necropower, the tropes of postcolonial terror, western fantasy in the representation of postcolonial terror, among others.

#### **4.1. Representing Islamic sectarian terrorism, its affects, and tropes in selected Nigerian novels**

Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* and Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* are selected as the novels for analysis in this subsection. John's *Born on a Tuesday* typifies a literary representation of the Islamic sectarian politics and differing ideologies that birthed Boko Haram in Nigeria by depicting sectarian conflicts and rivalries as well as its violent and terror effects in Sokoto, northern Nigeria. Although Chika Unigwe (2016) states that "in the west we mostly hear of life in northern Nigeria through news

reports of Boko Haram atrocities, John steers away from making this novel about Boko Haram” (The Guardian); however, she does not conceive the novel as a text that represents the conditions that led to the evolution of Boko Haram in Nigeria, therefore, subtly, narrativising Boko Haram. *Born on a Tuesday (BoaT)*, in this thesis, is regarded as the precursor (in the Nigerian Fourth Republic) in the literary representation of Islamic sectarian terrorism in Nigeria and the circumstances that fertilise them as rooted in the ideologies and sponsorship of Salafism and its concatenation with Wahhabism.

On the other hand, Nwaubani’s *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* represents the rupture of Boko Haram to family lives in northern Nigeria and the contradictory roles of females in the Boko Haram terror as well as imagining terrorism in the trope of madness. Different scholars – like Louis A. Sass (1994) and Michel Foucault (2006) - have interrogated the figuration of madness, especially in the Western imaginary. Sass (1994) delineates madness as a “protean figure in the Western imagination” (no pagination) with a common factor of irrationality. Similarly, Foucault (2006) historicises how terror is connected to madness in various ways and how the figuring of insanity has metastasized into different fields. However, the caveat is that the topology of madness in terrorism is often deployed to obfuscate different variables that perpetuate terrorism. Kolb (2021) contends that the trope of epidemics or disease is employed in cultural fields to depoliticise resistance and terrorism. Consequently, this depoliticisation provides the excuse for arbitrary securitisation of counterterrorism and the adoption of necropolitical mechanisms to undermine both genuine resistance and terrorism. Figuration of terrorism as madness may also be an excuse to abdicate the perpetrators of the intentionality of their actions. While at the superficial level, the argument of equating irrationality of madness may seem efficacious, however, at the sublime level, the intentionality attached to terrorism cannot be underestimated.

In Africa, the variations of Islam cannot be disconnected from politics and resistance. According to Falola (2003), there is a strong link between Islam and politics, especially in Nigeria. He perceives Islam as a cohesive force in Nigeria starting from the Sokoto Caliphate and expounds on the intersection between Islam and politics. First, “the government’s failure to promote development or enhance living standards” (p. 167) has made Islam an attractive alternative for organising change and this is represented in John’s

*Born on a Tuesday* in the character of Sheikh Jamal and his movement's filling the space of government's absence in many communities especially during the time of cholera. Second, tensions will continue in the country (Nigeria and most African countries) in the forms of "inter- and intrareligious conflicts" (p. 167). The intrareligious conflicts are usually sectarian, based on Islamic ideological differences and the wish to entrench one form of Islamic ideology over the other as well as the quest for religious funding. These ideologies in Nigeria range from Salafism, Wahhabism, Sufism to Shiitism, sponsored by transnational groups and foundations to expand their global dominance. These ideological differences are festered by differing political interests and complicated by the postcolonial condition/state of government's ineptitude and debilitating socio-economic conditions of the masses in the postcolony. The third intersecting factor, according to Falola (2003), is that "Islamic leaders and Muslim organizations are very efficient and astute at building regional and international solidarity networks to push their claims and gain strength in greater numbers" (p. 169). These Muslim organisations engender radical ideologies that focalise the state's alienation of its citizens and the corruption of the political leaders, therefore, radicalising the citizens and birthing radical Islamic sects. This is analogous to the historical trajectory of the Izala movement in Nigeria and the belief that it birthed Boko Haram (Gerard Chouin *et al*, 2014). However, the bottom line of Falola's (2003) analysis about the interconnection between Islam and politics in Nigeria, especially northern Nigeria, forms the background of most novels in this chapter. The postcolonial condition prompts violence that degenerates into terrorism.

Islam in Nigeria was established by the duo influence of the Sokoto Caliphate and the "Kanem Bornu" kingdom (Edlyne Eze Anugwom, 2019: p. 31). Also, colonialism strengthened the development of the Muslim identity in Nigeria. Kyari Mohammed (2014) traces the genesis of Islam in northern Nigeria and Nigeria further to the "centuries of contact with Muslim North Africa through trans-Saharan trade, the agency of the Kanem-Borno empire before the nineteenth century and the Sokoto Caliphate since the 1804 jihad" (p. 11). Anugwom (2019) contends that Uthman dan Fodio's jihad and the notions of pure Islam set "an immutable background to contemporary Islam in Nigeria" (p. 32). The Sufi brotherhoods of Qadiriyya and Tijaniyya are the major Islamic identities in Nigeria before being joined by the *Izalatul Bidi'a wa Ikhamatis Sunnah* (People Committed to the Removal

of Innovations in Islam), also known as Izala, and the Shiite body of the Islamic Movement of Nigeria. The pre-Fodio epoch in the northern region was polytheist until the jihad of the nineteenth century.

Since the 1970s according to Yasmina Tarhbalouti (2019), there was an evolution of various Islamic movements in northern Nigeria and this development occurred in tandem with the establishment of the Islamic University of Medina in Saudi Arabia which “became the intellectual centre of Salafism and attracted students from all Muslim countries” (online source). Izala, a Salafi-Wahhabi group, is one of the Islamic movements in Nigeria and has played a major role in the subtle radicalisation of Muslim youths in northern Nigeria. According to Johannes Harnischfeger (2014), the Izala, inspired by Wahabbi ideology, “sought to purify a lax and adulterated Islam” (p. 43) and considers whoever does not follow their “literal interpretation of Islam” (p. 43) as impure, therefore, creating a culture of differentiation between Muslims which prepare the ground for Boko Haram. Izala drew membership from the youths, who abhorred their parents for following magical ways and promoted equality between all ethnic groups. Harnischfeger (2014) describes Boko Haram “as a spiritual offshoot of Izala” (p. 48) and parallels Izala’s preaching like hostility towards the Tijaniyya and Sufi mysticism, however, Boko Haram contests the Izala clerics for their corrupt relationship with the political class. According to David Hundeyin (2021), the official name given to Izala by Sheikh Ismail Idris is “*Jama’atu Izalati Bid’ah Wa Iqamatus Sunnah* (Society of Removal of Innovation and Re-establishment of the Sunnah), also known as JIBWIS” (online source).

Izala was founded in the city of Jos under Sheikh Ismail Idris but relied on the “teachings of Sheikh Abubakar Gumi” (Tarhbalouti, 2019, online source). Izala benefitted from Saudi funding to propagate Salafism in Nigeria and called for the implementation of Sharia law and the removal of innovation, and religious practices that are not backed by the Quran and Sunnah. The youths that constituted the Izala movement refused to worship with the Sufis and founded their mosques, they also broke established codes. However, the first generation of the Izala members, according to Tarhbalouti (2019), were concerned with local issues like “anti-Sufi resentment”, unlike the second generation who integrated the local issues with global Islamic issues. The second generation was led by young graduates from Saudi

Arabia like Adam Ja'afar, who was Mohammed Yusuf's mentor. Rifts started between the second generation and led to a fissure, the first groups drew closer to the state while the second groups were at arm's length with the state, thereby creating numerous local Salafi-Wahhabis sects with doctrinal differences. Ja'afar's group, *Ahlussunnah*, according to Tarhbalouti (2019) was one of the most prominent and was based in Kano state. On the contrary, contemporary Izala has aligned more with the government. According to Hundeyin (2021), some of the present members include Shahru Haruna (at the time of writing, the Vice President of JIBWIS, Kano chapter) and Sheikh Yakubu Musa Katsina who are close to political figures, especially President Muhammadu Buhari's government.

The emergence of Boko Haram from Ja'afar's sect, according to Tarhbalouti (2019), popularised the Izala movement. Yusuf was described as more radical and forbade his followers from accepting Western education nor taking jobs from the state like the argument of Malam Abdul-Nur in John's *Born on a Tuesday*. Ja'afar and his religious scion, Mohammed Yusuf, had doctrinal differences and splintered which made Yusuf create his movement, *Jama'atu Ahlis Sunnah Lidda'awati wal Jihad*. The difference between the previous Izala groups and Yusuf's sect is that his movement believes in using "violence to implement its ideology". Ja'afar and Yusuf had theological arguments and debates that culminated in the killing of Ja'afar presumably by Boko Haram members in 2007. This forms the background of the plot in John's *Born on a Tuesday* and parallels the schism between Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur over differences in interpretation of the Quran and the belief in violent jihad. These religious variations in interpretation and rejection of innovation or modernity in Islam by Malam Abdul-Nur climax in the murder of Sheikh Jamal by the Mujahideens. Therefore, *Born on a Tuesday* can be designated a faction narrative of terrorism that portrays the activities that precluded Boko Haram terrorism in northern Nigeria and Nigeria as a whole.

#### **4.1.1. Textual analysis of *Born on a Tuesday*: a brief background**

*Born on a Tuesday* by Elnathan John is an eponymous and witness narrative. It is narrated by Ahmad, an adolescent, and *almajirai*, whose sobriquet is Dantala, born on a Tuesday. The narrative starts from Bayan Layi, a space of political violence and the small party's domination. Dantala, after completing his Islamic study as an *almajirai* under Malam

Jinadu, joins a group of boys under the vanguard of Banda; they live under the Kuka tree and they are mainly available for odd jobs given by politicians. The violence that engulfs Bayan Layi and the demise of Banda makes Dantala escape to Sokoto where he meets Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur.

Dantala witnesses the influence of religious leaders like Sheikh Jamal, the politicisation of religious philanthropism by Alhaji Usman, and the effect of religious radicalisation on sectarian rivalries. Sheikh Jamal epitomises the conformist Muslim and this makes Dantala admire him; however, he detests Malam Abdul-Nur who is violent and advocates violent Jihad. The tension between the Salafi-Wahhabis Sunnis represented by Sheikh Jamal and the Shiites is aggravated by Malam Abdul-Nur in Sokoto, northern Nigeria, to satisfy his quest for power and money. Dantala as well as Jibril, Malam Abdul-Nur's brother, grapples with the cascading effects of the violence that snowballs into terrorism between the various Islamic sects and the state. Dantala is caught between religious and state terror but he escapes both as a dehumanised victim of a state that ought to be his saviour. Therefore, Sokoto, the spatial setting, is a metaphor for Islamic postcolonial cities and the pull/push factors of opposing Islamic ideologies that set the stage for violence amid state absence, political leadership ineptitude, and the avarice for political, economic and religious power.

#### **4.1.1.1. Salafi-Wahhabism, funding and Islamic sectarian terrorism in *Born on a Tuesday***

Islam plays a vital role in northern Nigeria and this condition was preserved even during colonialism. Islam in Nigeria variates between the Sunnis, the Shiites, and the Sufis; however, each of these groups has various sects that interpret their ideologies differently. Salafism was introduced into Nigeria by the Izala movement in 1978.

In John's *Born on a Tuesday*, Islamic sectarian terrorism, a form of non-state terrorism, is represented as possessing a symmetrical connection between Salafi-Wahhabism and funding. Islam is employed as a site for representing the contesting ideologies and interpretations within most religions and how these variances precipitate sectarian violence. Funding, in this sense, means pecuniary resources that are provided by religious and political sources. The funding from religious sources is designated religious funding while



the one from political sources is named political funding. Both forms of funding provide a basis for the thriving religious movements and their perpetration of violence. In the text, John appropriates the binary construct of religious liberalism and extremism to portray Alhaji Usman, Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur Mohammed, Sheikh's assistant, respectively. Sheikh Jamal belonged to the popular Izala group before opting for the establishment of his sect which is based on the liberal puritan Salafi-Wahhabi ideology but depends on the political funding provided by Alhaji Usman while Malam Abdul-Nur believes in the absolutist and puritanical Salafist ideology that considers anything outside the Quran and Sunna as unacceptable. This portrayal by John reifies the heterogeneity in the interpretation of the Quran based on various contemporary socio-political and socio-economic needs.

There is the question of agency too. Although Alhaji Usman who has a political motive is the chairman of the committee that runs Sheikh's movement and mosque, he is hardly available, therefore, leaving Sheikh Jamal as the *de facto* religious leader of the movement, Jama'atul Ihyau Ismail Haqiqiy – the Society for the Restoration of True Islam. Sheikh Jamal's character is a fantasied personality that maintains an adaptive posture towards politicians like Alhaji Usman and criticises their corruption. One important feature of Salafi-Wahhabis ideology is the use of *da'awa*, a rhetorical proselytisation and radicalisation strategy in Islam, to criticise the West and its influence on political leaders. Sheikh Jamal during a *tafsir*, a message on the interpretation of the Quran, enunciates this anti-western and anti-modern discourse:

This country is a slave to Jews and their usury...this is why the West pushes our leaders to make laws that force us to go to Western schools at an early age, so that they can teach our children that this system of the Jews is the best and by the time they learn otherwise it is too late. (*BOAT*, p. 30)

This extract from Sheikh Jamal's preaching represents two concepts: hatred for the Jews and the Imperial West which point to the Palestinian struggle against Israel and the neocolonial influence of the West on postcolonial leaders who make laws at their behest. Although schools are used as illustrations, no substantial evidence is provided to support his abstract claim. This rhetoric is used by John to represent how Islamic sectarian leaders

use their messages to win followership by appealing to the postcolonial condition that the masses detest. Also, in this radicalisation discourse, Sheikh Jamal employs synecdoche as a device by using the Jews to represent the West and vice versa.

Equally, these messages by Sheikh Jamal are appropriated to gain followership and this followership becomes a means of getting political and religious funding. This representation of Sheikh Jamal signifies contradiction, he criticises political leaders and still gets political funding from them to fund his Islamic sectarian movement. Also, Alhaji Usman is used as a postcolonial metonymic image of the elite in an average Islamic society. Although he performs the religious duty of *sadaka* – giving alms and feeding the poor – at the mosque in Sokoto, he subtly employs philanthropism as a means of garnering support for his political ambition, therefore there is a link between religion and politics, the former provides the followership while the latter supplies the fund that fuels the former. After a message, Dantala, the witness narrator, informs the reader that Sheikh Jamal announces that “Alhaji Usman has sent breakfast and those who want to eat can go outside” (p. 30). Alhaji Usman is a metonymic personality of political funding and religious power conflated in one and maintaining a fluid relationship between the Islamic sectarian movement and politics. This is a culture of duality.

Sheikh Jamal represents the liberal Salafi-Wahhabi who wants to restore “pure” Islam but through the rhetoric of monotheism and absolutism without metamorphosing into a violent transformation of the society. His ideology and interpretation of the puritanical ideas are conformist and opposed to Malam Abdul-Nur’s literal view which makes Dantala, the narrator, perceive both men as “so different” (p. 85). The differentiation and opposing view is based on the Manichean representation of good or conformist Muslim versus bad or violent Muslim. This paradigm is part of El Fadl’s (2005) analysis. However, this paradigm is faulty based on the hypocrisy of Sheikh Jamal and the ethical vulnerability of his actions which fuels resistance from his subordinate, Malam Abdul-Nur.

Also, Islamic sectarian politics is represented in the novel, and how each sect is funded by various international organisations. This portrayal typifies the transnationalism of the local Islamic sects. According to Dantala

No one likes Shiites in Sokoto. Everyone believes they are dangerous, especially those of them who go to Iran to study and the Shiite malams who take *money* from *Hezbollah* to fight Dariqas and the Izalas. (*BOAT*, p. 107) **emphasis added**

This shows that most of these Islamic sectarian movements (Shiites, Dariqas and Izalas) are funded by different transnational religious organisations, as Sheikh's movement is sponsored by certain groups in Saudi Arabia and England, and this religious funding makes the sects further the interest of the transnational religious organisations locally and proselytise their followers towards this interest. Thus, religious funding serves as a means of survival and promoting sectarian ideologies. Also, the portrayal of these Islamic sects as heterogeneous in *Born on a Tuesday* deconstructs the gaze of an outsider who feels Islam is homogeneous. The different sects and mallams possess diverse ideologies and motives about the existential worldview of their society. While Haqiqiy, Sheikh's movement, aims to promote a liberal Salafi-Wahhabi ideology that proselytises to convert, Malam Abdul-Nur is the opposite.

Islamic sectarian politics is also represented as possessing an expansionist motive to gain more followers. As Sheikh expounds his objective to Dantala:

As far as Niger and Mali is how far he wants to take this movement. The movement will organize our operations but Sheikh is also tired of people referring to him as a dan Izala. Yes he studied once under the founder of the Izala movement, but 'I am not an Izala,' he says. He wants the movement to set him apart. (*BOAT*, p. 114)

The expansionist motive enunciated by Sheikh depicts the reason for the heterogeneity of Islam and the clash between its different followers who rely, most times, solely on the interpretations of the Quran by Islamic sectarian leaders. One of the characters at the front of Shuaibu's house comments that "I would rather an aggressive *Izala who takes everything literally than a Shiite* who creates a different religion from Islam" (p. 116), **emphasis added**. The unnamed character here prefers an Izala with the qualifier "aggressive" to a Shiite based on doctrinal differences and variance in the interpretation of the Quran. The character's appropriation of "aggressive" for the Izala movement, a Salafist sect, represents

a subtle depiction of the division between the aggressive Izala that interprets the Quran literally, as indirectly characterised by Malam Abdul-Nur, and the liberal Izala that is conformist, the background from which Sheikh Jamal thrives. The character's opinion typifies the monotheism that underlies religion, thereby, rejecting plurality in terms of religious worship. It can also be theorised that there are two types of religious fundamentalists namely: the non-violent or passive religious fundamentalist who holds the religious text sacred, this can be the Bible, Quran, or any other religious text, and will rather push their beliefs primarily through proselytisation or opinionated views instead of resorting to violence. This type includes religious theorists like Sayyid Qutb, clerics, and religious practitioners. The second category is the violent or active religious fundamentalist who combines violence with all the features of the passive religious fundamentalist.

This theorisation is the basis of the binary paradigm of representing religious fundamentalists in *Born on a Tuesday*. John portrays active religious fundamentalism as culminating in Islamic sectarian terrorism. Malam Abdul-Nur's representation is an apposite example of a violent religious fundamentalist turn terrorist. He represents a non-conformist and violent Muslim turn terrorist who interprets the Quran and the ideologies of the puritans literally. He is an epitome of the trajectory of *da'awa* to religious/sectarian terrorism, and fans the embers of Islamic sectarian division to promote terror.

The first approach of Malam Abdul-Nur is to radicalise those who worship at their mosque and belong to their movement through his literal interpretation of the Quran by appropriating some popular jihadi discourse that is anti-western and anti-modern. His narratives are parallel to that of Muhammed Yusuf whose sermons, according to Mohammed (2014), rejects "secularism, democracy, Western education and Westernisation" (p. 14). Abdul-Nur's core areas of contesting modernity are neocolonialism and western education which Mohammed (2014) attributes to the disdain for the link between *boko* (Western Education), the colonial state, and Christian missionaries. Malam Abdul-Nur expounds his belief by asseverating to Sheikh's visitors from England that:

Islam does not mean peace...Islam means submission to the will of Allah. And the will of Allah is not the will of the *infidel or the will of America. Islam means that we do not*

***submit to anything or anyone but Allah.* (BOAT, p. 84)  
emphasis added**

This radical manifesto means that his interpretation of Islam repudiates submission to anyone or anything. The purview of anyone here includes any authority whether government or religious patron which foreshadows his revolt against Sheikh Jamal and the movement. Also, Malam Abdul-Nur insists that anything associated with America should be rejected and employs the metaphor of religious identity formation, *infidel*, to characterise anyone that does not fall within the group identity of his form of Islam, *the takfiri* ideology.

Malam Abdul-Nur is represented as a rejectionist of order that supports the radical Salafist ideology that propagates the establishment of an Islamic government. Dantala reports that:

But what I also think is nonsense is what Malam Abdul-Nur says, that we should stand up and fight against the government because they are not doing anything about the Muslims that are killed by those Beran people in Jos and that we should burn all the drinking places and the mosques of those who are not agreeing with us. (BOAT, p. 97)

This extract portrays the *da'awa* or *dawah* that precedes Islamic sectarian violence/terrorism, radical speech is employed here to galvanise the listeners to violence against the government based on the **theory of alibi** and it promotes violence against religious pluralism. This is the tenet of quasi-state postcolonial terror to resist the authority of the state based on its inadequacies. In another instance, Dantala narrativises the fear and terror that Malam Abdul-Nur's message has on him:

Many things TERRIFY me. How easy it is for Malam Abdul-Nur to say the word kill especially when he is talking about the Shia people and the Dariqas...Malam Abdul-Nur is...preaching, he say (sic) plenty bad bad things about them...he says that the Dariqa people worship human being and put the picture of their leader Inyass all over their house and car and motorcycle as if Inyass is Prophet Mohammed...I think he likes to terrify people. (BOAT, p. 118-9)

The excerpt evinces Malam Abdul-Nur's rejection of sectarian pluralism within Islam and that he even abhors it more than Christianity. Dantala describes the atmosphere of his

preaching as propagating fear, which is an element of terror(ism). However, the portrayal of Malam Abdul-Nur as hitting people in the mosque, flogging to cause harm, and shaking while preaching raises the question of whether radical Salafist ideology makes him violent or violence is innate in him before converting to a Muslim. This portrayal is ambivalent and can make one extrapolate that violence is inherent naturally in human beings and is latent until it is triggered by a belief or religious ideology.

John portrays the dawah period as culminating in systemic violence/terrorism by Malam Abdul-Nur and his group. Sheikh Jamal is attacked and Malam Abdul-Nur prompts the people to attack the Shiites. Although John maintains an aporia in representing who attacks Sheikh Jamal which may be ascribed to Dantala's absence, Sheikh's statement that "I am sure that the Shiites are not the ones who shot me" (p. 145) is a subtle pointer that Malam Abdul-Nur is culpable. This means that Malam Abdul-Nur does not only propagate violence but politicises violence to promote Islamic sectarian terrorism. This is the first approach of his use of systemic violence before he is sent to Saudi Arabia which becomes a watershed in the narrative.

Similarly, the character of Jibril or Gabriel, Malam Abdul-Nur's brother, valorises the binary representation of liberal Muslim versus violent or radical Muslim and the process of conversion. While Sheikh Jamal believes in subtle proselytisation that leads to conversion, Malam Abdul-Nur is the opposite. Hence, Jibril is used as an experiment to show how Sheikh Jamal converts without using force, the same method employed in the conversion of Malam Abdul-Nur, contrary to Malam Abdul-Nur whose approach is imbricated in the physicality of violence by hitting, beating, or flogging Jibril. Proselytisation is adopted as a tool of conversion by Sheikh Jamal coupled with showing love and debating, but Malam Abdul-Nur's approach is different. This representation keys into the framework of good Muslim versus bad Muslim, gentle conversion versus forceful conversion. However, the acceptance of Jibril to convert based on Sheikh Jamal's proselytisation without further resistance is simplistic and keys into a model of fantastic representation of converting an adolescent who has no option. This fantastical representation is simplistic because Jibril, being an adolescent, could have run away as he later does at the end of the narrative, without waiting to witness his brother become a terrorist who butchers a boy's hand for stealing meat. Jibril's

refusal to convert from Christianity to Islam, especially with the insistence and violence of his brother, could have been a site of resistance instead of the common and simplistic framework of conversion based on proselytisation adopted by John in *Born on a Tuesday*.

At this juncture, it is important to examine the implication of funding on Islamic sectarian terrorism as portrayed in John's *Born on a Tuesday*. What is the connection between religious funding and Islamic sectarian terrorism? How complicit are transnational sources in propagating sectarian terrorism? In *Born on a Tuesday*, religious and political funding serves as a motive for promoting sectarian influence and, indirectly, sectarian terrorism. Religious funding is provided by transnational groups in religious metropolises, like Saudi Arabia and Iran, to local groups and individuals to propagate and entrench certain religious ideologies that lead to sectarian violence and terrorism. In the case of Malam Abdul-Nur, he is the "one keeping all the money for the mosque committee" (p. 93) and this makes him develop a simulacrum syndrome, a tendency/drive to occupy Sheikh's Jamal position and to have unfettered access to funds. This tendency starts with disseminating interpretations of the Quran and Hadiths that are contrary to his patron's and stealing money from the coffers of the movement. The corollary is that he covets the image and the position of Sheikh Jamal and his access to the movement's funds. This tendency is analogous to Fanon's analysis of the ambivalent relationship between the coloniser and the colonised in which the colonised detested the coloniser and, at the same time, coveted his position and the trappings. Thus, Malam Abdul-Nur develops this type of ambivalence towards Sheikh Jamal, he covets his leadership role, and the capital trappings but detests his aversion to violence.

Furthermore, the narrative portrays a connection between the religious funding from Islamic transnational groups based in Saudi Arabia and the perpetration of Islamic sectarian terrorism. Before Malam Abdul-Nur travels to Saudi Arabia, after the sectarian violence that he instigates, he only engages in rhetorical radicalisation because he lacks the funding to establish a group that will entrench his violent version of puritanical Islam. Therefore, his journey to Saudi Arabia and the funding he received serve as the bridge between the dawah period and the establishment of his group. According to Dantala, "it has been four months since Malam Abdul-Nur returned from Saudi Arabia with a turban and a new movement in opposition to Sheikh" (186). Although the narrator is ambivalent whether "it

is the hope of money that lures them or the fact that the Mujahideen movement is something new” (p. 187) but it is obvious that money plays a crucial role in the evolution of Malam Abdul-Nur’s Mujahideen movement and it attracts many followers both from within Sheikh’s movement and outside.

John depicts religious funding as promoting Islamic sectarianism and Islamic sectarian terrorism. Religious funding makes Malam Abdul-Nur establish his movement, get numerous followers and radicalise them for violence, thereby, instituting a quasi-state organisation and instilling fear in those that are not part of his movement. Dantala narrativises his encounter thus

I reach the source of the smoke and find a huge crowd. People are throwing books and papers into the fire. Malam Abdul-Nur is supervising the burning and adding kerosene any time the items being dumped seem to be overwhelming the fire. Every time the flames leap from the pile the crowd screams: ‘Allahu Akbar!’ There is excitement on their faces and many are jumping and pumping their fists in the air. Malam Abdul-Nur has told them that before they can truly join his movement they must burn any school certificates they have. They are also burning the books by Hausa writers because those books corrupt women with tales of illicit love affairs. And they are burning CDs of Hausa movies, which he says are products of Kano, a city of corrupt wealth, usury and decadence. (*BOAT*, p. 189-190)

The burning of books and certificates represents anti-western proclivities based on Islamic puritanical radicalisation that repudiates all forms of modernity, especially those associated with westernisation, but avers the literal interpretation of the Quran and various Hadiths. From this point, he “bought a huge farm outside the city and he is moving away with all his people” (p. 191) to form his quasi-territory and “state of exception” where his laws and interpretations will govern the people. One such implementation of his law is the butchering of a boy’s hands for stealing meat which culminates in the boy’s death. This type of conviction is meant to instil fear in his followers and the outsiders.

To practice jihad against those he considers *infidel*, he trains his people in the bush on how to use guns and forms a parallel government to commit terror. The representation of sectarian terrorism in *Born on a Tuesday* also entails the implication of the transnational on



local violence and terrorism. According to the portrayal, “a man from Chad teaches them how to dismantle, assemble and clean guns” (p. 195). This illustrates the relationship between transnational networks, individuals, and terrorism in the postcolony, considering the transnationalism of ideologies like Salafi-Wahhabism that Malam Abdul-Nur promotes. His creation of a pseudo-government is the onset of his terrorism. In the debate between Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur in Saudi Arabia, Malam Abdul-Nur is portrayed as being bereft of historical facts. He explains that “if the Europeans had come with guns and ships, it might have been easy to fend them off” but this is untrue. The Europeans employed extreme violence to conquer numerous Islamic societies like the invasion of the Sokoto Caliphate under the reign of Emir Attahiru dan Ahmadu in 1903 (William F. S. Miles 2000:210). According to Miles (2000), “British forces pursued him and his entourage and at Burmi forced a one-sided battle in which Attahiru was killed” (p. 211). This is amply depicted in Ahmed Yerima’s *Attahiru*. This slip depicts Malam Abdul-Nur as ahistorical as he argues that democratic governments should be removed by force. As a terrorist, he is represented as ignorant of the modern or western influence on Islam.

John employs contradiction and paradox in the portrayal of the debate. It is contradictory that Sheikh Jamal who is imploring Malam Abdul-Nur against being violent uses the examples of Osama bin Laden and Al-Zarqawi as Muslims who studied the Western ways to fight the west. Is he imploring him to study the Western ways first before fighting the West or warning him against fighting the West? According to Sheikh, “they learn the tricks of the West well enough to use the tricks against them” (p. 198). Appropriating these terrorists as examples contradicts the conformist message he is preaching to him. Also, John uses the debate to represent ethnocentric sentimentalism through Sheikh’s comment that “Obasanjo...reduced our numbers in the army and in the police and reduced our influence everywhere” (p. 199). This paradox of rejecting one and supporting the other shows subtly the puritanical ideas of Sheikh, however, passive. The Islamic sectarian terrorism represented in *Born on a Tuesday* culminates in the use of systemic violence against the state, attacking police stations, throwing bombs at soldiers, and the slaughtering of Sheikh Jamal as well as taking away his head. The killing of Sheikh Jamal is symbolic, communicative, and metaphoric. As most killings in terror acts are symbolic, that of Sheikh Jamal is not different. He is slaughtered, to instil terror, and his head is taken away which

is a metaphor for the religious head of Sheikh's movement. It is not surprising that after Sheikh's death, the movement collapses and its leadership disperse.

One aspect of the postcolonial condition of terror represented in *Born on a Tuesday* is complicity. Sheikh Jamal and Alhaji Usman are complicit in the making of Malam Abdul-Nur. Sheikh Jamal recognises his stubbornness and enunciates it after the violence instigated by him: "he is stubborn as a donkey, but not useless. I still need him. A time will come to throw him away" (p. 132). This means Sheikh Jamal employs him as an instrument to further his motive and grow the movement. Sheikh's unwillingness to let him go despite his radical penchant for violence typifies the complicity of Sheikh in the making of Malam Abdul-Nur. Equally, Alhaji Usman acquiesces to send Malam Abdul-Nur to Saudi Arabia as proposed by Sheikh, thus, he is complicit in the transformation of Malam Abdul-Nur into a terrorist. Despite acknowledging his violent nature, he sacrifices reason and colludes with Sheikh to offer him a temporary escape. The expedition of Malam Abdul-Nur to Saudi Arabia avails him the much-needed fund from Maliki Foundation to establish the Mujahideen movement that terrorises Sokoto. John appropriates this as a metaphor for the complicity of the political and religious elites in the making of most terrorists in the postcolony.

Also, Alhaji Usman is a metonymy of religion as politics within a postcolony, analogous to M. H. Abram's (1999) explanation of metonymy as applying one thing to another "with which it has become closely associated because of a recurrent relationship in common experience" (98). He is the chairman of Sheikh's Islamic sectarian movement but hardly performs any religious duties except for funding the organisation. He uses the funding of the movement to popularise himself among the followers of the movement and to garner support for his political objective. Therefore, his religious obligation is synonymous with his political objective. When the time of elections draws closer, the narrator explicates that "Alhaji Usman has doubled the amount of food he gives on Fridays and added bars of soap to the distribution" (p. 208). Although a Muslim should give alms to the needy, however, Alhaji Usman politicises it for a political goal and extends it to outsiders by making arrangements with the market association. Therefore, he uses religion as a metonymy for politics.

In converse to the binary paradigm of conformist Muslims versus violent Muslims as terrorists in *Born on a Tuesday*, the differentiation collapsed with religious and political funding. Both Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur compromise their ethics when it comes to money. Ethics and morality become anathema when one compares their message with their financial standing. Malam Abdul-Nur steals from “the box at the back of the mosque” (p. 101) and from the donations to the movement, this act contradicts the religious and moral obligation that he champions. Interestingly, Sheikh Jamal is not different. Although he explains to Dantala that when he first started, he rejected money from people but later realises that “poverty does not make a man descent” (p. 168) and argues that “a man’s character is not defined by what money he has or does not have, but what decisions he takes in spite of having or not having it” (p. 168). However, it is paradoxical that he colludes with Alhaji Usman to inflate the funds spent by the movement and the amount expended on projects. Dantala, the child narrator, narrativises this ambivalently

I discovered something else while handling that account. When he announces a donation, Alhaji Usman only gives us a third of what he announces. The money comes through his company, which makes a payment to us by cheque or by bank transfer. I then withdraw two-thirds of the amount and give it back to him in cash. Then we multiply all our expenses by three. So even though what we spent on the building of the school was eighteen million, our papers read fifty-four million. I do not know how to feel about this. (*BOAT*, p. 211)

This account focalises the corruption within religious movements and how the narrator is used as a pawn in the game. This compromises the ethics of Sheikh Jamal as a religious leader and Alhaji Usman as a religious patriot. Thus, one may surmise that Malam Abdul-Nur has witnessed all this before leaving the movement and this makes it impossible for Sheikh and Alhaji Usman to correct him, despite knowing that he steals from the movement’s coffers. Considering the disposition of the three characters to money, their morality is compromised and this collapses the paradigm of differentiation in their representation. These conditions of monetary pull influence the relationship between ideology and sectarian terrorism.

In sum, the representation of Islamic terrorism is sited in sectarian ideological differences and it is connected with funding. Although it may be simplistic to say that the representation reifies funding as the primary motive of Islamic sectarian terrorism, however, funding, whether religious or political, plays a pivotal role in propagating radical Islamic puritanism and the Salafi-Wahhabi ideology and this, in turn, leads to Islamic sectarian terrorism. Islamic sectarian terrorism is adopted as a designation, in this section, to represent the heterogeneity of Islam and the violence as well as terrorism that this heterogeneity degenerates into between different Islamic sects and society at large.

#### **4.1.1.2. *Born on a Tuesday*: Representing war against terror and necropower in the postcolony**

Defending sovereignty and state repression are Siamese twins. The way a country defends its sovereignty, especially against terror, underscores its necropower: “the power...to dictate who may live and who must die” (Mbembe, 2003: p. 2). In *Born on a Tuesday*, war against terror is represented as extremely repressive and parallelism of the terror the state wishes to quell. The necropower of the state is represented through the power relations between the terrorists, the people, and the state machinery of the police and the military. This study contends that the governments in the postcolony adopt or imitate the imperial style of their former colonial masters and the Western powers.

In *Born on a Tuesday*, checkpoints or roadblocks serve as a site of power negotiation and repression of the citizens by the state. The checkpoints represent a space of ambivalence, a place erected by the state to protect the people against terror but also terrorise the same people. The first instance of the checkpoint necropower is the appropriation of the legality of the gun by the policemen to harass and terrorise citizens passing through checkpoints. Dantala experiences this exhibition of necropower at the checkpoint

Then a skinny policeman shouts, asking me to stop, aiming his gun at my chest. I stop.

‘What are you carrying?’ he screams.

‘Nothing,’ I replied.

‘Open it!’ he orders.

‘I rip open the bag!’

I hesitate. He cocks his gun and I turn the bag upside down.  
(*BOAT*, p. 125)

This extract depicts the terror that state agents wield at power centres like the checkpoints and how vulnerable citizens are treated in the wild net of war against terror while state agents through the power of guns operate outside the law that institutes sovereignty. The terrorising of Dantala continues

The little knife I took from Shuaibu's house rolls out as well as the money wrapped in a paper. He looks at the knife, looks at me, then reaches forward and kicks my knee so that I fall to the ground. He kicks me in the stomach so hard I throw up all the rice and beans and fish I have just eaten...He slaps me and asks me to run. I leave everything behind, running and stumbling. Two other policemen laugh as I do. (*BOAT*, p. 125)

The attitude of the policeman represents unlawful acts and the necropower employed by state agents at different sites of power. The checkpoint, therefore, becomes a space of ambivalence and contradiction. While the citizens need protection against the quasi-state actors or terrorists through the checkpoints, the same space serves as a place for violating citizens and reinforcing the terror that the citizens abhor. The policeman in the account mocks Dantala, seizes his belongings, and makes him converse with power from a subordinated position. The roadblocks become a space of fear and terror for the citizens who "are afraid of being made to do frog jumps for offences as little as looking too directly into a policeman's eyes" (p. 136), where the law is suspended to the free will of state agents.

Equally, in *Born on a Tuesday*, the checkpoints also represent a place of vulnerability for the state agents, not only the citizens, and, at the same time, a space that activates the necropower of the state by its agents. Soldiers and police officers are depicted as vulnerable at checkpoints and enforcing the necropower of the state to terrorise and work outside the law. According to Dantala, "the soldiers have gone crazy and are beating people randomly at the junction. A boy tells me that someone on a motorcycle tried to attack the checkpoint at the junction. The police shot him" (p. 146). The thesis is that checkpoints become a space of *antithetical doubling* for the soldiers and the police, they are attacked and rendered vulnerable by the space and the same space makes them attack and act in the similitude of

the terror they want to stop. The checkpoints during terrorism become a space for safety and a space of fear, a space of vulnerability and space of necropolitical strength, a place to enforce law and a space for violating it and precipitate the exchange of violence between terrorists, citizens, and state agents.

Invoking Mbembe's state of exception, like the plantation camps, the checkpoints inscribe in one's memory the *space of exception* instituted by postcolonial governments to fight terrorism. Such *spaces of exception* are managed by soldiers or other state agents and these spaces operate outside the law to execute necropower over anybody its web catches. This is represented in *Born on a Tuesday*. After the terrorism in Sokoto by the Mujahideen movement and the mob terror, soldiers go on a rampage and arrest both perpetrators and victims, thereby combating terror through summary execution of citizens and prolonged incarceration. This means the war against terror is prosecuted outside the law.

John depicts the *space of exception* in *Born on a Tuesday* through Dantala's point of view. The prison where those arrested during the terrorist attacks in Sokoto are incarcerated epitomises the *space of exception*. At the camp or prison where Dantala and others are detained, they are treated as "living dead" and subjected to inhuman conditions, both the seeming perpetrators and the innocent. The thesis is that *spaces of exception* are operated outside the law by state agents legitimised by states to quell terrorism and this translates to the principle of the end justifies the means. It is pertinent to analyse the conditions humans are subjected to at *spaces of exception* in the postcolony like Abu Ghraib in Iraq.

The first condition of a *space of exception* in the postcolony is that it operates in secrecy. According to Dantala, "I cannot tell where we are because we were blindfolded with rags on the way here" (p. 237). This blindfold symbolises blindness to law and the ethics of reason in executing justice. Therefore, the soldiers can act outside the law without being questioned by the judiciary which does not know that these spaces exist or the *modus operandi* of these sites. Similarly, in these spaces, there is no differentiation between the dead and the living. They are subjected to the same habitation until the smell of the dead threatens the soldiers. The co-habitation of the dead and the living in the same cell inscribes trauma in the living of their expected end within that same space. According to Dantala,

“one man has been lying still since they threw him in” (p. 236) and the line between consciousness and unconsciousness is blurred to inscribe the necropower of the state.

In the detention camp, prisoners are subjected to conditions that traumatise and efface their dignity and humanity. The conditions include cramming prisoners together in a cell, “banging the metal doors for nearly one hour” (p. 237), summary execution, and disappearance. In the *space of exception*, there is no differentiation between the terrorist (the guilty) and the innocent (the victims). They are treated equally to foreground the sovereign power of the state to kill. According to an old man in the cell, “they don’t care who is Mujahideen or Dariqa or Izala or Shiite. All they want is to oppress and kill Muslims” (p. 240). The soldiers conflate the different sects and act under the mainstream homogenous identity of Islam which makes them cast a net to catch any fish at their disposal. This homogenous orientation makes the soldiers subject the guilty and the innocent to the same inhuman and terroristic condition of instilling fear to cause trauma and death. Also, torture is deployed and this adds to the blurriness between consciousness and unconsciousness. John’s representation of the detention camp is a critique of the war against terrorism adopted by many postcolonial states. Also, this approach of establishing a *space of exception* to prosecute agents of terrorism where free will reigns instead of law reifies the coloniality in the postcolonial which is part of the colonial legacy.

Apart from the law being abolished in *spaces of exception*, John depicts how temporality is suspended in the minds of the incarcerated. The narrator counts from day one till eighteen in incarceration until the number of days does not matter again and time is effaced. According to Dantala, “I started out guessing what time of the day it was by the temperature but these fevers keep me cold all the time. And finally I have stopped counting the days” (p. 246). The suspension of time and the enumeration of days are part of the conditions deployed by state agents as necropower in *spaces of exception* to brutalise and gradually animalise their captives. Also, the right to kill is unregulated and this makes humans objects that can be displaced easily. The terrorists like Malam Abdul-Nur and his followers are extra-judicially killed, not only them but also others captured in the net of the state’s anti-terrorism that has turned to another mode of terrorism. The captives are captured, tortured,

subjected to the necropower of the state, left to die or killed, and disposed of like an object. Hence, the state uses terror to (re)solve terrorism.

However, with the anti-terrorism tactics of the state, Dantala is released nine months later and, by that time, his world of the real and the unreal has been conflated. Dantala opines that “the soldiers, it is the soldiers who are making everyone so aggressive” (p. 259). Thus, John appropriates Dantala as a metaphor of witnesses that survive the necropower of the war against terrorism of most postcolonial and imperial states as well as represent the continuity of the status quo of necropower and (neo)colonial war against terrorism in postcolonial states. The command by a senior officer to return Dantala to where he was taken and to empty the pit represents the *space of exception*'s operation outside the law, the command could have been to kill him and dump his body. In *Born on a Tuesday*, the representation of necropower in the postcolony and the war against terrorism questions the ethics of the state in combating terrorism. The postcolony does not only create circumstances that prompt terrorism through its repressive machinery and the complicity of its political elite in creating terrorists like Malam Abdul-Nur but also deploys terroristic strategies and necropower that operate outside the law to combat terrorism. This places the masses in a double-terror jeopardy of the quasi-state actors, working outside the law and reason, and the state itself perpetrating the same form of violence. This forms the crux of John's representation of necropower and the war against terrorism in the postcolony, using Sokoto as a metaphor.

#### **4.1.1.3. Othering, terrorists' identity, and its fantasy in *Born on a Tuesday***

The representation of terrorists' identity in novels has always generated intense debate. Scholars like Scanlan (2001), Frank (2012), and the like, have examined how terrorists are represented in literary expressions and question its parallelism with reality. However, not many questions have been asked about how terrorists are figured in postcolonial novels. Do they imitate the same stereotypical representation of terrorists in Western novels? How are the terrorists framed? Is the figuring of the terrorist a continuity of the politicisation dominant in mainstream discourse? These are some of the questions pertinent in examining the terrorist identity in postcolonial novels. As common in Western representation, John adopts some of these othering methods in the depiction of a terrorist's identity in *Born on a*



*Tuesday*. The alterity of a terrorist figure is framed along the politicised dimension of ethnic othering and liminal othering that questions John's representation. The conceiving of the terrorist as an Other is a literary and discursive mode of representation that has been employed in Western thought and is enunciated in John's *Born on a Tuesday*.

In *Born on a Tuesday*, the main character that epitomises what a terrorist represents is Malam Abdul-Nur. As a terrorist in the narrative, he is figured as an ethnic Other who is analogous to the foreigner or a virus, in the medical term, that comes to contaminate or attack the natives or aborigines of a place. In comprehending the ethnocentric politicisation of John's portrayal of Malam Abdul-Nur, it is expedient to expound the ethnic liminality and the frame of foreignness within which he is framed and compare it to the extant terrorist figures in Northern Nigeria. Sokoto as the spatial setting reverberates the sectarian violence that rocked Sokoto state in the 2000s.

Malam Abdul-Nur is represented as a Yoruba from Ilorin, a city of ethnic doubling with its liminality between the northern and southern parts of Nigeria. According to the man sitting next to Dantala in the mosque, he describes Malam Abdul-Nur as "a Yoruba from Ilorin...there is not hadith of the Prophet that he doesn't know" (p. 31). Thus, Malam Abdul-Nur's migration from Ilorin to Sokoto makes him a foreigner or outsider in the state; this is analogous to the migrant from the postcolony to the metropole. Within the postcolony and the national boundary, one of the sites of othering is ethnicity and this is deployed in the depiction of Malam Abdul-Nur as a terrorist.

Why does John appropriate Malam Abdul-Nur, the terrorist, as a foreigner, a migrant to Sokoto? John appropriates the mainstream trope of anti-foreigner or the foreigner-terrorist as a fantastical simulation of the popular discourse of terrorism. It also reifies ethnocentric othering which is a common layer of postcolonial relation as a result of colonial legacy. John's appropriation of the terrorist as an ethnic foreigner shows representation as fantasy and ethnocentric bias as a defence mechanism of the native. Ilorin is a controversial northern state in Nigeria with an ethnic doubling of Hausa and Yoruba traceable to the 18th-century tussle between Afonja, an Are-Ona Kakanfo – "Generalissimo of the Alaafin's armies" using Adekunle Adekoya's (2018a) description, and Malam Alimi, his close ally.

According to Samuel Johnson (2016), the duel between two old friends led to the death of the highhanded Afonja and made Alimi and his successors the rulers of Ilorin and this makes him describe Ilorin as “different from the other Yoruba towns, in that the ruling powers are aliens to the place” (94), the aliens, in this case, are the Fulanis. According to Adekoya (2018b, **online source**), Afonja was the Kakanfo under Alaafin Aole who murdered his father to become the king. Afonja mutinied against Alaafin Aole because of some arbitrary orders he gave him and sought the help of Malam Alimi and the Fulani slaves to bolster his military and spiritual powers. He enlisted them into his army instead of his people. He was later betrayed and murdered by Alimi and the Fulani slaves. Thus, in the representation of Malam Abdul-Nur as the terrorist, there is no reference to Ilorin as a place with an ethnic doubling of Hausa and Yoruba which is an aporia. What is focalised in the representation of Malam Abdul-Nur is that he is a Yoruba from Ilorin. According to Sheikh Jamal, “A Yoruba man is a Yoruba man. No matter how Muslim they become. They stab you in the back. That is how they are. Hypocrites.” (p. 210). This portrayal feeds on historical stereotyping and othering, although Dantala debunks this stereotypical representation of Yoruba from Ilorin as a betrayer. The representation of Malam Abdul-Nur as a betrayer invokes subtly the treacherous act of Afonja against his master, Alaafin Aole, who Afonja ordered to commit suicide. In parallel to this historical narrative, Malam Abdul-Nur from Ilorin betrays his master, Sheikh Jamal, and orders his death like Afonja did to Aole. This representation is stereotypical and evokes ethnocentric othering.

The othering of Malam Abdul-Nur as a terrorist and a foreigner in Sokoto’s local space is a form of defence mechanism that emphasises a foreigner as a contaminating agent, a popular representation strategy in terrorism discourse. In the representation of terrorists in Western novels, the Muslim migrant is usually represented as the terrorist, for example in John Updike’s *Terrorist*. Similarly, John deploys the trope of an ethnic Other as the terrorist in *Born on a Tuesday* which concretises representation as a fantasy and adoption of popular ethnocentric or racial paradigm in the depiction of terrorists. In the deployment of the trope of a foreigner as a terrorist, Alhaji Usman comments that “How can some Yoruba convert come here and be doing all of this? We will send him back to whatever **bush** he came from” (p. 216), **emphasis added**. From this comment, the Self/Other paradigm is deployed by John to represent Malam Abdul-Nur as an ethnic Other and appropriates the metaphor of

“bush” to depict Malam Abdul-Nur’s space of origin as uncivilised, primitive, and undeveloped.

The metaphor of “bush” employed about the spatial provenance of Malam Abdul-Nur is a simulation of popular and mainstream metaphors that are deployed in the characterisation of the Other. This type of metaphor has its provenance in the Western imaginary that represents the Other’s space as a jungle, forest, heart of darkness, desert, *et cetera*. In examining the representation of Malam Abdul-Nur by John, it is expedient to ask whether his ethnic origin and where he is from are factors to consider in his radicalisation. The answer is negative. Malam Abdul-Nur’s radicalisation is not based on ethnicity but his exposure to the Salafi-Wahhabi ideology that criticises westernisation and its sundry cultural aspects but propagates jihad as the solution. The adoption of ethnic othering by John typifies ethnocentric hypocrisy and representation as fantasy. The ethnic Other is conceived as the terrorist, the contaminating agent, that harms the native.

Another level of alterity deployed in the representation of Malam Abdul-Nur is religious othering. He is depicted as a religious liminal character, a former Christian and a convert, not a born Muslim. In this representational undertaking, Malam Abdul-Nur typifies the in-betweenness between Christianity and Islam. While he will no longer be regarded as a Christian, he is also not regarded as a “full” or “true” Muslim but a convert. In this regard, he is neither here nor there. He occupies a space of religious liminality and this is appropriated as a mode of othering him as a terrorist. This representation is a defence mechanism for the paradigm of the ignorant versus wise, the ignorant as Malam Abdul-Nur who is inept in the interpretation of the Quran as against Sheikh Jamal who is adept and conformist in the interpretation of the Quran and the different Hadiths. However, this type of paradigm neglects the sundry conditions that prompt terrorism. Such conditions include religious funding for the propagation of radical Islamic ideologies like the one from Maliki Foundation in Saudi Arabia as represented in *Born on a Tuesday*, the influence of transnationalism on sects, proselytisation, and the effects of politicising religion for personal gains. Hence, the Manichean depiction of the ignorant versus wise is limited and rigid.

In *Born on a Tuesday*, the ethnic and religious alterity of Malam Abdul-Nur is underscored to evince his difference. According to the description by the man sitting next to Dantala in

the mosque, Malam Abdul-Nur is “a Yoruba from Ilorin. In fact his name was Alex before he converted, learned Arabic and memorised the whole Quran in just one year. There is not a hadith of the prophet that he doesn’t know” (p. 31). The comment of the man reifies the differentiation of Malam Abdul-Nur on ethnic and religious othering. His conversion is accentuated with his unique ability to memorise “the whole Quran in just one year” and a representation of being more Muslim than a born Muslim, being able to “run an Islamic state” (p. 210).

The representation of Malam Abdul-Nur as a foreigner perpetrating terrorism in Sokoto is analogous to the biographies of popular terrorists and radical Islamists like Al-Zarqawi, Osama bin Laden, Mohammed Yusuf who migrate to other territories or spaces to propagate terrorism. For example, Mohammed Yusuf is a radical Islamic ideologue from Yobe in Nigeria but established his movement popularly called Boko Haram in Maiduguri; similarly, Al-Zarqawi the leader of Al-Qaida in Iraq is from Jordan. The depiction of a terrorist’s identity as an Other or foreigner is a popular paradigm in terrorism discourse and narratives about terrorism; however, its appropriation by John in *Born on a Tuesday* typifies ethnocentric prejudice, and ambivalent representation.

However, Susan Dauda (2016) opines that John’s depiction of religious fundamentalism subtly proposes solutions to religious fundamentalism which include abolition or restructuring of the almajirai system of education, “the need for regulation of preaching by religious authorities in collaboration with government” (p. 18), the provision of economic activities and the training of forces on how to manage insurgency. In furtherance of these seeming solutions, the government should endeavour to monitor the funding of religious movements both locally and transnationally to nip in the bud the propagation of radicalisation and proselytisation that lay the foundation for terrorism as well as how the funding is appropriated, although this may be insurmountable for a corrupt government. While one must not be inauspicious, the complicity of the politicians in funding religious movements for political and personal reasons should also be interrogated.

#### **4.1.1.4. Tropes and representations of terrorism in *Born on a Tuesday***

Tropes enunciate the recurrent motifs, themes, and discursive devices appropriated in a literary text. In the literary depiction of terrorism, tropes encapsulate the recurring textual devices, motifs, and themes. These deal mostly with discursive devices like regular themes, character portrayal, and figurative elements in narratives about terrorism. The reading of tropes examines primarily the textuality of terrorism rather than the corporeality of the violence. Some tropes used in *Born on a Tuesday* include terrorism as madness, women in terrorism as victims, the betrayal motif, and withdrawal associated with the Alamut/Masada syndrome.

Terror and madness have always been connected whether directly or indirectly by outsiders. Many perpetrators of terrorism have been described as psychotic, maniacs, and possessing traits of madness. Michel Foucault (2006) historicises how terror is connected to madness in various ways and this has been spread to other discourse of terrorism. Foucault (2006) examines the changing meaning and social construct of madness from divine reason as madness to wisdom as madness. However, from the seventeenth century, madness is linked to unreason and ignorance is linked to terrorism. According to Foucault (2006), “madness has been linked to this place of confinement” (48) and the place of confinement where madness is conflated with prostitution and crime became a source of terror for the citizens. These houses of confinement in the seventeenth century instituted “a new reign of terror” (p. 355) and “people were in dread of a mysterious sickness that apparently emanated from houses of confinement” (396). The confinement imbued public fear “in a highly fantastical form” (p. 356) because madness at that time was connected with evil and terror. This imagination has extended to the present century in which terrorism is associated with madness, a form of unreason and insanity. Laqueur (1977) also observes that terrorism has been interpreted as “a form of madness with perhaps an underlying physical disorder” (p. 2), therefore, it is not surprising that terrorists are described as possessing a form of madness both in terrorism discourse and literary expressions. Similarly, Eyad Saraj (2001), a Palestinian psychiatrist, asks “do you still wonder why an Arab becomes a terrorist?” (p. 13), he responds that it is madness, which “is not confined to Arab desire for revenge, or to the Zionist dream of pure Jewish home. It has now engulfed the US with its supra-natural array of bombs” (p. 13). Saraj’s (2001) contention is that the resistant terror of the

Palestinians, the state terror of Israel, and the imperial terror of the United States of America are all forms of “madness like a plague” (p. 13).

In *Born on a Tuesday*, John subtly appropriates this trope and its imaginary through the comment of Sheikh Jamal: “Malam Abdul-Nur is mad. He is doing this because I floored him in the debate. He is trying to prove to me that he can run an Islamic state” (p. 210). Malam Abdul-Nur is also depicted as “shaking when he is talking” (p. 119) which makes everyone afraid of him, he flogs everybody except Dantala and hits people in the mosque. His portrayal engenders the trope of representing terrorism by non-state actors as a form of madness which is faulty because it is a ploy to abdicate the perpetrators of the intentionality of their actions. The trope of terrorists as psychopaths, maniacs, and misogynists has been recurrent in terrorism discourse and narratives about terrorism. To Sheikh Jamal, Malam Abdul-Nur is possessed with madness which accounts for his jihadi violence. However, irrationality as madness undermines the criminality behind terrorism which is not isomorphic with madness as a disease.

To underscore his madness, Malam Abdul-Nur is depicted as violent to his wife and brother, Jibril. According to Jibril,

He treats her...like a donkey. He treats her like an animal that he despises. Some days he locks her in her room without any food because his food is cold...He beats her with a tyre whip. He forces things into...her...anus! Candles. Bottles. He flogs her with the tyre whip when they are doing it. Some days she faints. (*BOAT*, p. 148-9)

Jibril’s witness account portrays Malam Abdul-Nur as a misogynist, an inverted masochist who enjoys sex when inflicting pain. This frame fits the stereotypical representation of terrorists as subjecting their victims to various forms of inhuman conditions to evince their madness. This trope of victimising women also characterise narratives about terrorism and the stereotypical imagining of women as victims.

Another trope dominant in narratives about terrorism and appropriated by John’s *Born on a Tuesday* is women as objects of victimisation. All the women portrayed in *Born on a Tuesday* are victims of patriarchal terror, victims of natural disasters, or characters

performing auxiliary functions. The first site of analysis is Malam Abdul-Nur's wife. Like in Farida Khalaf's *The Girl who Escaped ISIS* (2015), the anonymous wife of Malam Abdul-Nur is the first object that he experiments his terror on to enforce submission. He beats her and forces things into her as well as deprives her of food like the ladies used as sexual objects in Khalaf's autobiographical novel. In *Born on a Tuesday*, Malam Abdul-Nur's wife is "nameless" and assigned an anonymous position to objectify her. The representation of women as victims in narratives about terrorism has been attributed to the dominance of male writers in the subgenre of narratives about terrorism. Malam Abdul-Nur's wife is depicted as a sexual object who is migratory from brother to brother, thereby, entrenching the trope of women as erotic objects.

Umma, Dantala's mother, is another female character that is passivised due to the loss of her twins caused by flooding. She is represented as absent throughout the narrative and mad. The representation of Umma as mad because she loses her twins connects Malam Abdul-Nur to her. This tropology of madness enunciates the nuances of Malam Abdul-Nur as a feminised male and the trope of females as objects of emotions which has been argued in gender studies. This is analogous to the feminisation of men that commit terror during the French Reign of Terror as argued by Schraut and Weinbauer (2014). Subtly, Umma, a female character evinced as mad, is connected to Malam Abdul-Nur as mad, thereby transgressing his gender. Malam Abdul-Nur transgresses his gender to epitomise madness and unreason as Umma. Other characters like Khadija and Aishatu occupy marginal roles that represent women as passive objects or victims in narratives of terrorism.

Another trope used in *Born on a Tuesday* is betrayal; this is what Laqueur (1977) denominates as the Judas motive. In the theorisation of the relationship between the dominator and the dominated, the master-slave paradigm has been expounded differently by scholars like Hegel, Fanon, and Mbembe. The master/slave dialectics usually examines how the relationship between the two opposing sides evolves and gravitates to other forms. Fanon evinces this in the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised which makes the colonised admire, covet and revolt against the coloniser. There was an ambivalent relationship between the colonised and the coloniser which breeds hatred and desire simultaneously. Similarly, in terrorism discourse and narratives about terrorism like Joseph

Conrad's *Secret Agent*, the trope of betrayal between masters and subordinates is usually endemic. This is the case between Sheikh Jamal and Malam Abdul-Nur. Sheikh Jamal is his patron, he converts him from Christianity to Islam, brings him into the movement, rescues him when he (Malam Abdul-Nur) is in perilous situations by sending him to Saudi Arabia but he betrays his patron by hijacking his major sponsor, the Maliki Foundation.

The hijacking of the funding is not the only signification of betrayal in the narrative but also Malam Abdul-Nur's founding of a rival movement, "Firqatul Mujahideen Li Ihyau Islam" (p. 187) which opposes Sheikh's movement. According to Dantala, "Malam Abdul-Nur now preaches openly against us, mentioning us by name, mocking us in his sermons" (p. 187); this is a flagrant antagonism and betrayal of his former patron and master. The climax of his betrayal results in the elimination of his former master to, indirectly, occupy his position and access his religious funding.

The last trope is that of exclusion and withdrawal. Like in most terrorism discourse and narratives about terrorism, John deploys religious metaphors to construct an imaginary binary identity of "us" and the "them" of the various sects. Religious metaphors like *kufir*, *kafir* are employed as identity construct to represent unbelievers to entrench the *takfiri* ideology. In the jihadi discourse or radicalisation processes, it is essential to construct identities based on believers (Self) and unbelievers (Other) to determine those to attack. The Mujahideens believe other Islamic sects and people that do not subscribe to their ideology are *kafir* and infidels, this makes them an object for attack and elimination.

Equally, the withdrawal trope is appropriated in *Born on a Tuesday*. In most narratives of terrorism, there is usually the proclivity to narrativise the withdrawal of terrorists to isolated or remote places and this invokes what this study designates the Alamut/Masada syndrome. In the narrative, according to Jibril's witness report, he (Malam Abdul-Nur) "has bought a huge farm outside the city and he is moving away with all his people. They have just finished building his own house and many tents around where the people will stay. The farm is in quite a **remote place**...they say it is like three hours from the border" (p. 191) **emphasis added**. In most narratives of terrorism, the motive of withdrawal and remoteness is sustained to focalise how terrorists try to enshroud their activities from the public view and reify the belief of withdrawal from a corrupt society or a space of infidels. However, there



are still terrorist groups that occupy the metropole and use disguise to perpetrate their activities. In the remote farm, Malam Abdul-Nur establishes his state, government, and rules and terrorises the inhabitants of the area like the Boko Haram terrorists' use of Sambisa forest as their base. The motive of remoteness aims to achieve a state within a state and to maintain clandestine operations that imbue the populace with fear. The remote spaces are metaphors for the Alamut and Masada mountains of the pre-modern epoch and, in the contemporary time, exemplify the withdrawal of Boko Haram terrorists to the Sambisa Forest. Thus, the withdrawal trope in narratives about terrorism invokes the strategy of secrecy adopted by terrorist groups and their maintaining of a distance between the Self of the members and the main society of perceived unbelievers (the Other) to "avoid the corruption and contamination in the larger society and to prepare spiritually for the task ahead" (Anugwom, 2019: p. 53).

#### **4.1.1.5. Agency and representations in *Born on a Tuesday***

*Born on a Tuesday* is a witness narrative by Ahmad whose sobriquet is Dantala. The portrayal of Malam Abdul-Nur, the terrorist, from the vantage point of the ambivalent Dantala raises questions about representation in the novel. Who is representing and who is being represented? How is the object being represented? In the novel, Malam Abdul-Nur's representation is limited, only some of his conversations are featured. He is mostly reported by Dantala and Jibril as doing something or saying something. How competent is Dantala to represent Malam Abdul-Nur? How experienced is Jibril in narrativising Malam Abdul-Nur? How reliable is the misogynist report given to Dantala by Jibril about his brother? Considering that Jibril has sex with his brother's wife, could this affect the sincerity of his representation of his brother? These questions compromise the agency of Jibril as a witness of Malam Abdul-Nur's excesses; he lacks the ethics of reporting his brother to Dantala, the main narrator. This signifies the limitation of some narratives about terrorism to represent terrorists and their motives. Most of the narratives are based on second-hand information which may either be magnified or limited and this is alluded to by John in the acknowledgements of the novel. He appreciates Basiru, the almajiri from Sokoto, who is incarnated as Dantala in the novel. How reliable is Basiru's story? And how reliable is Dantala's representation of Malam Abdul-Nur?

Dantala's unalloyed loyalty is to Sheikh Jamal. However, he is ambivalent about Sheikh Jamal's handling of some issues especially those relating to money as well as his relationship with Alhaji Usman. When Sheikh Jamal first refuses to go to the Government House in a borrowed car, Alhaji Usman's jeep, Dantala wonders that "if Sheikh collects money from Alhaji Usman, using his cars for just one day shouldn't be a problem" (p. 138). The contradiction of the situation makes Dantala ambivalent about Sheikh Jamal's actions. Similarly, when he (Dantala) informs Sheikh Jamal about his intention to marry his daughter, Aisha, his reaction to the revelation upsets him (Dantala) and reinforces his ambivalence about Sheikh's intention towards him. He laments that

If I am good enough to handle his money and our movement then I should be good enough to take care of Aisha. Except if...all the grand things he says about me in my presence and when I am not there are all lies. But, perhaps, a daughter is not the same as a bank account. (p. 218)

This means that even the narrator has a limited perspective of what Sheikh's motive about him is. To epitomise this, Sheikh Jamal is murdered the following day, therefore, Dantala is not able to discover the real intention of Sheikh or to have closure. The corollary of Sheikh's demise is that it creates an aporia that complicates the witness narrative of Dantala and the representation of the principal characters.

The ambivalence of Dantala is a metaphor for the limitation of his representation of Malam Abdul-Nur. After Malam Abdul-Nur gives him a radio, Dantala ruminates thus

In my heart, I should have been happy but I was not. I have a funny feeling about Malam Abdul-Nur, Allah forgive me. It is hard to describe it. It is a little bit of fear, a little bit of anger that he doesn't want Jibril to talk to me and a little bit of confusion because **I don't know what is going on in his mind**. I cannot say that he is kind because he slaps people when he is angry. I cannot say that he is wicked because he also gives people gifts. (*BOAT*, p. 82-3) **emphasis added**

The inability of Dantala to know Malam Abdul-Nur's mind depicts the limitation of his agency to represent Malam Abdul-Nur accurately and this signifies the limitation of the first-person narrative technique. Albeit narratives of terrorism provide more perspectives on

terrorism and its motives, this does not mean that the representation is all-encompassing and equal to reality.

In all, John's *Born on a Tuesday* is a grand narrative that subverts the homogeneity of Islam and valorises Islamic ideological and sectarian rivalries as one of the drivers of religious terrorism. However, the aporia makes his representations of Islamic sectarian terrorism limited and brings to the fore ethnocentric bias as well as complacency with state terror by representing the status quo. Despite this, John's novel is sterling because it depicts the postcolonial condition that stimulates Islamic sectarian terrorism.

#### **4.1.2. Textual analysis of Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab tree***

*Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* is a fiction narrative about terrorism that depicts the kidnapping of the anonymous narrator, a young girl, as well as many girls, women, and children by Boko Haram from a village in Borno State, a village close to Izghe. The novel is a compendium that represents the pre-kidnapping time laced with communal activities, the kidnapping of the young narrator, later renamed Salamatu, and other villagers, and the killing of the men and male youths of the village. The victims' experience of terrorism is portrayed from the perspective of the narrator who is resistant to the proselytisation from Boko Haram, endures the modern slavery that terrorists subject their victims to, the forced conjugal union with a terrorist, freedom from terrorists, and the haunting dilemma of an unknown future.

Events in a society influence the plotting and themes of cultural expressions. This is obvious in Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, however, the narrativisation represents the story of the margin that Viviana Mazza (2019) designates "a lesser-known story" (p. 339). While the Chibok Girls' abduction has become the dominant narrative about Boko Haram terrorism and insurgency in Nigeria, Nwaubani brings to the fore the story of many more girls, children, and women that were abducted by Boko Haram from various places but have not received similar media attention like the Chibok Girls. This forms the background of Nwaubani's narrative and its chronicling of the journey of the narrator and others to the heart of Sambisa forest, while some submit themselves to the proselytisation and 'mobile being' of slave to wife, like Zainab, others like Salamatu resist and envisage freedom. While

John's *Born on a Tuesday* portrays the prelude of Boko Haram terrorism and the postcolonial condition that stimulates Boko Haram terrorism, on the contrary, Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, a title that focalises the many victims buried in the bowels of Sambisa forest, depicts the heart of Boko Haram terrorism from the victim's perspective. Nwaubani's novel is one of the Nigerian fictional works, if not the first, to represent Boko Haram terrorism and insurgency directly. This reifies the questions of how Nwaubani represents Boko Haram terrorism from the perspective of the victims, the mediation of women agency within Boko Haram, conversion as an agency, and the models of depicting the victims, thereby, raising the question of which is better between the dead and the *living dead* victims of Boko Haram.

#### **4.1.2.1. Communal life, dreams, and mediatisation of terrorism in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree***

Nwaubani's paradigm of narrativising Boko Haram terrorism starts with the representation of the communal life of the narrator's village that exists before the attack of the unnamed village and the kidnapping of the narrator and other villagers. This frame makes one understand the type of idyllic life shattered by Boko Haram terrorism. The narrator's village serves as a metaphor that represents the shattered family and communal lives destroyed by Boko Haram terrorism. The family life is integrated with a religious and communal ontology of peaceful coexistence between Muslims and Christians in the village.

The narrator's and Aisha's families are the two families that metaphorise the communal coexistence that subsists before the Boko Haram attack. The narrator, a young Christian girl, belongs to a family of eight. She has five siblings, all male, and bears the gendered role of doing the house chores, happily, and alone. Her father strives to send her children, especially her daughter, to school while her mother, unlettered too, dreams of grooming educated children. According to the narrator, her father wants her educated despite the patriarchal reasoning about not educating girls in the village:

Unlike many other girls in our village whose parents do not think that sending a girl to a school is important since she will end up getting married and taking all her father's years of investment to another man's house, papa wants me educated. (*BBTBT*, p. 17)

On the other hand, Aisha, the narrator's friend, is a Muslim, married to Malam Isa, but, despite her friend, the narrator, being a Christian, they remain friends and maintain pluralistic views towards religion. This Christian-Muslim amiable ontology in the unnamed village, which may be mere fantasy in certain situations, is a metaphor for the relative peace enjoyed before Boko Haram terrorism shattered it. Aisha typifies a young female whose dream of getting educated is cut short by marriage. Despite her stopping school, "Aisha wants to hear everything that happened in school between Monday and Friday" (p. 30) from her friends, the narrator and Sarah, that visit her often.

Another level of communal existence depicted in the novel before the Boko Haram attack is the gendered structure of the village which is a metaphor for a typical African village and its dominant patriarchal worldview. This consciousness is manifested with the meeting under the baobab tree

Men and boys gather under the upside-down branches of the baobab tree in front of our village health care centre, exchanging news or deciding who to vote for in the next election.

Women and girls gather under the baobab tree near the communal well, exchanging gossip or deciding what styles of clothes to sew next. (*BBTBT*, p. 12)

The space is gendered and the discussion is gendered which is a manifestation of the dominant trope of men are political while women are emotional. A point to note is that these communal spaces have no forms of religious differentiations. This friendly and pluralistic worldview occurs at home too as represented by the narrator:

seated with Malam Isa on the veranda are Malam Emmanuel, who sometimes handles the Bible study lessons in our church when Pastor Moses is away, and Malam Shettima, who teaches Islamiyya classes to Muslim boys and girls on Sunday afternoons. (*BBTBT*, p. 46)

The three are sharing pepper soup with Malam Isa who is a paradigm of a good or conformist Muslim in the narrative like Sheikh Jamal in *Born on a Tuesday*. Malam Isa symbolises the ideal Muslim that gives alms and maintains a pluralistic view about religion/culture. Later in the novel, Nwaubani employs the binary construct of Good versus Evil to portray the

variance of Islam practised by Boko Haram. This is depicted in Malam Isa, Malam Shettima, and Malam Emmanuel's conversation. Malam Isa argues that "Islam has always been a religion of peace...Prophet Mohammed himself lived peacefully with his Christian and Jewish neighbours" (p. 87) and this makes Malam Emmanuel question why they are acting differently. In this discussion, Malam Isa subverts this binary of good Muslims versus evil Muslims by referring to Boko Haram terrorists not as any form of Muslims but as "ruffians", "hooligans" and "criminals" whose acts are not based on the Quran.

Within this communal existence are dreams of various types. However, the centralised one is the narrator's dream to win the Borno State scholarship to study "anything—she wishes to study right up to master's degree" (p. 96). This dream for better education is a metaphor for the quest for better lives that are ruined by Boko Haram terrorism. This dream is both personal for the narrator and her family as well as communal for the village who will share in her joy and success. For Sarah, her dream is to love her husband as in the movie she watches at Aisha's house.

Equally, before the Boko Haram attack, Nwaubani portrays the mediatisation of Boko Haram terrorism through the narrator's father's radio and how it instils fear in the listeners. The mediatisation of Boko Haram terrorism fuels the myth and fantasy about Boko Haram in people. This mediatisation of terror presages the terrorist attack on the village and imbues the characters with fear as the audience of terrorism before they become victims. When the attack on Izghe is mediatised, the narrator represents the impact on the family: "we are frozen, all of us, by the voice on Papa's radio" (p. 78). The representation of the media's dissemination of terrorism in the novel foregrounds the issue of labelling too. The news report from the radio refers to the group as "Boko Haram militants" (p. 26), "Islamist militants" (p. 67) not terrorists which is a subtle way of reducing the gravity of the group's menace. Also, the use of the term "militants" for Boko Haram is an attempt to equate their insurgency to the Niger Delta struggle for eco-liberation of their region and socio-economic empowerment and this nuanced depiction focalises the complicated rivalries between the different Nigerian regions. However, the mediatised terror also records the helplessness of the government to prevent the attacks. This is a foreshadow of the inevitable attack on the narrator's village. The representation of the mediatisation of terror in the novel also allows

for switching between the real and the imaginary. The narrative is fictionalised but the accounts of the attacks are real.

The various witness accounts in the novel depict the representation of terrorism as filled with myth and fantasy. Rosemary claims that they (Boko Haram) “makes women and girls disappear” (p. 79) while Abraham fantasises that “they use charms that make them appear and disappear” (81). Papa, the narrator’s father, believes that a Boko Haram child will “automatically share its father’s ideas and beliefs. It will grow up to kill, steal and destroy” (p. 82). These fantasies shape the stigmatisation faced by children born for Boko Haram terrorists by victims of forced marriage. These fantasised witness account engenders confusion like Sarah asks “How do they make the women and men disappear?” (p. 83). The representation of these witness accounts symbolises the portrayal of terrorism as either magnified or limited. The imaginary also turns to fantasied terror and terror effects that are “self-generating, uncontrollable, proliferating” (Robert Young, 2010: p. 307), therefore, working as both “an individual and collective emotion” according to Young (2010). The witness account engenders terror of the unknown, enlarges fear, and propagates it communally. Terror, thus, switches between the real and the imaginary, the reality and corporeality of massacre and abduction, the imaginary of sudden disappearance, and puzzling questions like the narrator’s “do they have horns and hooves?” (p. 91) and becomes a mixture of both within the psychic space. Young (2010) opines that terror makes one live “imaginatively on the borderlines of the real” (p. 309) like the blurring of the real and the imaginary of Dantala’s world under state terror in *Born on a Tuesday*.

The attack of the narrator’s village by Boko Haram “militants” collapsed the communal life, dreams, and mediatised terror to a fictional reality and the beginning of a journey into the real and corporeal world of terror that the narrator and her friends have imagined and lived within the psychic realm.

#### **4.1.2.2. *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*: representing the terror of victims and the agencies of women in terrorism**

Nwaubani’s *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* represents Boko Haram terrorism as Islamic terrorism based on expansionism, kidnapping, modern slavery, and forceful conversion of victims to engender the drive of establishing an Islamic Caliphate that repudiates western

education and promotes extreme Sharia law. However, how are the victims of Boko Haram depicted? What are the mediating agencies appropriated by both the victims of terror and their captors? What are the affects of terror on the victims? How is the concept of Islam propagated by Boko Haram subverted in the text? How are the victims othered and their modes of resisting or assimilating this othering? Nwaubani's representation centralises the trauma and terrorising of girls and women as victims of terrorism, unlike John's representation that centralises the male gender as perpetrators in terrorism.

An essential and philosophical question raised by the representation of the victims of terrorism in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* is whether death is a better way of surviving or captivity that subjects the human body and psyche to the magnitude of terror. This philosophical rumination is appropriated along the gender prism but is collapsed with children like Jacob. In the narrative, when Boko Haram terrorists attack the narrator's village, men and the male youths are killed, this makes their torment instant, not repetitive, unlike the girls and women that are abducted for repetitive terror and torment that are inscribed on the consciousness of the victims. The binary of male versus female victims is complicated with the sparing of young male children that become recruits as future terrorists. This makes one ask who suffers the greater, those that die without being subjected to repetitive psychic and somatic torments, or those alive that will live with the consciousness of the terror and the stigma. Thus, the initial model for categorising the victims is gendered but dissolved in the male children. However, those alive are better than the dead as epitomised by the reflection of the narrator

I thank God that I am a girl. Girls fry the *kosai* and *massa*, then wait for the boys to have their fill before they eat what is left in the pan...But it was the boys and the men that got called to one side of the building when Boko Haram men gathered all the villagers they could capture and led us to the mosque...it was the boys and the men who were instructed to step outside...it was the boys who were lying in shallow puddles of red, while the girls and women and toddlers were marched into the trucks. (*BBTBT*, p. 116)



The extract is a paradox, the males enjoy first during freedom before the females consume the remnants of the patriarchal stratification, but the males die while the females are left alive for an unknown experience. This representation focalises the categorisation that underlies the terrorists' reasoning about their victims. The "militants" deploy necropower on a gender basis, not only this but also based on ability and disability. Peter's brothers, according to the narrator, are saved because of polio, "their disability is the reason why the Boko Haram men asked them to leave the mosque and limp back home in peace" (p. 117).

In every group, there are usually various paradigms of differentiation like in a mainstream society where race, gender, class, ethnicity, among others, form the basis of categorisation. Within the Boko Haram terrorist group, Nwaubani represents the diverse forms of categorising that are employed by the terrorists and how this shapes the power relations between the victims and their captors. The first category in differentiating the victims of Boko Haram terrorists in the novel is religion. According to the narrator, "Sarah and I shift to his left-hand side with other Christian women and girls, while Aisha stands on the right side with the Muslims" (p. 121). Albeit the imaginary that some Muslims do not subscribe to Boko Haram extreme and violent views, this representation evinces that differentiation by religion still plays a crucial role in the fate of the victims of terrorism. The Muslims are led away, while the Christians are to face death or forced conversion.

The corollary of the choice is that conversion becomes an agency of survival for the Christian girls and women. The agency of conversion enunciates the rejection of death as an option but survival as a bridge for psychological acceptance of the fate that awaits them. While Magdalene accepts death as an option, the narrator, her friend (Sarah) and the others appropriate conversion as a mediating agent of subtle submission to their "new masters" and a means of survival. Hence, conversion to another religion in terrorism subjugates free will and reason but makes it an agency of survival to mediate a present relief from the closure of death. Conversion becomes an opening for subsistence, an inevitable option to subtly resist the arbitrariness of terror.

Nwaubani also represents terrorism as slavery, a reincarnation of slavery in disguise. The victims are objectified and this invokes Mbembe's (2003) analysis of the plantation as a site of necropower. "You belong to Boko haram," the leader says. "You are now our slaves."

(p. 119). This reasoning reinvigorates the rationale behind slavery which is based on theft, abduction, or cheap acquisition where the pecuniary proceed is necessary for the benefit of a group that occupies a higher hierarchy. Terrorism is slavery in disguise and a patriarchal means of dominating the female victims who become mules for carrying out domestic activities for the terrorists. The culture of slavery imbricated in terrorism also include subjection of the *living dead* condition on the victims which include poor feeding, forceful acquisition for sexual pleasures that Al-Bakura and Malam Adamu characterise, and the like. Also, renaming is appropriated as a tool of acquisition of an object and a means of erasure of the past. The narrator is renamed Salamatau while her friend is renamed Zainab. These names become a seal of acquisition of their victims and a mode of confirming their conversion. For the victims, it becomes a loss of being because of the plantation condition they are subjected to.

Similarly, considering the need to acquire the mind of their victims, like the African slaves in the Americas were taught the Christian ways by their white masters, Boko Haram terrorists institute mediating agents at various sites of power epicenters to proselytise their victims. These mediating agents wield the power of domination and sexual acquisition. Al-Bakura and Malam Adamu are a representation of these agents whose role is to compel the submission of the girls/women and proselytise them to be “good Muslims”. These agents wield fear as a weapon of submission and this fear prompts nightmares and hallucinations in the victims and blur the line between the real and the imagined.

To control the minds of the female victims, Malam Adamu teaches them Quran based on Boko Haram’s interpretation, makes sure they pray at dawn, and appropriates metaphors of religious exclusion to scold them. The word “infidel” is deployed as a metaphor for denigration. However, being their agent of proselytisation, he also doubles as a sexual predator: “He tiptoes into our sleeping area after dark, noiseless as a shadow, taps a woman or two, and beckons her to follow him out quietly” (148). The male agent’s sexual predatory of the women symbolises the victims’ status as an object that can be acquired by these agents who have the power to kill or make them live.

The women agents also possess parallel powers as their male counterparts. They proselytise the girls and women and mould them according to the wish of the Boko Haram vanguard.

The first is Amira who teaches the converts how to dress as a Muslim, serves them food, and prepares them for their next phase as wives of Boko Haram men. Fanne performs similar functions and maintains order among the wives of the Boko Haram terrorists as well as trains them. She teaches the new wives how to appease their husbands and how to please them. Her role mediates a settlement between the girls and their husbands as well as the wish of the Boko Haram leadership to turn them into an asset of sacrifice by radicalising them and sending them on suicide bombing missions as typified by Zainab. According to Fanne, “Allah does not allow men to fight women...you brave women of brave fighters have to be the ones to fight infidel women for Allah” (p. 224)

Women as victims of terrorism also possess a mobile status like their male counterparts. Nwaubani deploys the institution of marriage as a mode of mobility from slaves to wives which connotes graduation from general slaves to “a slave of one man” (p. 208) with rights and privileges like sleeping in a tarpaulin tent instead of under an open sky. This mobility creates complex power relations between females or women in terrorism based on hierarchy. In *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, the vertical hierarchical representation of women in terrorism depicts the mediating agents like Amira and Fanne as occupying the highest position, followed by the wives while the slaves occupy the lowest rung of the ladder. Equally, the marriage of the girls to the Boko Haram men epitomises virgins on earth as a gift, a simulation, and replication of the virgins in paradise, the mythical belief of the reward for men that join Islamic terrorism. The virgins are Houris which Mohammed Senoussi and Ilhem Serir Mortad (2019) contend are *Hour al-Ayn* in Paradise described in the Quran as “virgin and alluring women” (p. 507) and are offered by God to martyrs that fight for his course. According to the leader, “these are the virgins that Allah has prepared for you” (p. 186), therefore, the virginity of the girls translates to a physical and spiritual salary for the fighters. Also, the process of the marriage institution is rewritten for the girls as the narrator asks “who will accept the groom’s proposal on my behalf?” (196), rather than being offered marriage by their parents and relatives, they are substituted with the “Leader” who acts as their sole proprietor, arrogating to himself the legal and familial role of “giving” them away to their husbands. The marriage ought to be a two-way process of proposal and acceptance, but, in this instance, it is a one-way process of giving the brides

to their Boko Haram husbands without asking. This underscores slavery that underpins Islamic terrorism as represented by Boko Haram in the novel.

Marriage also serves as a platform to schematise the women in terrorism into two categories. The first category is the assimilationist while the second is the resistant type. The former is metaphorised by Zainab who is married to an affable Boko Haram terrorist, Ali, who makes her fall in love. Zainab assimilates and develops the syndrome of belonging to the group. Ali, her husband, buys her gifts, discusses with her and this opens her mind to accept her husband and the Boko Haram group. Zainab, the assimilationist, accepts her husband's explanation which she intones to her friend that "Boko Haram are not really bad people...they may be killing people now, but it is so that we can have peace and live under sharia law...the way many people are living in Nigeria, Allah is not happy about it" (p. 237). Zainab is a metaphor of the girls/women in terrorism that develop the assimilationist syndrome; she accepts the rationale for the terrorism of Boko Haram members and identifies with it. On the contrary, Salamatu epitomises the resistant syndrome, an example of girls/women as victims in terrorism that develop a defence mechanism against the radicalisation of their captors and reject belonging or identifying with them. Salamatu is married to the man in the mask, with the sobriquet Osama, who believes only in "matrimonial commands" (p. 210).

However, this representation of women as victims of terrorism is complicated with the Manichaeic construct of the nature of the two husbands. Will Salamatu have developed an assimilationist syndrome like Zainab if she is married to a Boko Haram man like Ali? Does her marriage to a man like Osama strengthen her resistance against developing belonging to the group? This thesis contends that memory and reminiscence of life before terrorism will still have made Salamatu remain resistant to the Boko Haram radicalisation and intrigues. Her memory of Success, Pastor Moses' son who she idolises, her proclivity for education, and her recollection of Mama would have entrenched her resistance to the Boko Haram mediating agents' intrigues and the proselytisation process of belonging and ascribing everything to Allah's command, the alibi for terrorism.

Also, the representation of the effect of terrorism on girls/women in terrorism within the institution of marriage differs. On the assimilationist model, Zainab finds love and is

rewarded with a mission of sacrifice to earn a mythical reward. According to Fanne, “you will see millions of angels and money. You will find yourself in paradise” (p. 261), this is the mythical and fantastical reward for suicide bombing. This mode of death is anchored on speed and “favour of Allah” connected with the love of her husband as Fanne announces that Zainab’s husband wants her to be the first to go to jihad. The love between Ali and Zainab is complicated with the willingness of Ali to offer her as a sacrifice. This patriarchal stance is more political and hypocritical than religious. Zainab represents how radicalisation coalesces subtly with human relations in terrorism to prompt sacrifice for a mythical reward. Love represents an altar of sacrifice that Zainab loses her life on and, possibly, that of her victims to earn death and “paradise”.

In contrast, Salamatu, the narrator, the resistant one, earns freedom but with pregnancy. She is haunted by the trauma of the “man in the mask” and the uncertainty of the future after experiencing terror and terrorism. After regaining her freedom and discovering her pregnancy, she wonders how “the mother of a child with bad blood lift her head high among normal human beings” (p. 292). In the representation of women as victims in terrorism, Nwaubani deploys the binary construct of assimilationist victims and resistant victims through the characters of Zainab and Salamatu respectively to explain the conditions that prompt the belonging or unbelonging of Boko Haram victims to their captors’ terror imaginary. This construct is anchored on various reward systems both within the group and outside it. The belonging of Zainab prompted by her husband makes her earn the reward of death as a sacrifice for the Boko Haram group while Salamatu’s unbelonging earns her freedom with etched trauma of haunting terror inscribed in her consciousness. The corollary of this representation is that women as victims of terrorism experience various and differing power play and human relationships that alter them differently.

While Zainab earns death on the altar of sacrifice, Aisha earns death as a result of the conditions she is subjected to and she is used to subvert the belief that Boko Haram practises true Islam. She is raped by Al-Bakura, even though she is pregnant, and objectified by mediating agents instituted within the Boko Haram. The conundrum of her character is that while she earns death, she rewards the group with her offspring, the son of Malam Isa who has earlier referred to the Boko Haram terrorists as a group of criminals. Therefore, instead of appropriating the popular Manichean construct of good Muslim versus bad Muslim,

Nwaubani deconstructs the paradigm through the characters who contend that “Boko Haram has nothing to do with Islam” (165). To these characters like Malam Isa, Aisha, and Malam Shettima, Boko Haram is not practicing any form of Islam but a bunch of criminals using Islam to appeal to people. Thus, Nwaubani favours the argument that what is bad should not be considered a part of an element but the analogy is whether a bad orange translates to not being an orange. This study argues that John’s representation of Islamic sectarian terrorism in *Born on a Tuesday* typifies a clearer depiction of Islamic terrorism that certain ideologies in Islam like Salafism are extreme but that does not mean they are not part of Islam like Nwaubani projects.

In conclusion, Nwaubani’s representations of women in terrorism both as victims and as mediating agents symbolises the complexities of women's experiences in terrorism, though there is the patriarchal dominance of men within the structure. However, the narrative focalises the numerous stories of different girls and women that have experienced Boko Haram terrorism in different ways, the marginalised stories that have been dominated by the abduction of the Chibok Girls by Boko Haram in 2014, as well as the uncertain future faced by these victims. The corollary is that Nwaubani depicts Boko Haram terrorism better from the victims’ perspective.

#### **4.1.2.3. Tropes and representations of terrorism in *Buried beneath the baobab tree***

Like in John’s *Born on a Tuesday*, Nwaubani connects terrorism to madness in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*. Terrorism is imagined as madness and the anonymous Boko Haram Leader in the narrative who, most likely, is Abubakar Shekau is represented as a mad man. This parallels Isha Sesay’s (2019) description of Abubakar Shekau’s message as “theatricality of a madman” (p. 72). One of the chapters on the Leader is titled Mad Man which connotes acts of terror as madness and the thought processes of terrorism as madness. The acts of terror as madness are signified in the chapter when the soldier is slaughtered by Al-Bakura to intimidate the Christian girls and women, to convert to Muslims, as well as the stabbing of Magdalene by the Leader for refusing to convert like the others. These acts of terrorism depict incomprehensible madness, thereby, characterising them as a typology of insanity. Therefore, a symmetrical relationship is drawn between madness and terrorism. Throughout the novel, Nwaubani portrays the Leader as a madman. This representation

foregrounds the imagination of terrorism as madness which is endemic in the mainstream discourse of terrorism. This fastatical representation is due to the negative stereotypical prejudice connected to madness in most societies which perceives madness as transcending any forms of illness.

Similarly, there is the deployment of the master-slave paradigm and this is focalised by Nwaubani in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*. The master-slave paradigm is analogous to the coloniser-colonised framework of identity. In the narrative, Nwaubani depicts Boko Haram men as vocalising the culture of slavery that underpins religious terrorism. According to the Leader, “You are now our slaves” (p. 119). The question is what happens to slaves; they are objectified and subjected to the plantation and *living dead* conditions by making them carry out domestic and menial jobs as well as serving as sexual objects for their masters. In the chapter LIFE OF A SLAVE, Nwaubani represents the life of slavery in terrorism through the narrator who fetches water; “washes the bloodied shirts of the Boko Haram men” (p. 144); offload clothes, gadgets, and armoury from the truck; cook for the group; fetch water and “lie on the bare ground under the sky” (p. 114). As slaves, the girls have no statutory rights unless those allocated to them by their masters.

Lastly, Sambisa Forest in the novel represents the trope of withdrawal that typifies terrorists’ abode and the popular “ungoverned spaces” that terrorists utilise for clandestine reasons. The Sambisa Forest is represented as a jungle with dense forests, wild animals, and space of hiding for the terrorists. Like the remote village in John’s *Born on a Tuesday*, Sambisa Forest represents a quasi-Islamic Caliphate that is remote, vast, and difficult to penetrate and reinvigorates the disappearance and mythical fantasy about Boko Haram terrorists.

#### **4.1.2.4. Style and narrativising of terrorism in *Buried beneath the baobab tree***

Nwaubani deploys a journalistic style of news bulletin in the narrativising of terrorism in her novel. The chapters’ length resembles news bulletins with headings. Like the general news reportage, the variegated length of the chapters symbolises essentiality of the topic, some chapters are extremely short, others are of medium-length while others are long. The issues portrayed in the chapters determine the length of the chapters which is analogous to news reportage. News of relative importance is usually long while the others are usually

short. Based on Nwaubani's journalistic background, she deploys this style to narrativise terrorism in the novel. For example, *SOMETIMES AND ALWAYS*, the chapter is about the narrator and her friend going to school and the secrets they share. This experience is captured in less than one hundred words. Conversely, a chapter like *MAD MAN* is lengthy, it captures how the Christian girls and women, through the instrument of fear and terror, are compelled to convert to Islam. This approach switches between the stream-of-consciousness of the narrator and the portrayal of actual events. In the chapter *SURPRISED*, fourteen words are used to depict the narrator's wonder at still having tears to shed.

Furthermore, Nwaubani deploys intertextuality to convey a sense of merging fantasy with reality. She employs extracts from Robert Browning's *The Pied Piper of Hamelin* as epigraphs to divide the book into four sections which can be categorised as Pre-Boko Haram attack/Communal life, Slavery in Sambisa Forest, Living as a wife of Boko Haram and Freedom. Similarly, the plot of the narrative parallels that of *The Pied Piper of Hamelin*.

#### **4.2. *Wolf dreams* by Yasmin Khadra: the historical background**

Islam played a pivotal role in the liberation of Algeria from the French colonial masters. It was appropriated as a site of resistance against colonialism during the battle of Algiers by FLN and has become a legacy in the postcolonial Algerian state. According to Jean-Louis Triaud (2000), one legacy of French colonialism in Algeria is that it had "bequeathed an official religious establishment under strong state control" (p. 386-7). The postcolonial condition of military coups soon engulfed Algeria in 1965 when Colonel Hourri Boumediene hijacked power through a coup. This experience is parallel to the military coups that swept many African countries in the 1960s, some years after colonial liberation. While the government-sponsored Islamic leaderships were conservative, the postcolonial condition of impoverishment, disillusionment, and corruption of the political class made the youth gravitate towards radical Islamism in the 1980s and this was encouraged by the intifada, the Palestinians' resistance against Israeli occupation. This was also invigorated by the three-decade FLN government's hegemonic stance that maintained a one-party system instituted by Ben Bella and the repression of dissents.



As Frederic Volpi (2003) explains, Islam is a prominent political category in Algeria and it means different things to different people. Although Volpi (2003) does not pursue this argument immediately, one may surmise that like in the case of Nigeria, some believe that Islam's relation to politics should be that of surrogacy and liberalist while others believe Islam through its instrumentality like the Sharia law should play a primary role in politics, not supportive, what Volpi designates a collective will for political Islam. From the 1980s, there is fissure among the populace on which is appropriate between liberal, national democracy and the Islamised notion of democracy. The 1988 October protest against the hike in food prices, high school fees, and debilitating economic conditions under President Chadli Benjedid led to the deployment of the military to the street as protesters torched national ministries. The protests were later fronted by Islamic fundamentalist leaders after prayers according to Volpi (2003) and turned to political agitations. The torture and killing of protesters by the armed forces aggravated the situation. The political compromise by the President led to the democratisation of Algeria and the formation of the Islamic Salvation Front (*Front Islamique du Salut*, FIS), an Islamic fundamentalist group, by Abassi Madani and Ali Belhadj, on 9th March 1989 according to James D Le Sueur (2010).

The FIS won majority of the parliamentary elections in the first round but the second round was halted by the resignation of the president on January 11, 1992. Power was handed to a quasi-security council, *Haut Conseil de Securite*, HCS known as High Security Council, but this irked the FIS led by Abdelkader Hachani. State repression led to the evolution of *Mouvement Islamic Arme* (MIA – Armed Islamic Movement) and later *Groupements Islamiques Armes* (GIA – Armed Islamic Group), a coalition of guerilla groups, created by Moh Levelley, Djaffar al-Afghani among others. GIA perpetrated attacks against civil servants and agents of the state, according to Volpi (2003), and this is represented in Yasmin Khadra's *Wolf Dreams*. GIA also engaged in diverse attacks on foreigners and perpetrated terrorism and insurgency against the state. The *Armee Islamique du Salut* (AIS – Islamic Salvation Army) was founded in 1994 as the military or guerilla wing of FIS to counter GIA. In 1995, GIA declared war against FIA and AIS; its members assassinated some of the leaders of FIS and later switched strategy to attacking civilians that participated in elections, especially in the countryside, and those that supported the state. The relationship

between Islamic terrorism and guerilla groups turned complex without any linear or symmetrical trajectory.

As Le Sueur (2010) stated, for Algeria like France, “the period of political reform gave way to the middle state of the conflict, the age of terror” (p. 5) especially between the military-inspired government and the radical Islamists. The halting of the democratic transition by the military degenerated to a state of terror and an exchange of violence between the state and the quasi-state actors. The most enigmatic part of the terrorism in Algeria is the spill-over of the conflict across its borders orchestrated by the GIA, GSPC, AQMI, and other Islamic groups. There were bombings in Paris and other metropolises by the Islamic groups from Algeria and this led to the increasing internationalisation of terrorism. However, the military, like in most postcolonial states, created the circumstances that prompted the terrorism in Algeria. These include excessive repression of state opposition, the disappearing of dissents, the halting of democratic processes, the arbitrary use of violence against demonstrators, international collaboration with the military for oil concessions, among others. The circumstances entrenched terrorism that bred the exchange of violence between the state and the Islamist groups, a repetition of the anti-colonial terrorism of the late 1950s and early 1960s. This historical review is the background of the events in Yasmina Khadra’s *Wolf Dreams*.

The terror in Algeria which Le Sueur (2010) designates as ‘war against “the near enemy” began...in 1992’ (p. 5). The enemies from the Algerian Islamic perspective include intellectuals, writers, unveiled women, inter alia. The propagation of terrorism in Algeria continued until the reconciliation process introduced by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika in 1999. The process offered amnesty to repentant Islamist terrorists and set the stage for peace. However, according to Le Sueur (2010), the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan galvanised and radicalised the “disenfranchised Algerian youths” that were about to lose interest in jihadi and Islamist/terrorist activities. One lesson to learn from Algeria is that the colonial legacy of anti-colonial resistance as terrorism and the institution of Islam as the state’s religion came to haunt Algeria in the 1990s.

Other conflicts in Algeria include the passing of the family code law in 1984 which reduced the rights of women and prohibited them from marrying non-Muslim men but the men can

do otherwise. Also, women cannot travel without the supervision of men and can be divorced at any time by their husbands. This parallels the experience of women and the abolition of their rights based on Islamic laws in Egypt recorded in Nawal El Saadawi's memoirs: *Walking through Fire* (2009). Similarly, there is a crisis between the Arabs who are the majority (about eighty percent) and the Berbers who are the minority (about twenty percent), this is accentuated by the legalisation of Arabic as the national language which was conceived as marginalisation by the Berbers. This culminated in the Berber Spring violence in 1980 that led to various degrees of violence between the Berber rioters and the state according to Le Sueur (2010). The concept of *takfiri* brought by the Afghan Algerians to the formation of GIA provided the paradigm for labelling victims and killing them. The Islamists employed *takfiri* as the framework for killing intellectuals, activists, state agents, and the like. The Afghan Algerians that returned to Algeria after the Afghan war with Russia also helped to deepen the radicalisation of Islamists and Muslim youths, as well as escalated the fissure between the FIS leaders on the propagation of violent jihad for political objectives. Other groups that evolved from GIA include Groupe Salafiste pour la Predication et el Combat (GSPC) established by Hassan Hattab and AQMI. The disintegration of GIA according to Le Sueur (2010) was due to extreme violence against Muslims and the "internal rivalry at the leadership level" (p. 143). However, the amnesty programme with the terrorists by President Zeroual during the late 1990s helped end FIS and AIS's terrorism and reduce violence in Algeria.

Despite the terrorism from both the Islamists and the state, cultural artists like Tahar Djaout and Matoub Lounes, both murdered, deplored the terrorism in Algeria through their works. Many were forced into exile in France and still live there like Yasmina Khadra. Yasmina Khadra is an example of an Algerian writer who is transnational, his name is a pseudonym that hides his personality for many years before his real identity is uncovered as Mohammed Moulessehoul, a former high ranking Algerian soldier. State terrorism and Islamist terrorism in the Algerian 1990s is the background to the plot of *Wolf Dreams* translated by Linda Black.

#### **4.2.1. *Wolf dreams: plot account***

*Wolf Dreams* is written originally in French and translated into English by Linda Black, the translated form will be the reference point here. The novel is divided into three parts and follows the life of Nafa Walid, the protagonist, in the Algerian society of the 1990s. The first section depicts the dreams of Nafa Walid to become a famous artist, actor, as well as the frustrations and the disillusionment he encounters in a political crisis-ridden Algeria. The peak of it is the traumatising he faces at the Rajas that precipitates his worshipping at Imam Younes' mosque and his confession to him. The second part portrays Nafa Walid's wish to suppress his haunted past and how he unwittingly joins the FIS by becoming a taxi driver supporting the Islamists. The peak is when he escapes from the law and descends into the abyss, in the third part of the novel, where he works with Sofiane's group, a wealthy group of young Islamist terrorists, before he joins the *maquis* squarely. He becomes the emir and the monster in him that he wishes to suppress at the Rajas manifests in an unprecedented manner that dooms him.

#### **4.2.2. The postcolonial condition as push factors to terrorism in *Wolf Dreams***

Invoking Phyllis Taoua's (2009) essay, the postcolonial condition comprises the inhibiting or provocative societal conditions, mostly contradictory, that succeeded the decolonisation processes and euphoria in most postcolonial nation-states. Equally, Robert Young (2012) explicates the postcolonial condition as both the "state, as well as the common circumstances, of...now living on the legacy of colonialism" (online source). These circumstances are anathema to the hope of dividends of decolonisation in the postcolony what Taoua (2009) describes in Ayi Kwei Armah's novels as "the toll the failure of nationalism takes on the intimate self and its longing for wholeness and authenticity" (p. 218). Postcolonial conditions include disillusionment, poverty, neo-compartmentalisation based on class, state oppression/repression and terror(ism) that breeds resistant counter-terror, evolving alternative spaces for critiquing socio-political and socio-economic conditions like the mosque as a religious-political space. Most African novels have represented and engaged these postcolonial conditions as well as employed them as diverse thematic preoccupations, most prominently in Ayi Kwei Ahmah's *The Beautiful Ones are not yet Born*. The thesis in this subsection is that Yasmina Khadra depicts these conditions

as push factors to Islamic fundamentalism, violence, and terrorism. These situations are symbolic of the postcolonial subject who seeks alternatives to resist the injustice of the nation-state.

According to Rumina Sethi (2011), the end of the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union led to transnationalism and globalisation that have affected the economies of many postcolonial nation-states that benefited from the cold war by playing one side to the other. In many nation-states, like Algeria, there is a struggle between local and global pulls. Sethi (2011) contends that neoliberalism “presaged the declining of the nation-states” (p. 35). This decline in the 1980s weakened the economies of countries like Algeria and Nigeria and prompted diverse crises that led to the demanding of socio-economic gains for the citizens like the October 1988 demonstration in Algeria. The alienation created by foreign capital investment also exacerbates the postcolonial condition of disillusionment in most postcolonial nation-states.

Disillusionment is a central thematic preoccupation in *Wolf Dreams*, however, there is a twist to the disillusionment in the novel. It affects both the rich and the poor as portrayed in Mullet, a minor character, and Nafa Walid, the protagonist, respectively. Nafa Walid wishes to become a prominent actor and his dream symbolises the hope of a postcolonial subject in the postcolony to surpass limitations and achieve their dream. However, the conditions of the postcolonial state shatter the dream and create disillusionment in him. Other conditions like extreme poverty, seeming neglect of the state, corruption, and humiliating situations underscore Nafa’s disenchantment.

The identity question based on class is reified by Khadra through Dahmane who asked “Who is Nafa Walid?” (p. 20) to question his hubris, a personal flaw of tragic propensity that is a push factor too. Dahmane recommends Nafa to become the chauffeur of the Rajas but he (Nafa) is sad about the idea because it falls short of his dream. Dahmane, a representation of the bourgeoisie deployed by Khadra, interrogates Nafa that how much has he got in his pocket to refuse a job. To Dahmane, Nafa has “no right to complain” (p. 20) when he is nothing and has no money. This impoverished situation violates Nafa’s hubris and his dream of becoming a prominent actor. His being is subjected to a condition that he abhorred but pushed to by the class-oriented postcolonial condition in Algeria. At the Rajas,

the metonymic representation of the postcolonial rich class, the being of Nafa is violated by the excesses of the family, Junior's exploitation of Nafa coupled with Sonia's makes him realise that his "childhood dreams were shattered on the shores of lost causes" (p. 39). His disappointment at not being able to connect with celebrities through his job as a driver to the Rajas objectifies him and pushes him further to the abyss. Nafa's exploitation at the Rajas and the terror he faced by watching Hamid smash the junkie's head are inscribed in his subconsciousness. As these conditions push him away from the Algerian mainstream society, they unconsciously drive him to Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism.

Yahia, a fellow artist, who has become a chauffeur to a rich family too contends that Islamic fundamentalism is a bridge to deferred dreams of being active participants in the Algerian society. He tells Nafa that "at least the Islamists have a chance of shaking us up, of involving us in grand schemes...be part of something big...just a serious, collective project with people who are proud of their contribution" (p. 49). The dream of the masses' participation in societal affairs is undermined by the elitist FLN government in Algeria that took over from the French colonialists in 1962 and has since then excluded the majority of Algerians from enjoying the socio-economic dividends of self-governance and political participation. According to Yahia, "with the FLN, I don't have the sense. Their system is corrupt...antagonistic to art...I refuse to be treated like a disease" (p. 50). To him, it is better to be an Islamic fundamentalist and terrorist, participating in the grand scheme of forming an Islamic caliphate, than be excluded by the Algerian nation-state governed by the political elite.

Khadra deploys symbolism and synecdoche to represent the postcolonial rich family. Though this may be an overgeneralisation, the Rajas represent the excesses of wealth and the exploitation of the poor that characterise a bourgeoisie society in a postcolonial state. Salah Raja, the patriarch of the Rajas, engages in sexual excesses even with his wife's sister. Equally, Junior engages in various sexual forays with different women, ladies, and prostitutes to the extent of killing one, objectifying the dead prostitute as Hamid's item to dispose of while Sonia exploits Nafa both physically and sexually. This coalesces the argument of the exploitation of the masses and hegemony in Marxism and postcolonialism. While Nafa is exploited by the Rajas, he is also subjected to the hegemony of the state that

refuses him the benefit of a telephone set until the Rajas' intervention. These situations serve as a push factor to Islamic terrorism.

The terror of Nafa witnessing Hamid's smashing of the dead prostitute's head and the obliteration process turns to a trauma that haunts Nafa and pushes him to search for an alternative from the traumatic experience, a purgatory source. Dahmane's unperturbed poise after Nafa apprises him of the incident also symbolises how the rich care less about the silencing of the subaltern. Also, Hamid and Nafa signify contradictory agencies. While Hamid plays the role of abetting the rich, represented by Junior, to achieve their aims, Nafa, on the contrary, resists the rich as a determinant agent in his life. The trauma of the smashed head and the exploitative conditions at the Rajas push Nafa to "the call of the muezzin" (p. 70) that offers him a temporary respite under the abode of Imam Younes. Khadra deploys class stratification and disillusionment with the excesses of the elite class as push factors to Islamic fundamentalism.

While the poor like Nafa are disenchanting with the exclusion from the socio-economic gains of the Algerian postcolonial state and thus serving as a push factor to Islamic fundamentalism, conversely, the Mullet, a son of a former minister, becomes a paradox that subverts the class argument that underpins Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism in some quarters. However, there is a binary representation that underpins the rationale for joining terrorism in *Wolf Dreams*. While Nafa and other characters from the proletariat join the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) to escape the socio-economic exclusion from the Algerian mainstream society, the Mullet joins FIS to escape the vagaries of wealth – "the futility of ostentation, the shameful of dissipation and the punishments of an ephemeral world where showy facades were a poor disguise for internal corruption" (p. 175). This opposite syndrome in the Mullet, Hind, and Sofiane's group foregrounds the emptiness in wealth. Therefore, the disillusionment of Nafa and Yahia is hinged on alienation but the Mullet's disenchantment is based on waste and futility. However, this binary portrayal of the motive for participating in Islamic terrorism between the rich and the poor seems simple and fantastical. This Manichean view undermines the complexities of human relations that make people engage in terrorism.

The neo-compartmentalisation of the Algerian society based on class also serves as a push factor. In French colonial Algeria, Algeria was compartmentalised into quarters for the colonisers and the colonised according to Fanon. A similar tendency based on class is depicted in *Wolf Dreams*. The first section, Grand-Algiers, represents the compartment of the rich and the elite that rule and control the businesses in Algeria. The space is characterised by “wide boulevards” (p. 12) that the narrator describes as “free from the swarms of impish brats that scour the streets of overcrowded cities” (p. 15). Beverley Hills represents neo-compartmentalisation that Nafa experiences as a contrast to life in the Casbah. While in the 1950s, the Algerian masses occupied the Casbah; in *Wolf Dreams*, it is occupied by the poor and the fundamentalists, unlike Grand Algiers that is a space for the rich and elites. The contrast between Grand-Algiers and the Casbah depicts neo-compartmentalism that characterises the Algerian nation-state, a subtle continuity of history, instead of the coloniser and the colonised, it is the extremely rich and the extremely poor. Grand-Algiers is similarly fantasised as a European space that is free of dirt and the excesses of fundamentalism while the Casbah symbolises a space of squalor and fundamentalism. This paradigm of representation represents the gaze of class as a basis of fundamentalism which Khadra subverts subtly with the Mullet.

State oppression and the use of necropower to counter dissension is a postcolonial condition that has pushed many into joining terrorist groups. Khadra’s representation of this situation alludes to the historical events in Algeria in the early 1990s when the military was deployed to quell the protests of the Islamists against the halting of the democratic processes by the military. The postcolonial state’s deployment of violence against its citizens as a push factor is represented in Yahia’s narration

I didn’t join the *maquis* out of conviction. When they began to shoot people who had nothing to do with the system, I tried to keep out of it. That wasn’t what I was hoping for from the Islamic revolution. But I wasn’t given any choice. My eldest son was an FIS activist. He was deported to Reggane. I said it was bound to happen and I resigned myself. Except that the gendarmes wouldn’t leave me alone. Every week, they’d turn up at my place, make a bloody mess, cart off one or two boys and beat them up. I went to see their officer. He called me a filthy fundamentalist and



threw me in solitary. I was tortured. When they let me go, I didn't even have the time to dress my wounds before the cops moved in. My wife became diabetic. It was hell. After a few months of persecution, I couldn't take it anymore. So I took my two boys and I yelled: 'Death to the bastards!'...I would rather die than put up with some things. (*WD*, p. 201)

Yahia's situation thematises how the state's arbitrary use of violence pushes its citizens to the periphery that promotes resistance over negotiation. The state's appropriation of violence as a currency with its citizens drives some of them to non-state actors that revolt against the state. In this case, that is a metaphor of some postcolonial states, the gendarmes, a replica of the colonial Algerian police, pushes Yahia to terrorism.

Nafa also suffers state oppression when "he was beaten up by the police. His body and his pride battered" (p. 144) and this makes him consider requesting a gun from the FIS that he serves as a driver. State oppression like the state terror in *Born on a Tuesday* drives postcolonial subjects to alternatives that make them have a sense of belonging/becoming. Such alternatives in *Wolf Dreams* are the FIS, MIA, and GIA that are anti-state actors and perpetrating terrorism and insurgency against the postcolonial Algerian state.

The postcolonial state also flaunts terror as an exchange for anti-state terrorism. The state police

attack...nine fundamentalists in a squalid apartment. At dawn, their unrecognizable corpses were thrown onto a lorry and paraded through the streets. The police fired into the air in triumph. Onlookers watched them make an exhibition of themselves, their expressions filled with hatred. (*WD*, p. 155)

This exhibition of violence and terror by the state undermines the ethical responsibility of the state to make its citizens believe in it as a source of legitimisation and justice and this makes terror a currency between the state and the Islamists. The brazen show of violence by the state pushes the citizens, who, in some cases, consider they have limited options, to the willing arms of the Islamists. This is a representation of terrorism as a continuity of the old colonial order which is an after-effect that Boehmer (2010) reifies in her argument about postcolonial terror. The police in this case employ parallel tactics like the colonial police in

Algeria. Therefore, the state's adoption of systematic violence and terror in *Wolf Dreams* serves as a push factor to terrorism and this symbolises the culpability of the postcolonial nation-state in driving its citizens into a revolution that gravitates to terrorism.

The drive to interrogate the socio-political inadequacies of the state makes the mosque evolve from just a religious space to a religious-political space that employs the Salafist ideology to revolt against the state. While Nafa, a metaphor of an alienated postcolonial subject, seeks peace for his traumatic mind in the mosque and the gathering of the faithful, he is lured unwittingly into the FIS and becomes a terrorist on a rampage against the state and the people.

Hence, Khadra represents postcolonial conditions of disillusionment, shattered dreams, poverty, state terror, and the religious-political metamorphosis of the mosque as the push factors to terrorism in Algeria. While it will be overgeneralisation to state that all postcolonial subjects that undergo these conditions join terrorism, nevertheless, these conditions play pivotal roles in pushing some postcolonial subjects like Nafa and Yahia into terrorism.

#### **4.2.3. Representing terrorism, its motivations, and the changing figures of terrorists in *Wolf Dreams***

Representation of terrorism in literature usually explores the motivations of terrorism. The impulse that drives a person to terrorism or a terrorist is essential to apprehend the psychosocial factors that underlie terrorism. While fiction may not encapsulate all these psychosocial drives, the ones portrayed avail the reader(s) opportunities to glimpse into a terrorist's mind and the diverse transformations inherent in their individuality. While the postcolonial conditions are mostly external and conditioned by spatial configuration, the motivations are sometimes psychosocial drives that merge with the external factors. Therefore, what are the psychological drives that make an individual join fundamentalist and terror groups? How do these impulses conjoin with postcolonial conditions to create a terrorist identity? In *Wolf Dreams*, hubris and quest for essentiality are the motivations for Nafa joining Islamic fundamentalism and becoming a terrorist.

Hubris is a major hamartia in literature and has led to the downfall of many characters. Just like the Biblical Lucifer revolted against God and was ejected from heaven, characters like

Okonkwo in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* experience doom because of a bloated Self, what Chigbo Arthur Anyaduba (2019) designates hubristic masculinity defined as "a constellation of proclivities and attributes that characterize maleness as excessively arrogant in ways leading to tragic consequences" (p. 92). Therefore, Okonkwo's hubris makes him perceive the white man's reign in Umuofia as an anathema to the cultural and traditional Igbo order, he repudiates the white man's authority and commits murder. Considering himself the alter ego of his father, he cannot bear the humiliation of facing the colonial law, he therefore hangs himself. According to M. H. Abrams (1999), the tragic hero in the Greek tragedy always possesses hubris or pride, a tragic flaw, which leads to the violation of moral law. In the modern sense, hubris can be reanalysed as pride that culminates in resistance or revolting against the state, like in the case of Nafa. that climaxes in a tragic end.

Nafa's dream of becoming an actor invigorates his pride and makes him disregard authorities right from his school days. According to Nafa, he was "sent before the school disciplinary board in disgrace...kept my head in the clouds, heedless both of my teachers' anger and parents' increasing anxiety" (p. 13). His refusal to heed the warning of his teachers and parents to concentrate in school parallels the refusal of tragic heroes, like Oedipus, in the Greek tragedies to listen to divine warnings or stick to moral laws. Nafa's bloated Self makes him believe school is not a necessity in the Algerian society where "eminent university professors willingly became street vendors to make ends meet" (p. 13). His egoistic Self makes him repudiate acquiring any skill from school. His hubris is violated more with his humiliation at the Rajas by Junior, Sonia and Hamid. His overweening self-confidence and pride are complicated with the postcolonial condition of shattered dreams and poverty in the Algerian society. To demonstrate his pride, he revolts against Sonia's exploitation and states: "I am a human being, and I have my pride. It's not enough to protect me from prejudice, but I have nothing else. If I were to lose that, I may as well lose my life" (p. 36). However, one wonders why Khadra's depiction of Nafa's revolt at the Rajas is genderised, Nafa resists Sonia's exploitation but assimilates with Junior's and Hamid's. The paradox is that Nafa loses that pride before leaving the Rajas and this subtly awakens his alter ego and the thirst for essentiality. The trauma of witnessing Hamid smash the junkie's head awakens his alter ego, latently at the time, while his Self is brutalised in the confrontation against bourgeoisie terror. After the incident, Nafa narrates that

I spent my night in terror. My sleep was haunted by nightmare visions. The forest of Bainem like a Chimera on heat, heightening my nocturnal terror. The girl's ghost stalked me through the mist...the thumping of my heart mingled with Hamid's "aaargh"s, with the dull thud of the stone crushing the dead girl's face. I would wake up howling, my hands outstretched in the dark. (WD, p. 68)

The "I" of Nafa, his Self, is violated and traumatised but this, conversely, wakes up Nafa's latent brutish alter ego.

Like the European quarters in colonial French Algeria that breed ambivalence in native Algerians, Nafa's experience at the Rajas' estate in Beverly Hills drives him to quest for essentiality or meaning, a sense of being and belonging. The wealth of the Rajas creates in him the feeling of desire and detestation, desire to acquire material essentialism but detestation of exploitation and humiliation. His humiliation at the Rajas makes him search for peace and salvation of his brutalised Self at the mosque and this acquaints him with Imam Younes who contrasts the material terror of the Rajas. A quest for the restoration of Nafa's proud Self is dashed finally by Mourad Brik who dupes Nafa of his savings and disappears with it. His hubris and desire for essentiality blindfold him from perceiving the illusion in Mourad's promise to help him secure a grant at the French Cultural Centre to train at a professional theatre in France. Mourad's disappearance with Nafa's money further plunges Nafa into disillusionment and frustration. His hubris makes him reject Dahmane's help and choose a "different path" (p. 123) in the Salafist-Islamists' circle.

Nafa's violated Self makes him search for essentiality, an essence, to recover his self. This impulse drives him into the arms of the fundamentalists represented by Imam Younes, a personality of disguise and Islamic resistance against the state. With the guise of economic engagement, Imam Younes enrolls Nafa, as a taxi driver, into the FIS support group for the fighters and when he eventually joins the *maquis*, his alter ego emerges at an unprecedented level. Nafa's hubris therefore serves as the major drive that pushes him to the peripheral of the Algerian society and obfuscates his reasoning when Sid Ali warns him against the Islamists' danger.

This brings the next set of questions to the fore. How is terrorism represented in *Wolf Dreams*? What forms of terrorism are depicted in the novel? What are the nuances between

the different forms of violence and terror as portrayed in the narrative? Khadra portrays terrorism as complex and intersecting various spectra of human relations in the postcolonial Algerian society. Terrorism will be explored as systematic violence to cause and communicate fear at various levels by both the state and non-state actors.

In *Wolf Dreams*, resistance morphs into terrorism and insurgency that combine Islamic and political terrorism. The religious-political terrorism comprises the alibi of an Islamic revolution for the systematic killing of state agents, constituting a parallel state (Islamic Caliphate), Islamic sectarian violence and rivalries between various terrorist groups, philistinism, death as communication, and patriarchal terror. All these forms of terror are interwoven with the deployment of terrorism by the state in response to the Islamic revolution portrayed in the narrative.

The proselytisation of the masses, especially the poor, by the Islamic clerics presages the terrorism that is deployed by the FIS against the state agents and those against FIS. The Islamists enunciate a socialist vision that criticises the corruption of the ruling class in the Algerian postcolony, and the capitalist undertaking of the government that institutes inequality and a class-oriented society. They represent the paradox of the postcolonial Algerian society wherein “a country as rich as Algeria, fully-fledged citizens should languish in the most ignominious poverty” (p. 95). The postcolonial Algerian condition is contrasted with the colonial Algerian society: “before 62, an Algerian would have preferred to cut off his hand rather than hold it out to beg. Today, he holds out both hands” (95). This type of rhetoric like that of Malam Abdul-Nur in *Born on a Tuesday* is employed as a mode of critiquing the banality of the postcolonial state. Propaganda mixes with proselytisation to recruit the poor and disenchanting into the Islamic movement while the excesses of the state and its appropriation of violence as a dialogue with the masses are turned into an alibi to resist the state. The contention is that the Islamists appropriate proselytisation as a sublimation of their intended insurgency against the state by criticising the postcolonial conditions. They use this vision as a bridge to lure the poor to their side. Similarly, the Islamists employ religious imagery of the tyrants rejected by the saints as part of their preaching to patronise the masses to rally against the state. While the Islamists are luring

the masses to their sides, the state adopts violence as a currency and this compromises the ethical duty of the state.

Proselytisation coalesces with welfare activities to create an alter image of the postcolonial state as hegemonic. Equally, charity is politicised to engender the counter-hegemonic stance of the Islamic movement, the FIS. According to Stephen Morton's (2003) review of Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony, he argues that "dominant ideological institutions such as political parties, churches" (p. 64) play a role similar to that of the "capital-labour contract" and "depends on the consent and agreement of the individual" (p. 64). In *Wolf Dreams*, charity and preaching are employed as ideological strategies to win the masses just like Alhaji Usman's religious philanthropism in John's *Born on a Tuesday*. Therefore, the Islamists forge a revolutionary image against the state, a form of resistance against postcolonial conditions, a socialist vision of equality for the masses as an alternative to the state. However, when does the revolutionist become a terrorist? What are the ethical roles that blurred the lines between resistance and terrorism? While these questions are contentious and nuanced at various levels, the Algerian state is portrayed as complicit for adopting violence and terror as a medium of exchange between its ruling class and the ruled. Thus, this postcolonial condition necessitates violence as a transactional mode that the terrorists reciprocate.

The Islamists' resistance against the state commences with the systematic killing of state agents like the magistrate that Nafa kills in the presence of her daughter. The representation of these killings evinces the terror motive of the Islamists, engendered by FIS's campaigns against the government, and this intersects religious and political terrorism. The killings are communicative and send messages of fear to the audience. Fear is an integral component of terrorism and this is deployed by the *Mouvement Islamique Arme*, MIA, in *Wolf Dreams* to expand its campaign of violence against any opponent. The killing of the target is communicative

Each morning, hooded men emerged from their hiding places and shot their targets point blank. Sometimes, a butcher's knife finished off the wounded, *slitting their throats*. At the mosque this gesture was explained: a ritual through which death became an oblation and murder an allegiance. (WD, p. 134) **emphasis added**

Therefore, death is semiotic, a system of signs between the triad of the government, perpetrators, and the masses as the audience. The dead are not only killed but also inscribed with messages for the audience. Decapitation of the dead and modes of killing like slitting of the throat are signs depicted by Khadra as an indicator of terrorism. While the systematic campaigns of violence are first perpetrated on state agents, the scope expands to the citizens and the terror becomes all-encompassing and holistic in the guise of jihad against the state. The widening of the terror to the masses raises the ethical question of the Islamists' seeming revolution whose ideological paradigm is socialist. Also, adopting death as a semiotic instrument undermines the revolutionary proclivities of the Islamists and represents them as terrorists.

The representation of the Casbah as a parallel mini-state run by the Islamist terrorists in a nation-state is a historical marker of the anti-colonial campaign in the 1950s and the repetition of the history in perpetual form. The postcolonial terrorism in the Casbah, therefore, depicts continuity in another form. In the Casbah like in the 50s

The Casbah reinforced its defences. It became a forbidden city. The *mujahideen* withdrew there after exploits. This was *their* territory. Distinctive with dark-haloed heads and their pistols protruding from their belts, they strutted about the terraces of the cafes cataloguing their attacks, describing their victims' terror and laughing... (WD, p. 155)

The Casbah is represented as a metaphor for the usurpation of political authority of the postcolonial city by quasi-state agents and the deployment of terrorism as a means of governance. The parallel state instituted in the Casbah eliminates state agents like the "police, military, journalists and intellectuals" (p. 135) to engender free violence for the terrorists based on their ideological values. Sidi Ayach is another representation of a parallel state as a sign of terrorism in the postcolony. The space is deserted by the villagers to escape the throes of terrorism by Emir Chourahbil's terrorist group. Sidi Ayach typifies remoteness and spaces hijacked from the postcolony by non-state actors.

Furthermore, the parallel state is depicted as monotheistic and employing arbitrary identity construction and radical rhetoric to further terrorism. According to Sheikh Nouh, "everybody must take up arms. Anybody that is reluctant must be executed" (p. 139-140),

this enunciates the closure of free will and a monotheistic belief to perpetrate violence. Monotheism and absolutism are integral parts of terrorists' sensibilities. When free will is closed and erased, allegiance becomes a mandatory requirement of everybody within the parallel state. Also, monotheism underlies the construction of traitor versus faithful identity. Traitors are executed while the faithful are preserved. However, the identity framework of a traitor is subjective and fluid, depending on different social relations and power play. The dominant model is the us/them binary, the mufti of Emir Chourahbil's *katiba* says that "those who have refused to join us fester in the shadows of demons" (p. 208). The "them" can be other terrorist groups like AIS, a rival Islamic group, state agents, or civilians.

Khadra also represents the identity crisis that is endemic to religious terrorism. The rivalry between the different terrorist groups epitomises this crisis and complicates the concept of a traitor. The question of who a traitor is is politicised especially between the GIA and the AIS. According to the mufti of Emir Chourahbil's *katiba*, the "Islamic Salvation Army is a vipers' nest" (p. 209), a traitor that should be eliminated. The GIA employs absolutism as a mode of legitimising its image as the only one sent by God to wage war against the infidels.

The representation of terrorism in *Wolf Dreams* also explores the anti-art/ist culture or philistinism in a terrorist society. Sid Ali and Rachid Derrag are metaphors of the dangers artists face in a terrorised society. Sid Ali is demonised as anti-religious while Rachid Derrag is slaughtered in front of his children. The portrayal parallels the Khomeini's fatwa against Salman Rushdie for 'deriding' Prophet Mohammed in his novel. While Salman Rushdie is protected by various Western countries and agents, Khadra uses Sid Ali and Rachid Derrag to narrativise the dangers faced by artists in terrorised postcolonial societies. Similarly, he portrays the patriarchal terror inherent in Islamic terrorist societies through the characters of Nabil and Hanane. It is ironic that Nabil, a lousy advocate for an Islamic society and freedom from the government's excesses, terrorises his sister and stabs her for participating in a protest. This affirms the variegated forms of terror and their manifestations at various levels in society.

Another essential perspective in Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* is the representation of the terrorist figure as complex and heterogeneous. The monolithic figure of the terrorist is deconstructed to reflect the arrays of identities that constitute terrorist groups like the GIA. This



heterogeneity is transnational in nature and clannish. The Afghan Algerians, those that fought in the Afghanistan war against the Soviet Union, have worn a transnational figure while the Iran influence is also narrativised. After the death of the leaders of the movement, the leadership tussle focalises the heterogeneity of the terrorist identities as “Iranians, Afghans, the *Hijra wa Takfir* sect, Salafists, Jaz’ara, the companions of Said Mekhloufi, disciples of Chebouti...other occults” (p. 185). This portrayal deconstructs the reading of the terrorists through the protagonist or the leaders of terrorist groups. The contention is that the various foot soldiers of most terrorist groups are a potpourri of identities from diverse demographics and with different psychosocial motives. Hence, terrorists’ figures morph depending on contexts and groups. While the vanguard of Chourahbil’s *katiba* is clannish, “the rest of the *katiba* was a ragtag of deserters, escaped convicts, thugs, teachers and engineers hounded out of the cities, and young peasant farmers kidnapped during expeditions and recruited by force” (p. 206). Hence, the analysis of an individual character as a terrorist cannot be generalised as a representation of terrorist identity. The identities of terrorists are complex and dynamic.

Among the dynamics of the identity of a terrorist, Khadra depicts class as playing a pivotal role. The representation of Sofiane’s wealthy group is hinged on disguise as a mode of terrorism. Sofiane’s members are clean-shaven, not the stereotypical image of heavily bearded terrorists, and they move in and out of wealthy societies without detection. Like the women that employ disguise to enter the European quarters during the battle of Algiers, Hind, Sofiane, Nafa, and the Mullet appropriate camouflage as a terrorism strategy. However, why is Nafa transferred to the group initially? It is because of the influence of Imam Younes in the FIS but when he loses that influence, Nafa is transferred to Chourahbil’s *katiba* located in the remote mountains. Sofiane is also infuriated that “a stupid peasant. An illiterate idiot” (p. 186) emerges as the emir of the group after the leaders were bombed. Ironically, a group that is resisting inequality is structured based on class and influence. The paradox is that hegemony is difficult to divorce from any human relationship in societies.

The artist as a terrorist is also represented as a form of terrorist’s identity. Nafa and Yahia embody this portrayal. Nafa, a prospective actor, is pushed unwittingly into the Islamist movement, likewise Yahia, a musician, is forced into the GIA by state terror. The characters

typify two spectra of intellectuals in terrorism. While Sid Ali and Rachid Derrag are victims of terrorism, Nafa and Yahie are perpetrators and victims. Their families suffer as victims too; Nafa's mother is bombed while Yahia and his sons are executed for various arbitrary reasons.

Women as terrorists are represented based on the western fantasy of class, beauty, seduction, and genderised figuring. The western fantasy of women in terrorism is centred on hyper-femininity which transgresses the gender of a woman. Hind embodies this hyper-femininity, she is depicted as a *theopath* who is feared by everybody including the men in the group. This genderised prism of representing terrorism is stereotypical and fantastical, it depicts women in terrorism as more extreme than their male counterparts. Also, Hind and Zoubeida are constructed within the frame of beauty and seduction as their mode of engaging in terrorism while male characters like Chourahbil are depicted as strong and "could knock out a donkey" (205). Although Nafa is described as possessing handsome looks, this does not count in his engagement in terrorism. Therefore, Khadra deploys genderised prism of representation of terrorists in *Wolf Dreams*. Zoubeida, for example, escapes because she beguiles Nafa and uses him as an escape route, similarly, Hind drives Sofiane's group during missions to captivate the law enforcement agents and give the group a smooth ride while the men are depicted as an epitome of strength in terrorism. Therefore, there is a genderised binary representation of strength/beauty in the male/female dyad in terrorism. However, does this mean that there are no women that are stronger than men in terrorism? Are women more violent than men in terrorism? This type of genderised representation is stereotypical and fantastical.

A close examination of the representations of Islamic terrorism in Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* shows that his portrayal is questionable. Are there no Muslims that countered the terrorism of groups like AIS, GIA and MIA in Algeria? In the novel, all Muslims and Islamists are depicted as terrorists, this evokes the homogenising western gaze that Edward Siad (1994) criticises. Throughout the narrative, no Muslim is depicted as a dissenting force to Islamist terrorism, unlike John and Nwaubani that represent opposing Muslim voices to Islamic (sectarian) terrorism. In the novel, the only antagonising forces are artists like Sid Ali and Rachid Derrag, they symbolise the role of the artist as the conscience of a society. Although

Khadra's objective is to narrativise the violence and terrorism/insurgency that rocked Algeria during the 1990s which he does courageously, however, the homogenising gaze of all Muslims as terrorists undermines his representation of terrorism in the novel and makes one question whether there is no Muslim or Islamist throughout the period that opposed the terrorism of the Islamists and their armed groups and why it is not worth depicting in *Wolf Dreams*.

#### **4.2.4. Narrativising terrorism and its tropes in *Wolf Dreams***

In *Wolf Dreams*, Khadra deploys animal symbols to narrativise terrorism. Mohammed Senoussi and Ilhem Serir Mortad (2019) argue that Khadra employs the “wolf metaphor” to exploit “man’s barbarism, an incarnation of savagery, an emblem of ferocity, treachery and bloodshed” (p. 503) and to depict the terrorists. While their argument is valid, an addendum is the appropriation of the same animal symbol to represent the rich/elite/political class that creates the conditions that breed terrorism. According to Imam Younes, “the rich are vile, unscrupulous and ruthless people...rather like wolves, they operate in packs to boost their spirits, but have no hesitation in eating a fellow wolf alike if he is too weak” (p. 73). This representation of the rich/political class focalises the brutal exploitation of the poor that creates an animal out of the terrorists. Capitalism and politics intersect with hegemony to subject the masses to conditions that push some of them to terrorism. Hence, while the terrorists are depicted as wolves owing to their terroristic acts of devouring state agents and the vulnerable in the Algerian society, the rich and their agents possess similar animalistic cruelty by using their wealth to exploit and brutalise the poor. A vivid example is the exploitation and traumatising of Nafa Walid by Junior and Hamid.

Junior and Hamid turn Nafa to a nocturnal prowler for mistresses and prostitutes, to a wolf in the night getting prey to satiate his master. It is through these errands that Nafa confronts death and it is inscribed in his consciousness. This experience pushes him to Imam Younes who later recruits him into FIS. Similarly, the nocturnal activities of the elite police force, *Ninja DZ*, connects them to the wolf phenomenon. They raid their victims at night and disappear during the day. This tropology of the wolf/animal symbol in terms of predatory and terroristic acts characterise the elite/political class, their agents, and the terrorists.

Like in most terrorist novels, the motif of betrayal/betrayer is widely appropriated in Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* on various levels. The first level is the construction of the enemy, an Other that should be eliminated, as a betrayer by the terrorists. Throughout the narrative, the different terrorist groups employ the traitor frame for conceiving the enemy and considers those that do not belong to their groups as betraying them. Death is the remuneration for being a traitor: "you're going to die, traitor" (p. 134). Similarly, another level of the motif of betrayal/betrayer in the narrative is signified within the diverse terrorist groups. As a common trait of groups, terrorist members of one group leak information to the other groups. In the novel, a regional emir of the GIA "was court-marshaled and sentenced to death for having secret dealings with the Salafists" (p. 218). The motif of betrayal is exaggerated to the extent of killing a member that protects a familial person or relative in an enemy Islamic terrorist group.

The withdrawal motif is also represented in *Wolf Dreams*. Albeit the Islamists started their campaigns from the Casbah, they later withdrew to the mountains and remote villages from where they launch attacks on the state and the civilians. Remoteness/withdrawal of the terrorists in the novel serves the dual purposes of safety from the state's attack and operation of a parallel state within the Algerian postcolony. Sidi Ayach is a spatial representation of the withdrawal motif. The withdrawal motif in the novel is analogous to the Sambisa forest in Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* and the remote village where Malam Abdul-Nur trains his followers in John's *Born on a Tuesday*.

In all, Khadra narrativises and subtly historicises the terrorism that bedeviled the Algerian nation-state during the 1990s and represents characters from both spectra of the state and Islamists as culpable. Equally, he depicts the heterogeneity of the terrorist figure and the complexity of their identities as well as the diverse conditions that stimulate terrorism. However, his representation of all Islamists as terrorists without depicting the "dissents" within Islam is questionable and panders to westernised/generalised gaze of all/most Muslims are terrorists. Similarly, Linda Black's translation of Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* has what Robert Young (2013) describes as "current penchant for foreignization in translation studies" (p. 689). Black appropriates words like "Lord" (196), instead of Allah, which are inconsistent with Arabic/Islamic societies but adopts these words for foreignisation.

### **4.3. *Crossbones* by Nuruddin Farah: a background**

Al-Shabaab, the youth wing of the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) or Islamic Courts Union (ICU), emerged to challenge the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia after the collapse of the central government but underlying this narrative is the predominance of clan rivalries in Somalia (Solomon, 2015). However, Stig Jarle Hansen (2013) traces the genealogy of the group farther to the Somali jihadists that fought in the Afghan war of 1979-89. Similarly, Al-Shabaab's roots can also be traced to Al-Itihaad al-Islamiya (AIAI) which was formed in 1983. Despite this latter historical provenance, the clans and diya-paying groups within the group maintain a collective responsibility of protecting their members and they revenge over any atrocity committed against any member. Solomon (2015) further contends that the identities of the clan members are not fixed but fluid and influenced by other factors like socio-economic conditions. Al-Shabaab is an intermingling of business interests and the jihadi mission of establishing an Islamic state. Despite the clan differences, Solomon (2015) argues that the nationalist spirit in Somalia is stimulated by external aggression especially from Ethiopia supported by the United States and that the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia in 2006 radicalised many Somalis, "including those in the diaspora" (p. 50), to join Al-Shabaab. Nuruddin Farah represents the diasporic disposition of Al-Shabaab's recruitment through the character of Taxliil who is recruited to join the group from Minneapolis in the United States of America which underscores the transnational influence of the group. According to Harun Maruf and Dan Joseph (2018), the name Al-Shabaab, an Arabic term, means the youth and it is given to the group by the Somalis during its early years in allusion to the age of the rank and files of the jihadists who are mostly in their teens and early twenties, members of the senior cadre are the relatively older ones. This is analogous to Boko Haram in Nigeria whose name was given to it by the local population in Maiduguri. Another account is the coalescing of various jihadist groups to form *Harakat Al-Shabaab al-Mujahedeen* (HSM) known shortly as Al-Shabaab.

Al-Shabaab since 2006 has possessed contradictory traits of maintaining peace and stability in the areas they controlled in Somalia as well as promoting violence and terrorism against liberals, secularists, and the West (Hansen, 2013). He describes Al-Shabaab as a heterogeneous organisation whose "recruits are motivated by a variety of factors such as financial gain, fear (forceful recruitment), siding with the winner, anti-Ethiopian feelings,

clan grievances, a quest for justice...or offensive jihad” (p. 3). These factors are represented by Farah in *Crossbones* through characters like BigBeard, Gumaad, inter alia. Similarly, apart from Al-Shabaab being a result of the prolonged civil war between the warlords, there is the international implication of the Afghan mujahedeen that gave the group the Al-Qaeda ideological background and support. Al-Shabaab like any other religious group comprises hypocrites and real believers who use the group as a platform for “instrumentalism” what Hansen (2013) defines as “the use of religion to achieve personal or political gain” (p. 5).

Factors that stimulated the development of the group according to Hansen (2013) include “Islamic charities, the trust put in religious leaders, the use of religious symbols” (p. 18) and are similar to conditions in Nigeria and Algeria where Islamic charities have been instrumental in luring many poor youths into Islamic radical/terrorist groups. Also, the Ethiopian occupation fuelled animosity against the interlopers who engaged in random bombings that killed many civilians and it aided the recruitment of many disenchanted Somalis into Al-Shabaab on the back of nationalism. Clan politics equally plays a pivotal role in Al-Shabaab although there are times that the group transcended the clan disparity to foster unity among its members. In 2007, Al-Shabaab engaged in systematic killing and assassination of civil servants, supporters of the Transitional Federal Government, former military officers not supporting them and terrorise the Others in the southern Somali hemisphere as well as engaged in suicide attacks and the use of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs). By mid-2007, Al-Shabaab splintered from the courts and conducted its violent campaigns independently based on local and global outlook driven by its partnership with Al-Qaeda.

The malaise of piracy is mixed with terrorism in Somalia as one facilitates the other. According to Assad, a money-transfer banker (Peter Eichstaedt, 2010), some pirate money has been used to support Al-Shabaab. Considering the rife rate of piracy in Somalia, the lucrative profits are shared with Al-Shabaab and the group, in turn, protects the pirates’ business enterprises in Al-Shabaab’s controlled areas. Piracy is not an isolated business according to Eichstaedt (2010), it is supported by various clans and important personalities in different parts of Somalia. After the fall of Siad Barre’s regime in 1991, piracy increased in Somalia to protect the Somali coasts from illegal and predatory fishing as well as toxic

waste dumping by foreign vessels but the huge money from the ransoms paid to the pirates became a motive for its escalation. Popular coasts of piracy in Somalia include Eyl in Puntland, Harardheere, inter alia. The pirates provide an avenue for an arms shipment to Al-Shabaab and serve as the artery for human trafficking while the group trains the pirates and protects them in some cases. In *Crossbones*, Farah represents the subtle interconnection between piracy and terrorism as well as the causes and motivations for piracy.

From 2007 to 2009, many Somali Americans were recruited by Al-Shabaab according to Maruf and Joseph (2018) especially those in the Twin Cities area of Minnesota because of the large concentration of Somalis in the zone. Many of those recruited left Somalia as children and have lived in America since then until they were lured back by Al-Shabaab recruiters to join the group. This is most likely the inspiration for Farah's *Crossbones* which is based on Taxliil's disappearance from America and the efforts made by his stepfather to get him back coupled with the journalistic quest of Malik. It is not incidental that Taxliil is also recruited to join Al-Shabaab from the Twin Cities area through the help of his Imam at a mosque in Minnesota. Somali diaspora youths in countries like Canada, Sweden, among others, are also lured back to Somalia to join the group. Recruitment is propagated through propaganda on Facebook, videos on YouTube, blogging, inter alia, and sponsored by sympathisers too. It is pertinent to note that Al-Shabaab is not the only Islamic and radical group in Somalia, there are others like Hizbul Islam that collaborated with the group, but Al-Shabaab is the most radical and violent group. It is fashioned after the Taliban Government in Afghanistan. It instituted a parallel government underpinned by its defined Islamic governmentality and judicial system that convicted people whose punishment included stoning to death, beheading, amputation, among others.

Although Al-Shabaab's objectives are to evict all foreign security forces from Somalia especially the Ethiopian army which it perceives as a Christian interloper/empire backed by the United States, turn Somalia to an Islamic state and govern it according to strict Sharia laws, the motivations of its members differ, ranging from business to religious as well as personal reasons. It is also ironic that Al-Shabaab has foreign fighters from Pakistan, Yemen, among others, in its ranks despite claiming that it is fighting the occupation of Somalia by foreign forces. Roland Marchal (2019) in examining the motivations of Al-

Shabaab conceives the group as a political organisation “not merely as a terrorist organization eager to kill a population as mentioned in media headlines” (p. 310). However, his argument is inadequate, it will be better to designate the group an insurgent/terrorist organisation that appropriates terroristic tactics to voice its political objectives, considering its historical trajectory from AIAI. One could opine that Marchal (2019) views the group from the prism of African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa that was described as a terrorist group during apartheid, the contrast is that Al-Shabaab rejects the truce extended to it to form a government with the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) especially when headed by President Shiekh Sharif (Maruf and Joseph, 2018).

According to Marchal (2019), some of the motivations of those below, the rank and file of Al-Shabaab, include “the importance of revenge; the call to follow friends; and economic grievances” (p. 314). There is the nationalistic motive too to revenge against foreign occupation of Somalia by Ethiopia, a repetition of the Ogaden war, and this serves as a premise for recruiting many youths into Al-Shabaab especially those in the diaspora as well as a drive to combat the injustice of the West/Christians against Muslims. Many of those with this motive joined the group to defend their country. Also, many recruits joined Shabaab because of their friends, what Joshua Meservey (2019) designates “peer-to-peer recruitment” (p. 426) while others became members to earn the monthly stipend paid by the group to its fighters/members which the TFG could not pay its soldiers. It is also important to consider the motivation of strategic positioning, a position of joining the winning side to survive. Many areas controlled by the group makes the inhabitants and youths feel that joining the group is the only strategic position for survival, to be free from suffering terror. The revenge drive is represented by Farah in *Crossbones*. Mohammed Haji Abdullahi “Ingiriis” (2019) also alludes to the “grievance-based motivation” (p. 343) in Southern Somalia which makes many youths in marginalised clans join Al-Shabaab because of the federal government’s inequitable distribution of power among the clans.

#### **4.3.1. Nuruddin Farah’s *Crossbones*: plot account analysis**

*Crossbones* is set in Somalia and has two layers of stories. The first is the quest by Ahl, Taxliil’s stepfather, to find and recover Taxliil who disappears from Minnesota, the United States, and has been recruited into Al-Shabaab as a fighter. Taxliil is one of the twenty



Somali American boys that are recruited by the group and smuggled out of the US to become Al-Shabaab fighters. The second part of the plot is Malik's drive to write about Somalia during the reign of the Islamic Courts Union and the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia. Ahl travels to Puntland, an autonomous state in Somalia, and meets different actors, most significantly, Fidno. He gets Taxliil back but with a price that almost costs Malik his life. Simultaneously, Malik interviews various actors about piracy in Somalia, the connection between piracy and terrorism. Also, he witnesses the effect of the Ethiopian invasion on the Somali national consciousness. Malik's guides, Dajaal and Qasir, are assassinated by Al-Shabaab members and he too has a close shave with death that leaves him in a critical condition.

#### **4.3.2. Representing terrorism, Al-Shabaab, and neo/occupation in *Crossbones***

Farah's *Crossbones* is the last part of a trilogy that depicts the various forms of crises that have bedeviled Somalia since 1991, after the fall of Siad Barre. *Crossbones*' temporal setting is 2006, an epoch of the Islamic Courts Union's (ICU) brief rule, the burgeoning Al-Shabaab, and the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia. Although Naicker (2017) reads *Crossbones* as a crime fiction based on the need to (re)solve the mystery of Taxliil's disappearance, it will be read more specifically, and appropriately, as a terrorist novel or a faction novel about terrorism. Taxliil's disappearance and Malik's quest for journalistic pieces form the crux of the narrative. Farah depicts ICU's rule, the rise of Shabaab, the neocolonial invasion of Ethiopia as a motivation for terrorism, the intersection of terrorism with piracy, and Taxliil as a metaphor for diasporic postcolonial terrorism which focalises the recruitment of the diasporic subject as an agent of terrorism in the postcolony. However, there are pertinent questions to answer. How does Farah represent terrorism in *Crossbones*? What are the motivations of terrorism represented in *Crossbones*? How can one deconstruct Farah's characterisation in *Crossbones*? All these questions are interrogated against the background of postcolonial terrorism as complex and intersecting with various political, economic, and socio-cultural factors in the postcolony using Somalia as a metaphor. Also, the thesis that imperial force through surrogate means like the Ethiopian invasion of Somalia is part of the after-effects of colonialism and new forms of colonialism.

While one may be tempted to interrogate Farah's *Crossbones* from the perspective of Malik and Ahl as Naicker (2017) does, a deconstructive view focalises characters like BigBeard, Gumaad, and Taxliil and their disruptive proclivity of the narrative. Farah in *Crossbones* portrays terrorism as absurd, arbitrary, and complex. BigBeard's characterisation as a member of Al-Shabaab embodies absurdity, arbitrariness, and complexity. BigBeard, also known as Abu Cumar bib Cafaan, says he is charged with "ensuring that no objectionable computer software or pornographic material is imported into the country, in breach of the Islamic code of conduct" (p. 21) and seizes Malik's laptop in an arbitrary way that the omniscient narrator denounces as having "less to do with the breaches in the Islamic code of conduct than with the settling of old scores with Dajaaal" (p. 26). The seizure of the laptop represents abuse of power and the arbitrariness deployed by agents/members of terrorist groups in a terrorised society. BigBeard's mortification of Dajaaal, Jeebleh and Malik's guide, is a metaphor for the arbitrariness of power and its absurdity in Somalia perpetrated by Al-Shabaab members. Gumaad clarifies the rift between Dajaaal and BigBeard as "bad blood" (p. 27) and this typifies the personal motive in terrorism that operates simultaneously with the ideological/political leanings of Al-Shabaab's religious-political terrorism in Somalia, a form of "religious authoritarianism" (31). The deletion of Malik's screensaver, his one-year-old daughter's picture who is "soaped and naked...in a bathtub" (p. 32), by BigBeard evinces the absurdity of Al-Shabaab's Islamic terrorism and how superficial the implementation of its precepts is by its agents. Marchal (2019) contends that motivations in Al-Shabaab are based on the dyad of the leadership and the grassroots' objectives, the latter as personal or individual drives. The deletion of files on Malik's laptop is more of a personal motivation than leadership/collective motivation. Also, victims are arbitrarily identified and designated "apostates" (p. 115) to legitimise Al-Shabaab's actions.

Similarly, Gumaad is a representation of the absurdity of terrorism and its perpetrators. He is a self-professed/nominal journalist that abhors the diasporic hubris of Malik who conceives the local Somali journalists' writings as inferior and Somalia as a site of garnering raw materials for his writings. He also envies other journalists that have published and therefore betrays them on this ground. He plots the assassinations of local journalists as well as Malik's based on this reason but this motivation depicts the absurdity of terrorism. Farah employs Gumaad as a signification of the multi-faceted nature of terrorism in the Somali

postcolonial city of Mogadiscio. The corollary is the personal and superficial motive of Gumaad plotting the deaths of journalists because he “couldn’t produce a single line good enough to be published” (p. 338). Curiously, Gumaad’s betrayal of journalists on the altar of a personal impulse of his inability to pen down/publish a piece enunciates Farah’s trivialisation of the personal motive of terrorism by Al-Shabaab members in Somalia. One wonders why journalists are not only assassinated because of their polemics against the Court or Al-Shabaab but also because Gumaad envies them. Although Farah tries to portray the personal motive as an impulse for terrorism, his representation is complicated by its triviality.

Farah also depicts the intersection between terrorism and economic interests and this further complicates his portrayal of terrorism/insurgency in *Crossbones*. For example, BigBeard is portrayed as opportunistic who “until recently...was not doing well financially” (p. 27) and as a computer merchant that has taken advantage of his membership of Al-Shabaab. Equally, Farah appropriates the Bakhaaraha market to focalise the interconnection between terrorism/insurgency and economic interests. Like the businessman in Khadra’s *Wolf Dreams* that uses the terrorists as a weapon against his business foes, the Bakhaaraha market serves as an economic space that funds terrorism for its financial interest. According to Qasir, “Bakhaaaba are aiding the insurgency” (p. 324) because “no businessman will show eagerness in welcoming a government that is bound to levy tax on his business” (p. 324) and this further complicates the motive of terrorism in Somalia.

Piracy which valorises the title of the novel is another economic activity that blurs the line between economic interest, resistance, and terrorism. Farah narrativises the genealogy of piracy in Somalia and portrays the global capitalist and neocolonial conditions that push subjects in the postcolony to certain activities. Apart from the alibi of poverty in coastal areas in the northeast of Somalia, Ma-Gabadeh, a financier of piracy, contends that

things have become much worse, because of the foreign vessels fishing illegally in our seas. So we have nothing to eat, no fish to fish... we found that ships flying flags from faraway places—Korea, Japan, Spain, Russia, Yemen, China, Belize, Bermuda, Liberia, and a handful of countries you couldn’t place on a map—were in our seas, plundering our fish and destroying their habitat. (*Crossbones*, p. 186-7)

The failure of the Somali nation-state to curb illegal fishing and the complicity of global capitalism serve as the alibi, the push factors, for piracy. Therefore, piracy becomes a form of resistance to the economic sabotage of the postcolony by neocolonial agents and expands to other financial profiteering means for the pirates. However, Farah complicates his representation of the link between terrorism and piracy by appropriating rumour as a mechanism because some operations of Al-Shabaab like most terror groups are clandestine and remain a surmise. According to the narrator,

Ma-Gabadeh is allegedly bankrolling a string of activities in which his men collaborate with a Shabaab unit charged with bringing Yemeni, and Pakistani operatives into Somalia by boat. It is rumored that the pirates bring the foreign jihadists into the Somali peninsula, and in exchange receive weapons and protection in the coastal areas under Shabaab control. (*Crossbones*, p. 180)

The use of conjecture signifies the representation of terrorism as limited and based on secondary sources that blur the line between the real and the imaginary.

Furthermore, Farah's representation of Taxliil as a terrorist typifies a subtle gendering of terrorism that blames the female gender for the misdeed of her son. Nana Wilson-Tagoe's (2009) states that Farah, in his early novels, portrays feminine as not only the relation between men and women but as linked to the traditional, political and cultural contexts, Farah has sustained this cultural formation of depicting the nuanced and complex relationship between the male and the female and its connection to the political. Hence, Ahl, Yusur's husband and Taxliil's stepfather, after enduring an outburst from his wife, describes his wife as possessing "a character trait that resurfaces when she is anxious or when she doesn't have things her way" (p. 373). While this depicts the gender relations between Ahl and Yusur as a married couple, this relationship is complicated by connecting it to Taxliil's misdemeanor. Ahl explicates that "you see Yusur's behavior replicated in Taxliil...like mother, like son; sweet one minute, poisonously bitter the next minute" (p. 373). This nuanced representation of Taxliil and his mother, and not his abdicated father, connects the traditional precept of women as the harbinger of misdeeds from the Biblical Eve as a metaphor to the political. Thus, Taxliil's bitterness for the death of his friend in Iraq is the

motivation for him joining Al-Shabaab and this is linked subtly to his mother's personality. This representation genderises the motivation of terrorism as feminine and transgressive. Also, Taxliil represents the link between Al-Shabaab and the diaspora, it connects postcolonial terrorism to transnational terrorism, making recruitment into terrorist organisations borderless. Taxliil is recruited by Al-Shabaab minders from Minneapolis and transported to Somalia where he is trained as a fighter. Farah leaves the detail of his escape from the group as a gap for the reader to conjecture.

However, albeit Farah's subtle gendering of the motive of terrorism, he portrays a contradictory notion in Cambara. Cambara epitomises the nexus between feminist resistance and postcolonial terrorism. She defies the Islamic rule that an unmarried woman should not live with a man she has not married. This can attract severe and fatal remonstrations from the Court and Al-Shabaab but she persists in her determination of tending Bile but not marrying him. She inquires "why not think of me as a nurse caring for a convalescing man?" (p. 172) and contends that she is viewed by Al-Shabaab members as "provocative, against the grain" (p. 172). Farah deploys Cambara as an incarnation of feminist liberalism and secularism that the Al-Shabaab members like BigBeard detest. Also, the way Al-Shabaab maltreat and restrict women portrays terrorism as patriarchy through other means. Malik inquires why women that are not veiled are lashed while men with jeans are not penalised as well as the sentencing of a woman raped and "then falsely accused of adultery to death by stoning" (p. 120) without fair hearing nor punishing the perpetrators of the rape. This contradiction connotes the male dominant views entrenched in Al-Shabaab's ideology. Farah's female characters like Xalan are "no-nonsense" (p. 146) women that resist the patriarchal order in their space and construct ways of negotiating them.

Farah also represents the connection between postcolonial conditions and postcolonial terrorism. Considering the temporal setting of *Crossbones*, Al-Shabaab appropriates identity and neocolonial conditions as the push factors for its terrorism. Al-Shabaab propagates itself as a resisting force against the invasion of Somalia by "infidels" and deploys religious identity as a force against the neocolonial occupation of Somalia, a Muslim country, by Ethiopia, a Christian country supported by an imperial force, the United States of America. Malik opines that "Somali religionists of radical persuasion are

provoking a confrontation with the Ethiopian empire in hopes of pitting the Muslim world against the Christian-led Ethiopia” (p. 25). Therefore, Al-Shabaab underpins its terrorism as a form of resistance against foreign invasion and a nationalist agenda. Its motivations are to formalise the implementation of its brand of Sharia law in Somalia and clinch power from the effeminate Transitional Federal Government. Kala-Saar obfuscates the representation of terrorists and insurgents by describing the former as killing innocents purposely and the latter as compelling the opponent, Ethiopians, and Somali government, to kill the innocent people. Kala-Saar submits that Al-Shabaab is fighting for “the radical fringe” (p. 314) and portrays Al-Shabaab as contesting secularism in Somali society.

Although Al-Shabaab tries to blur the line between resistance and terrorism by engaging and rallying its members against the Ethiopian invasion, however, it undermines this image by terrorising the people it proposes to free through systematically assassinating journalists, eliminating dissents in the Somali society, and bombing its supposed enemies. The resistance of Al-Shabaab against Ethiopia is depicted as a performance geared towards winning support for recruiting people into its fold. The identity clash between Muslims and Christians is propaganda for resistance to institute Al Shabaab’s goal of Islamic governance but, beyond this, is the contest between the Somali liberal Muslims and Somali radical/sectional Muslims. Also, Al-Shabaab members promote extreme *takfiri* ideology as well as terrorism. However, Ethiopia is culpable in playing to the gallery by invading Somalia. Thus, Farah represents terrorism as absurd, arbitrary, and complex. He unfolds the multifarious factors that make non-state terrorism a conundrum to represent.

#### **4.3.3. Imperial counterterrorism force and the postcolony in *Crossbones***

Farah’s *Crossbones* depicts how imperial force motivates terrorism in the postcolony by using Samir and Taxliil’s case as an illustration. The Imperial military force of countries like the United States against terrorism has been described as arbitrary and terroristic in itself. According to Deb (2015), “extra-judicial violence of the empire against populations has come to be known as counter-terrorism—most recently in the US War on Terror” (p. 2) and has made torture a normal currency in counter-terrorism. This imperial/neocolonial attitude has stimulated terrorism in the postcolony more than quell it. Many counterterrorism tactics like torture and invasion of another sovereign country by the US

and its allies have been critiqued as new forms of colonialism that prompt resistance and terrorism in the postcolony and other parts of the world. This nuanced view is appropriated by Farah in *Crossbones*. Why does Taxliil decide to leave the comfort of his home in the United States and join Al-Shabaab in Somalia? Why does Taxliil feel surrendering to the authorities is analogous to Shabaab catching him? How does the imperial military force haunt the postcolony? Hence, Farah in *Crossbones* represents imperial counterterrorism force as one of the drivers of terrorism in the postcolony.

Apart from the influence of the imam on Taxliil, Farah appropriates the Samir metaphor to thematise the culpability of the United States in driving some minority populations to terrorism through its imperial counterterrorism force and this haunts the postcolony. This is what Boehmer and Morton (2010) designate the “colonial forms of present-day terror” (p. 7) through police brutality, the use of torture, the set-up of necro-spaces that operate outside the law, and the justification of terror in the name of national security. Samir, Taxliil’s intimate friend, is a Kurdish boy from Iraq. According to the narrator, Samir

flew out to Baghdad with his father to visit Iraq for the first time since the American takeover. He was sitting in the back of the car with his grandparents, his father in the front next to the driver, Samir’s uncle, when an American Marine flagged them down at a checkpoint. Samir alighted speedily and waited by the roadside, away from the vehicle, as instructed. His father helped Grandma in regaining possession of her walker and held his hand out to her as she shakily stepped out of the vehicle. Meanwhile, his uncle bent down to assist Grandpa, who was still in the car, in retrieving his cane, and he took a long time, half his body hidden from view. Panicking that one of the two men would shoot him, the young Marine opened fire, killing everyone except Samir. Back in the Twin Cities, Samir became morose. The two friends still spent time together, but their life lacked the fun and ambition they had previously shared. Then Samir began to speak of attending to his “religious responsibilities,” and shortly thereafter he vanished from sight. A month or so later, his photo appeared in the *Sun Tribune*, the caption reading “Local boy turns Baghdad suicide bomber.”

The FBI came early the next morning and descended unnecessary force on Taxliil, Ahl, and Y usur, as if they had detonated the bomb that caused the death of the

soldiers...Taxliil was made to endure longer hours of interrogation, with repeated threats. (*Crossbones*, p. 40-41)

Farah employs the Samir incident in Baghdad to draw a connection between the US counterterrorism forces in a separate space that affects the postcolony. Surprisingly, the root cause of the brazen murder of Samir's family is not addressed until he goes on a revenge spree of bombing US soldiers that he believes are responsible for the death of his family. Equally, the response of the FBI typifies an ahistorical and imperial approach to a minority population within their space. One can extrapolate that Taxliil's stark contact with the brazen US counterterrorism force serves as an unconscious personal motivation to join Al-Shabaab and resonates the argument of Abdullahi "Ingiriis" (2019) that some youths join Al-Shabaab on a "grievance-based motivation" (p. 343). The decimation of Samir's family by the US counterterrorism force coincides with the US backing of Ethiopia to invade Somalia and this must have driven Taxliil to Al-Shabaab to follow the path of his friend. The Samir case is a metaphor for the implication of imperial counterterrorism forces in numerous spaces that spill over to other parts of the postcolony and this serves as an alibi for terrorist organisations like Al-Shabaab to perpetrate terrorism.

Equally, Taxliil's fear to turn himself in after he gets disillusioned with Al-Shabaab is rooted in his knowledge of the brutal US counterterrorism force that treats terrorists as an outside-the-law object. Taxliil's fear of Al-Shabaab is equated with his fear of being flown "from Djibouti to Guantanamo" (p. 372). While terrorism is a reprehensible act, its perpetrators should be judged based on the laws they violated and not as objects that should be denied access to the law. Saifullah, Xalan's nephew, expresses this fear and asseverates that "he preferred dying in dignity to be arrested and handcuffed by the Americans and treated with suspicion for the rest of his life" (351). After Ahl and Taxliil are arrested in Djibouti while trying to enter the country, Jeebleh believes that "they are in less of a hell than the one they would be in if they had fallen into the hands of Shabaab, the FBI, or Homeland Security in the US" (p. 380). Farah's placing of Shabaab and the various US counterterrorism agencies on the same pedestal implicates the imperial counterterrorism forces deployed by the US and its allies, their strategies are suspicious, racial, and prejudicial.



Furthermore, Farah uses his characters to criticise the counterterrorism strategy of the US and its allies in Somalia. The launch of Tomahawk cruise missiles from US submarines that kill not only the targets but also civilians undermines the counterterrorism tactics of the US. This wanton and unjustifiable killing of civilians as collateral damage equates the imperial force of the US with the terror of Al-Shabaab. Therefore, there is extremism on the side of Ethiopia that killed civilians as well as the US and this makes them culpable of terror like Al-Shabaab. One may consider Ethiopia and the US as appropriating terror through legitimate means while Al-Shabaab is doing otherwise. Hence, Farah denounces the imperial counterterrorism force as terrorism through another means, Cambara believes “there is no difference between the imam remote-controlling the suicide bomber and the guy orchestrating the Tomahawk launch from the safety of his Colorado base” (p. 355). This connection evinces imperial counterterrorism force as a form of terror that has haunted Somalia and appropriates this as a metaphor for the peril of neo/colonialism in the postcolony.

Thus, these counterterrorism strategies against the Other by the West have been critiqued in postcolonial studies as new forms of colonialism. While these are mutated forms of colonialism, it is expedient to state that terrorism is not justifiable, however, the crux of the matter is that the US and its allies have not addressed the brutal conditions like the extrajudicial killing of Samir’s family that serve as motivations for terrorism in the postcolony like Somalia. Farah represents this well through the Samir-Taxliil affair in *Crossbones*.

#### **4.3.4. Tropes of representing terrorism in *Crossbones***

Farah deploys metaphors in *Crossbones* to represent the diverse precarious situations in postcolonial Somalia of 2006. He employs Crossbones as a metaphor, more precisely, to signify danger and death in Somalia. Crossbones originally is a symbol for piracy and it is preceded by the word “skull” but viewing it from the larger picture, Farah uses the metaphor of Crossbones to portray danger and death in Somalia caused by multifarious factors like insurgency, terrorism, and piracy. Farah in his plotting of the narrative also enunciates the connection between these factors. This nexus suggests that none of the factors are mutually exclusive.

Also, Farah depicts how Al-Shabaab members appropriate religious metaphors for identity construction of us versus them. Al-Shabaab with the Islamic Courts frames the identity of Ethiopia as “the army of infidels” (p. 200). This metaphoric identification is used to garner support from Somalis and to recruit more members. Similarly, Farah alludes to the metaphor/symbol of *injirray*, which means lice, that Somalis use to describe Ethiopians. According to Jeebleh, Lice “defines the Abyssinian/Ethiopian foot soldiers in these outposts, the insects with which Somalia have associated these unwashed, ill-paid soldiers” (p. 111). The stereotypical metaphor of lice characterises generalisation that defines identity construction. On a cultural level, lice are abhorrent and should be exterminated while they too can decimate if not attended to. On the other hand, the Ethiopians represent Somalis as “ass washers” or “skirt wearers” to denigrate them culturally. These cultural currencies of metaphors are premised on stereotype, generalisation, and prejudicial identity framing. Identity construct also plays an essential role in legitimising the killing of Al-Shabaab’s victims. According to Qasir, “to justify their killing them, the victims are defined as apostates” (p. 115), this foregrounds the arbitrariness of terrorism and may make one ask who an apostate is and who defines who an apostate is. These questions evince the randomness and highhandedness that underlie the identity formation of victims for the legitimisation of terror.

Furthermore, Farah appropriates dream mechanisms to amplify the metaphors of lice. According to Malik, “in my dream, I saw battalions of lice moving in an eastward motion, coming toward the Somali-Ethiopian border town of Feerfeer” (p. 111). Malik’s dream anthropomorphises Somalia as a body that is infested with lice. The lice are the Ethiopian soldiers that want to decimate the Somali body. Malik reifies Somalia as a “flea-bitten nation lying dead by the roadside, spotty, dirty and armpits itchy, head crawling with lice” (p. 111). This metaphoric signification alludes to the title, *crossbones*, a postcolonial space of danger and death, a necro-space. Equally, Farah’s use of dream mechanisms serves as sarcasm on the Somali situation. Jeebleh, Malik’s father-in-law, in a dream sees youths “dressed in immaculate white and donning colourful keffiyehs, they sport long beards. Several women come out of nowhere, uniformly pretty, gazelle eyed, the very image of houris of Paradise, to tend to the youths” (p. 164). Farah portrays this dream to mock the propaganda of Al-Shabaab that its male martyrs will be tended by women in paradise. The

dream raises questions on the irony of the old recruiting the young to die as “martyrs” and interrogates the sincerity of recruiting the youths to die untimely for an unjustifiable course.

Farah deploys the motif of the mosque as a religious and political space: “the hub of opposition activities after the invasion” (p. 176). The motif of the mosque as a transcendental space for political activities is maintained in *Crossbones*. The mosque is a space for recruiting youths into Al-Shabaab as Taxliil is recruited into the group by his imam in Minneapolis. However, the motif of the mosque as a transcendental space for politics and recruitment for terror should not be generalised as a one for all representation that all mosques perform similar functions. While Farah’s technique of portraying the motif of the mosque as not only a religious space is predominant in terrorist novels, there is a hue of generalisation that relegates to the background other mosques that counter virulent Islamic ideologies. Albeit he portrays characters that oppose Al-Shabaab’s ideology, Farah does not do the same about mosques in Somalia which makes one assume that all mosques support Al-Shabaab’s ideology.

Farah uses *Crossbones* to narrativise the onset of Islamic terrorism by Al-Shabaab in Somalia and how it intersects with neocolonial/global factors that breed it. Also, he critiques the response of Ethiopia as well as the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) along with the United States to religious-political terrorism in Somalia and the failure of Somalia as a postcolony. The inability of Somalia to fulfil the dreams of its youths is portrayed as a metaphor of some postcolonial nation-states and this has stimulated various forms of violence/terrorism in those spaces.

#### **4.4. Chapter summary**

All the authors of the African novels analysed in this chapter employ the term “militants” or “militancy” for members of terrorist groups represented or their actions to avoid the politicised word “terrorists” and “terrorism” and the labelling they connote. However, the reality of their said “militancy” that include the systematic killing of dissents through bombing or assassination, using death for communication, mutilating the dead, terrorising innocent civilians, and entrenching absolutist/monotheistic ideologies for sectarian, religious, and political objectives are forms of terrorism that transcend the routine violence

of agitating for civilians. The authors also portray terrorism in the postcolony as intersecting with various factors that serve as alibis or motivations as well as new forms of colonialism and they focalise the nuances of representing terrorism in African fiction. While representing terrorism and its traumatic effects on the postcolonial subjects, the authors reify the lessons of global impacts that the postcolony must learn to subvert terrorism. These include providing economic opportunities for postcolonial subjects in the postcolony, instituting mechanisms to monitor charities that provide religious funding that stimulate ideologies that drive terrorism, entrenching justice, and engendering a pluralistic society. All the authors also represent the necropower that underlies war against terrorism in the postcolony

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TERRORISM AND NON-VIOLENT ALTERNATIVES IN SELECTED ASIAN AND AMERICAN PROSE WORKS AND COMPARATIVE REFLECTIONS

#### 5.0. Chapter overview

This chapter interrogates both Asian and North American literatures. The first category comprises Asian prose works that portray terrorism through other means, basically state terrorism, resistant terrorism, and neo/colonial occupation. The countries depicted include Israel, Palestine, and Afghanistan. The objective of this section is to examine how selected texts from these countries depict terrorism through other means (state terrorism) and how they propose non-violent alternatives to these situations. The works are Khaled Hosseini's (2004) *The Kite Runner*; Abdul Salam Zaeef's (2010) *My Life with the Taliban* edited by Alex Strick van Linschoten and Felix Kuehn; Collin Mallard's (2012) *Stillpoint* and Elias Chacour with David Hazard's (2013) *Blood Brothers*. The selected works include autobiographies, memoirs, and fiction, they include works about terrorism and a terrorist narrative by Abdul Salam Zaeef, a former member of the Taliban. The works selected in this chapter do not only narrativise terrorism through other means, but most also propose alternatives to terrorism. While these works do not represent the general perspectives of the spatial settings, they represent inimitable points of view on the subject matter. The latter section examines the American prose works. Also, the concatenation among the selected texts are examined and the summary of the findings is presented.

#### 5.1. Violence, occupation, and their representations in Israeli/Palestinian prose works

Various forms of violence have evolved in the Middle East since the creation of Israel in Palestine in 1948. In the heart of the violence is Zionism that aimed to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine and the wish of the Palestinians to rid their land of the settlers. The Zionist and settler vision was spearheaded by groups like Irgun, Haganah among others

while the Palestinian agenda designated the “Palestinian idea” (Edward Said, 1980: p. x) was championed by groups in the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) as well as some groups known as the *Fedayeen*. However, it is imperative to examine how literature has narrativised the exchange of violence between the two sides, the motivations, the push factors, and the alternatives provided by these literary expressions. These questions will be explored briefly including the connection between history of violence, occupation, and literature.

Said (1980) argues that Palestinian terrorism is complex but, in comparison, states that Zionism has done more damage to the Palestinians than what Palestinians have done in retaliation but the Palestinian side has been accentuated more than the Zionist terror because the Zionists control the media and misrepresent Palestinians, which Said (1980) term “a blocking operation” (p. 39) of the Palestinian voice. This position evinces Palestinian violence against Israel as a reprisal and instigated rather than Palestine being the provenance of it and Zionism as parallel to European colonialism. The contention is that there is a cultural attitude by Europeans and Zionists towards Arabs, Muslims, and Palestinians that perceives them as inferior and objects that require governing by the Zionists. This romantic notion precipitated the dispossession of Palestinians from their land and the occupation of major areas in Palestine by Israel because the Palestinians inhabiting the Holy Land were perceived as absent or non-human. Culturally, all these have been codified into various forms of representations which Ella Shohat (2010) conceives as possessing “political as well as aesthetic connotations” (p. 3). Equally, the Palestinian-Israeli conflicts are legacies of British colonialism.

Similarly, there is the perception that Palestinians’ perspective should be heard from the standpoint of the Zionists whose ambitions are to generalise about and denigrate Palestinians, to maintain a fantastic phenomenon that the Palestinians are the opposite of Israelis that are conceived as an epitome of civilisation. Therefore, Said (1990) describes the question of Palestine as “the contest between an affirmation and a denial” (p. 8), the contest between occupation and resistance, and the agitation between the coloniser and the colonised. All these can be traced to the Balfour declaration of 1917 that is the genesis of the Israeli-Palestinian crises. The contention is that there is a people, Zionists/European Jews, whose

ideology is to inhabit another people's land, Palestine, by whatever means possible to entrench a romantic or religious belief of establishing a home for the Jews which, as Said (1990) states, has made "Occidental Jews in Israel...become oppressors (of Palestinian Arabs and Oriental Jews)" (p. 69). The corollary is that Zionism or Zionists have assimilated the colonialist proclivities from their European counterparts and this attitude forms the mode of relating with the Palestinians as well as founding Israel in Palestine to displace the natives who were considered absent, although present.

Literature has been one of the formidable ways of culturally circulating the conflicting violent relationships between Israel and Palestine as Ami Elad-Bouskila (2013) argues that Palestinian literature has been "partially influenced by Israeli culture and literature" (p. 9). Anna Bernard (2013) traces this tendency in Israel to the "early days of the Zionist movement, after the revival of Hebrew literature in Central and Eastern Europe during the *Haskalah* (or Jewish enlightenment) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" (p. 2). However, Bernard (2013) asseverates that Palestinian writing does not enjoy the same form of popularity and circulation as its Israeli counterpart which Said (1990) alludes to as the inequality in power and international backing between the two sides. Despite these conditions, Bernard (2013) contends that "Palestinian and Israeli literature in translation...has a special kind of currency for non-national readers" (p. 3) that makes them attain a type of worldly and metropolitan status. While the Israeli literature enjoys a farther presence, the Palestinian writing, especially its translational type, is recent. Israeli writers like Amos Oz are against the occupation of Palestine by Israel. Bernard (2013) analyses some Israeli/Palestinian narratives in the context of national allegories within postcolonial literary studies and argues that the question of the nation is still central in the Israeli/Palestinian contexts against the thesis of the dwindling influence of the nation in postcolonial literary studies. The texts are read through the prism of the "relational literary history of Israel/Palestine" that focalises the settler-native relations, a colonial interaction that maintains a vertical power exchange between Israel and Palestine in which Israel maintains a superior location rather than a horizontal positionality with Palestine.

Palestine is a clear example of the contestation of present forms of colonialism and imperialism which forms the background of postcolonialism. However, Bernard (2013)

raises an eyebrow on why the Israel/Palestine situation has not been given ample attention in postcolonial studies which may be as a result of the empire's politics of silencing the victims at the expense of the Zionists, she suggests that Palestinian-Israeli conflict undermines the "anti-nationalist tendency in postcolonial studies" (p. 22). This can also be attributed to the complicity of location because most prominent scholars in the field of postcolonialism work in the US academy and in Europe.

The literature of Palestine and Israel usually examines the question of citizenship that is drawn between racial/religious beliefs on one side and indigeneity on the other side as well as the contest over land possession. In the Israeli/Palestine literature, there is an engagement of the push and pull relationship between European settlers (who are Jews), Oriental Jews, and natives (majorly Arab-Palestinians that have inhabited Palestine for ages). Bernard (2013) analyses Said's *Out of Place* as moving from the sense of personal belonging to Palestine to the "Palestinian demand for national self-determination" (p. 46) within the framework of exile and liberation. Exile is connected to social alienation that prompts introspection and intellectualism which is the artery to liberation. In Oz's memoir *A Tale of Love and Darkness*, Bernard (2013) suggests that Oz deploys "hyperbolic language" (p. 90) to portray the fantasy of Jews' danger in the hands of the Arabs and critiques the excesses of the Israeli state as well as lack of compromise between Palestine and Israel but denounces his failure to include Palestinians in his conflict resolution.

Elad-Bouskila (2013) categorises Palestinian literature as those written within Israel and those written outside it. Using the historical marker, the post-1967 Palestinian literature is expanded into three: "literature written by Palestinians in Arab countries and in centres of Palestinian culture in Europe and the United States...literary activities in the West Bank and Gaza...and Palestinian literature written in Israel" (p. 10). In the analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, one can contend that the attention paid to Arab Palestinian Christians and their literature has been marginal. Most appraisals have been based on the literature of the Muslim majority from Palestine/Israel while the age-old "belonging" of the Arab Palestinian Christians represented in their literature has received little attention. Edwar Makhoul (2017) suggests that many in the West are unaware of Arab and Palestinian Christians' existence. Similarly, Ibrahim Taha (2002) argues that even the general literature



of the Arab minority in Israel has not received much academic attention. However, autobiographies and memoirs like Elias Chacour's *Blood Brothers* have played crucial roles in representing the history of Arab-Palestinian Christians in Israel. Despite this, Elisa Farinacci (2013) cautions that "autobiographies represent a delicate category to handle" (p. 4) because of modifications they undergo before being published. In Palestine, the Arab Christians are a minority or a "triple minority" in Farinacci's term because, since the creation of Israel, many are a potpourri of being an Arab-Palestinian, Christian and Israeli, and this complicates the politics and definition of identity in the two countries and breeds identity crises. Equally, religion, especially, in Arab Palestinian Christian communities, plays an essential role in conflict resolution and dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian crises, although they are most times alienated from the Palestinian National Movement (Makhoul, 2017: p. 12). Farinacci (2013) examines Chacour's *Blood Brothers* as depicting the author's use of peacemaking mechanisms at the grassroots, although, from a religious perspective. Albeit this, the approach can be assimilated as general, humanistic alternatives for resolving conflicts.

One can reflectively suggest that narratives whether religious or secular, settler-oriented or autochthonous have formed the crux of the contest for land in Israel and Palestine Occupied Territories. As Said (1994) states that land is the main battle in imperialism, he also points out the centrality of narratives to this contestation. Narratives, fictitious or non-fictitious, are employed as spaces of affirmation, rejection, domination and resilience by both the dominator and the dominated. The corollary is that the dominator also maintains a dominant and immanent narrative that is supported by its hegemonic structures like internationally recognised television channels, books from renowned publishing outfits, a technology that recognises one and rejects the Other and serves as the gatekeeper of narratives that are circulated while, on the contrary, the dominated subject struggles to popularise or voice its narratives unless through forced or violent means that rupture the gate-keeping process of the dominant/imperial powers. This relationship parallels the Israeli-Palestinian relationship and the circulation of narratives about the contest, noting that Zionists both within the Israeli and European societies have promoted the Zionist agenda and "demonise" the Palestinian idea of nationhood. Therefore, works like Chacour's *Blood Brothers* serve as a witness narrative that chronicles Zionist imperialism as well as subverts the Zionist agenda of

obliterating the Palestinian course. Considering Said's (1994) conceptualisation of imperialism as "thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on and owned by others" (p. 7) – neocolonialism, the acquisition, dispossession, expropriation and bid to erase Palestinians from Palestine is nothing short of Zionist imperialism, an assimilated form of Western imperialism and colonial present.

The creation of Israel in 1948 split the Palestinian population into those (Arabs) remapped into Israel, those in Occupied territories and those sent into compulsory exile with each possessing its unique literary temperament about the Israeli/Palestinian crisis. Taha (2002) states that literature of Arab minority or Arab literature in Israel thematically performs the dual function of reinforcing "the Palestinian national identity of the Arab minority and the same time express its strong yearning for equal citizenship" (p. ix), this is strongly represented in Chacour's *Blood Brothers* to voice the desire of belonging to Palestine and those parts that have been expropriated by Israel. Many Arabs became nationals of Israel after 1948 due to the geographical remapping that ushered in the creation of Israel and redefined their areas (formerly Palestine) as Israel. This came with a hybrid identity that coalesced two contesting nationalities, therefore, birthing the nomenclature Palestinian Israeli as an identity that limits. Hence, there are Palestinians in the Occupied Territories while there are those that have been forcefully recategorised as Palestinian Israeli. Taha (2002) emphasises that the theme of peaceful coexistence between Palestinians and the Jews is predominant in literary works of Palestinian minorities in Israel such as in *The Hell with the Lilac* by Samih al-Qasim, *Soul in the Crucible* by Salim Khuri, inter alia, and these novels privilege political themes over social themes. They also make use of allegorical techniques to connect the individual to the collective and the private to the political.

Some characteristics of the Palestinian literature in Israel, according to Taha (2002), which may also be extended to the general Palestinian literature include the utilisation of hero and antihero characterisation, the appropriation of "contrasts, paradoxes, parallels...textual reality" (p. 24) which creates a binary relationship between the oppressed Palestinians versus the Jewish oppressor, the European Jews versus the native Jews. Also, there is a spatial contrast to accentuate the difference between the Palestinian areas and the Jewish ones, this has a psychological effect on the Palestinians who are mostly confined to ghettos.

Equally, there is a contrast between the behaviour of the settler Jews and the native Jews and the Palestinians. Another technique is the appropriation of the telling method that pronounces ideological stand which may be political, secular or religious, like in Chacour's *Blood Brothers*, as well as the use of satire to simultaneously attack and defend.

Also, Bashir Abu-Manneh (2016) contends that the Palestinian novel has chronicled the Palestinian and Arab defeat as well as “constructs the aesthetic forms and features that register the story of both Palestinian and Arab historical transformation after the *nakba*...tell of exile...settler-colonial dispossession and disentanglement” (p. 3). The corollary is that the *nakba* is a historical marker not only in Palestine but also in the Arab world and has created the politics of conjuncture and disjuncture along with trust and distrust. Hence, the Palestinian literature has represented this gamut of symmetric and conflicting relationships between Palestine and the Arab world concerning Israel. Abu-Manneh (2016) suggests that there is an uneven condition common to the Palestinians because they live in various countries under differing political, legal and cultural circumstances that make them uneven. Despite this, we contend that there is still a united consciousness on Palestinian nationalism among Palestinians and this shapes their literary forms.

One prominent feature of the Palestinian literature is the collaboration between history and aesthetic forms. This appropriation validates the colonial imaginary behind the Palestinian-Israeli relationship since the 1930s till now as championed by Israel along with Britain and the elusiveness of reconciliation that this imperial vision has entrenched. Also, the historical shifts in events created new waves in literary forms. Abu-Manneh (2016), citing Ghassan Kanafani, states that the Palestinian revolts of the late 1930s engendered a popular culture of poetry that inflamed Palestinians with “revolutionary awareness and agitation” and the Palestinian novel grew into this revolt in the 1940s and onwards, creating literature of commitment. Since then, Palestinian literature has evolved to a mode of nationalist, modernist, feminist and socialist expression, a literature of commitment like the novels of Kanafani.

It is also noticeable that there has been differing, perceptual imaginary on the exchange of terroristic violence between Israel and Palestine, the Israelis term it national security while the Palestinians designate it revolution. While both sides dub the other

terrorists/colonialists, it is pertinent to examine how these forms of violence have been aestheticised in the Israeli-Palestinian literature, especially Palestinian literature, and how these literary forms have proposed alternatives to the currency of violence between both sides. Although resistant terrorism and terrorism through other means are the terms that will be deployed in our analysis, they will be employed judiciously to interrogate the response of literary forms like autobiographies and fiction to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, paying close attention to the terroristic violence appropriated by Zionists/Israeli to expropriate and dispossess native Palestinians' land and the violent response of certain Palestinian groups to Israeli's military necropower. As an illustration, the figure and trope of martyr/om is preponderant in Palestinian literature, for example in Radwa Ashour's *The Woman from Tantoura*, and there is a constant reference to revolution and bravery in both literatures.

Culturally, the identity of Israelis may be perceived as homogeneous and hegemonic but the notion is deconstructed by Shohat (2010) who contends that the majority of the Israeli demography is Third world but dominated by the European Jews who constitute the minority and deny the country of its "Easternness". This analysis accentuates the heterogeneity of the Israeli population which is constituted by European Jews (the settlers also known as Ashkenazim), the Oriental Jews (also known as Mizrahim but discriminated against by the European Jews), the Arabs (natives also Palestinians) and the Sephardim (Third World population from countries like Morocco) which means the significant part of Israeli demography is Third World but mostly silent or neglected on the world stage.

In sum, since the creation of Israel in 1948 popularly termed *nakba* by Palestinians, land has become an object of contestation between Israel and Palestine based on various ideological differences, each practicing various forms of violence. On the one hand, the Zionists in the Israeli government perpetrate terrorism through other means by using the Israeli Army and other state structures as its machinery against Palestinians, while, on the other hand, some Palestinians form groups that resist violently the colonialism of Palestine by Israel and force their narrative to the world consciousness through various terrorist acts. The Zionists' tactics were similar to the spread of European colonialism and the terrorist violence that accompanied it. Curiously, the Zionists who form a significant part of the Israeli government are supported by the United States to maintain the occupation of

Palestine. This contestation between Palestine and Israel over land, based on spatial imaginary, has been represented by writers through various subgenres of literature such as memoirs, autobiographies, and fiction and has evinced the complexities of the imaginary/real narratives that inform the crises. The authors represent the colonial practice behind the Israeli occupation of Palestine, the diverse reactions it has created in the Palestinians, and the alternatives, some violent, others nonviolent. In the subsequent analysis, the historical materialist frame inherent in postcolonialism, context as related to text, heterogeneity of identities, and the complexity of representation will be employed.

### **5.1.1. Elias Chacour's *Blood brothers*: a brief account**

Elias Chacour's *Blood Brothers* is an autobiography. Chacour chronicles his formative years in Palestine and the impact of his father's belief in the Melkite principles as a model of human relationships on him. He records how his family and his community were expelled from Biram by the Israeli soldiers, how he became a minister of God, his drive to seek a peaceful alternative to the violent relationship between the Zionists and the Palestinians, and his frustration with Israeli militarism. His autobiography ends with the violent attack of the Occupied Palestine Territories by Israel.

#### **5.1.1.1. Ruptured identities and the terror of occupation in *Blood Brothers***

In *Blood Brothers*, Elias Chacour, through his autobiography, portrays the Palestinian autochthonous-religious identity that was ruptured by the incursion of the Israeli soldiers into Biram, his village, and projects a nonviolent conciliatory alternative through a syncretic vision. Chacour's autobiography depicts how his family and fellow Palestinians were dispossessed from their homes and land in Biram, the story of Biram, therefore, becomes a synecdoche of many villages that were ransacked and expropriated by the Israelis through their military architecture. The narrativisation is from the perspective of Melkite Christianity and their ancient belonging that equalled that of the Jews. Chacour fuses history with Biblical allusions and geography to portray ruptured identities, the horror and trauma of occupation, hypocrisy and the hopelessness of quelling Zionist colonial imaginary that underlies the relationship between Occidental Jews and native Palestinians. Chacour's autobiography is unique because of its Christian background that projects a different and

marginal dimension, unlike the general Palestinian-Muslim perspective that has caught more attention.

Chacour is a Melkite Christian whose family and forebears have lived in Biram - Palestine, now Israel, for many centuries. This background projects an autochthonous identity that coalesces with the Melkite Christian identity. According to Chacour: “our family, the Chacours had led their flocks to these, the highest hills of Galilee, many hundreds of years ago. My grandparents had always lived here...Biram had grown here, quietly rearing its children...for so many generations” (p. 19-20). The excerpt performs two functions, first, the author uses Biram, a synecdoche of Palestine, to subvert the Zionist imaginary that Palestine, most parts now Israel, were uninhabited before the *nakba* in 1948 and to foreground an autochthonous identity for Arab Christians whose stories are most marginalised in the Palestinian-Israeli existentialism, this reifies Bernard’s (2013) position that Palestinian citizenship is based on indigenous presence.

The Autochthonous-Melkite identity portrayed by Chacour in *Blood Brothers* undermines the popular/general belief that only Muslims inhabit Palestinian areas in Israel and that Palestine’s demography is homogeneous. Despite the Palestinian presence that Chacour foregrounds, he narrativises the ontology of Jewish villages and the communal coexistence between the Palestinians and native/Oriental Jews before the gradual arrival of Ashkenazim/European Jews since the late nineteenth century. The Autochthonous-Melkite identity of the Chacours is fused with biblical allusions and history for validation. The history of the Melkites is traced to their alliance with the king of Byzantium after “James and the other apostles died” (p. 37), the Melkites were designated “Melkites” which means King’s men, and they “united the splintered churches” (p. 37). Chacour also depicts the various wars of foreign occupations from Rome to other colonial powers that their forebears resisted. This textual narrative evinces a syncretic relationship with the Jews, not a discordant one that the present Zionists propagate for colonial reasons. He depicts his father’s humanist vision of syncretism that their “lives were bound together with the other people who inhabited Palestine—the Jews. We had suffered together under the Romans, Persians, Crusaders and Turks, and had learned to share the simple elements of human existence—faith, reverence for life and hospitality” (p. 38). This didactic humanism creates

a model for the resolution of the contemporary Palestinian-Israeli conflict. It is also noteworthy to state that Chacour portrays the native Jews as impervious to the colonial mentality of the European Jews and Zionists, therefore, adopting a Manichean representation of the Jews in contemporary Israel. However, this is deconstructed by Shohat (2010) as a tripod of Occidental Jews, Oriental Jews, and the Sephardim.

Considering the essentiality of geography to postcolonialism, Chacour weaves his tale with geography and connects it to Biblical allusions to subvert the single narrative of Jews' sole right to Israel/Palestine. He alludes to the Mount of Beatitudes, where Jesus' famous Beatitude sermons were preached, as "a hill very near to our house" (p. 33), he references the Sea of Galilee as well as the agrarian nature of the area: orchard, olive trees, fig-trees, inter alia. These allusions are deployed to foreground the indigeneity of the Chacours and others in the village of Biram, and, as an extension, other Palestinians, to the Palestine areas that have been occupied and renamed Israel. Therefore, geography and historical narrative play an interconnected role in fostering the indigenous identity of the Chacours in Palestine/Israel.

The indigenous identity of the Chacours like other Palestinians is ruptured by the Israeli military occupation of Biram and the uprooting of the Chacours and other Biram villagers from Biram. Despite the wariness associated with autobiographies, one cannot but notice the contradiction between the amiable native Jews that lived with the Chacours and the hostile Settler-Jews that arrived from Europe. Chacour narrativises the deceit that underlies the Zionist occupation of Biram and the terror that accompanies it. Unlike the Zionist systematic terrorism that villages like Tantoura, Qisarya, Saffurya, Ain Ghazzal, inter alia, faced as depicted in Ashour's *The Woman from Tantoura*, Biram's own commenced with disguise and deceit, perhaps because Biram is a "Christian village". In Biram, the (Zionist) soldiers

had sent word to the village *mukhtars* that they would stay for only a few days and they would take nothing. They were just looking over the land. Father accepted their word as a gentleman. If need be, these Jews from Europe could settle in our village and farm the land that lay open beside our own fields. (*BB*, p. 39)

The excerpt depicts that the patriarch of the house believed the Zionists and compared them to the native Jews they had lived with. One feature of colonialism is contradictions based on various subjectivities. These contradictions manifest in the “unfamiliar rumbling of trucks and jeeps” (p. 41) and the imperious demeanour of the supposed guests. Chacour observes that “these Zionists soldiers were not at all like our Jewish neighbours who chatted in the yard with father over coffee” (p. 41). They were described as “aloof, almost brusque” (p. 42) and the arrogant display of guns while they were in the narrator’s house. This colonial attitude of superiority displayed by the Zionist soldiers is conjoined with news of “more terror, of villages blown up in barrel bombs while others narrowly escaped the flaming ruins of their homes” (p. 44). However, the gentle approach is utilised to lure the Birams out of their village in the guise of protection but they were not allowed to return to their houses. Guns and military power become the mechanisms of necropolitics that rupture the autochthonous identities of the Birams and other Palestinians. The rupturing is in two dimensions, personal and spatial, personal in terms of psychological while the other is geographical.

Chacour depicts the blurry line between terrorism and nationalism in the figure of Menachem Begin. The occupation of Palestine is perpetrated through the military architecture of Zionist soldiers and it is deployed to rupture the identities of many Palestinians from being natives/indigenes to refugees and exiles. The Zionists also employ fear as a tactic to perpetrate their occupation. The military campaigns of the Zionists are weaponised as an instrument of fear, a form of colonial repetition, like the use of military might to subjugate the natives. Chacour witnesses these terroristic campaigns and weaves them into his autobiography, knitting historical events with personal events.

The terror of Zionist occupation of Palestinian villages is perpetrated on the tripod of erasure to turn inhabited spaces into empty spaces, expropriation, and renaming. The occupation is terrorism through other means, state terrorism, which can be conceptualised as the precept of perpetrating terrorism through legal mechanism/means by the state to subvert the illegality of terrorism itself in the cloak of national objectives. By the time Zionist/Israeli soldiers were purging the Palestinian villages of Palestinians and occupying them, they acted in the name of the state, employing necropower to subject Palestinians to death or



rupture them from their homes. Biram, in Chacour's autobiography, is portrayed as a one for all to signify the rupturing of Palestinians from their homes through disguise, followed by military might or in some cases only the latter. The disguise of protection that the Zionist soldiers employed to make the author and his family and other villagers leave their homes is analogous to the colonial civilising mission or necropolitics. They were to move to the hills for the soldiers to protect their homes from danger but they were not allowed to return to their homes. When they sought legal means to return and they were given, their homes were turned into rubble and their indigenous claim to the geography of Biram is ruptured, erased for colonial appropriation. Chacour uses his autobiography as a witness narrative to depict the terror of Zionist occupation in the wake of the *nakba*.

There is the signification of betrayal that accompanies Zionists' erasure of the villagers from Biram. However, the ruse used in erasing the Birams from the village is contradicted with the summary execution of the people of Gish. The contradictions depict the subjectivity of the methods of erasure employed by the Zionist soldiers. The erasure is accompanied by looting and vandalism, the people were sent away or executed and hurriedly buried while their belongings were looted. The graves in Gish instigates terror in Chacour, "numbness dulled all feeling" (p. 54). Shallow graves are a recurrent motif in literatures of terrorism like in Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*. They represent the hastiness to erase the victims of terrorism.

Chacour represents the terror of occupation as inscribed physically and mentally, the operations are swift and perpetrated in nocturnal temporalities "as the darkness settled over us, no one dared to light fires or cook a meal" (p. 56). The men of Biram were haunted down in Gish where they moved to and were driven away from their families, some returned to their families while others did not forever. The alibi or motivation of the Zionist soldiers is couched in renaming them as "Palestinian terrorists" (p. 55) which in itself ruptures them psychologically. There is a refraction of their images: the victims are accused of the perpetrators' offences. The Zionist/Israeli soldiers appropriate their voices to torment their victims: "we are taking your terrorists away. This is what happens to all terrorists. You will not see them again" (p. 57). While the reliability of this direct voicing may be questionable,

Chacour employs this direct speech method to echo the various haunting voices of the Zionist occupants inscribed in his memory. This is done to maintain a “climate of fear”.

The occupation of Biram and other Palestinian villages as a neocolonial project is executed with unabashed force and premised on the tripod of usurpation (expropriation), erasure, and substitution. The villagers were sent away from their villages but their bid to return made the Zionist soldiers activate the next phase of their colonial project. Considering the essentiality of men to the project of recovery of Palestinian homes, the soldiers made them effeminate under harsh conditions, made them contact power from a weak position, and drove them away from their families

On the night they were taken from Gish, the men were driven through the dark for hours...The trucks pulled off the road north of the city near the town of Nablus on the border between the new State of Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan...

As the men staggered from the trucks in the bleak light of dawn, the soldiers opened fire, aiming just above their heads. The men of Biram scattered in terror...Some fell and were almost trampled. Father and my brother tore through the open fields...At last they distanced the shouting soldiers and the rifle fire, *which was meant to drive them from their homeland for good...* (BB, p. 63-64) **emphasis added**

Although the author was not part of the group, with the power of hindsight, he realised the essence of the project is erasure.

The next phase of the settler-colonial project is substitution, the expropriated pieces of land were sold by the Israeli state. The author realises that “Father’s big orchard had been purchased from the government by a well-to-do settler as some sort of investment” (p. 67). This material seizure and denial climaxes the dispossession of the author’s family from their roots, their land, and makes geography a contestation between the Israeli state and the dispossessed. The process of substitution is institutionalised through the establishment of the *kibbutz* and a process of historical remapping/renaming. According to the author,

news reached us...plans were under way for a new *kibbutz*, an experimental agricultural community set up by the new

government for settlers from Europe and America. It was to be located just across the fields from our still-empty homes, and strangely, *it would be called Biram*. (BB, p. 66)  
**emphasis added**

The excerpt above evinces a simulation of a colonial process that expropriates, remaps and renames on its conditions. The remapping supplants the name “Biram” from its old location to a new location, the map is therefore rewritten and textuality is effaced for a new generative one that ruptures and displaces the old belonging. This process was protected by the soldiers ‘who stayed back to “protect” it from our return’ (p. 67) according to the author, this maintains a “climate of fear” and institutes a “plantation-like” physical and mental space that reverberates colonialism’s brutal exploitation.

The substitution also fosters compartmentalisation, a process that Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* examines as a colonial mechanism for dividing society between the colonisers and the colonised. The European compartments were barricaded and access of natives to the quarters was regulated with instruments like passes. There is a similitude of this colonial imaginary in Chacour’s depiction of the newly established *kibbutz*. The *kibbutz* coalesces political and economic existentialism. The Biram *kibbutz* is described as a dwelling “going up here or there, poles being uprighted for the telephone and electrical wires, the constant surveillance by the police” (p. 69). However, the Biram men were hired as cheap labour to till their expropriated land and their access was regulated, “they were hired and granted special work passes, the only way they could enter their own property” (p. 68). In this case, the Zionist/Israeli government is the expropriator and the regulator, therefore maintaining a vertical positionality over the natives.

In the (anti)colonial discourse, ambivalence and paradox (contradiction) are some of the dominant frames of interrogating the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. Fanon examines this in *The Wretched of the Earth* explaining that there is a desire by the native to occupy the position of the coloniser and there is an accompanying disgust for the colonial positionality as well as the contradiction between the humanist ethos of “all men are equal” in France and Europe in general while the same countries are subjecting other human races to colonial condition, which exhibits a subtle form of irony. In the case of the Israeli-Palestinian relationship, Chacour depicts a situational irony in which the position of

the Palestinians is refracted, the landowner becomes the tenant, the property owner changes to the worker whose movement is regulated, a similar situation is depicted in Ngugi wa Thiong'o's *Weep not Child*. For example, Chacour narrativises how his father insisted that he would work on his "old property" when he heard the new owner was hiring. When interrogated by the author's mother, his response was: "if we go to care for the trees, we'll do the best job. Someone else won't know what they are doing. They'll break the branches and spoil the new growth" (p. 68). Thus, the author's father and his three oldest brothers went to work on their former property. The author's father's subjectivity of tending the farm more than others is a form of assimilationist agency that neglects the commodification of workers.

The Zionist terrorism through other means, basically state terrorism, depicted by Chacour is at both personal and communal levels. The personal level represents the individual contact between the natives and the military force of the Zionists. The author experiences the systematic terrorising of the natives when he and other boys were picked randomly and accused of stealing the *Kibbutz* telephone wire. The author narrates his experience

The huge man who had first grabbed me raised the stick over his head a stinging *crack* seared my shoulder. I drew a sharp breath and tried to shield myself from his next blows. The boy beside me screamed as he was struck across the back. We tried to fend off the slashing sticks with our arms, which only infuriated our captors. Another whipping blow stung my bare legs just below the short pants I was wearing. Then another. Two across my back—lashes like hot brands. (*BB*, p. 72)

The excerpt typifies the contact between the Zionists and the natives at the personal level which represents terror and arbitrary use of force. The contradiction is that the telephone wire in question was later recovered from a wagon driver whose loaded wagon had dragged it off. However, despite the pains of beating and the terror of being questioned by the police several times, the author notes that no apology was given for the incident. The communal level represents the Palestinian identity colonised by the Israeli narrative.

In *Blood Brothers*, Chacour depicts the primacy of military deployment in the Zionist terror of occupation and how it subverts legal instruments and institutions. At the communal level,

the people of Biram approached an Israeli court for the recovery of their land, “an official letter arrived in Gish...The letter said we could return to Biram immediately by order of the Supreme Court” (p. 76) of Israel. However, the people of Biram were rebuffed by the soldiers, according to the author quoting the Commanding officer of the Zionist soldiers, “this letter means nothing to us. Nothing at all. The village is ours. You have no right here” (p. 76). This military supremacy over legality is analogous to the necropolitics of the *space of exception* in John’s *Born on a Tuesday*. Another attempt by the people of Biram to seek legal means to recover their expropriated land was met with disguise and brazen force. According to Rudah, the author’s brother, as narrativised by the author:

Sometime in early December the court had again granted the people of Biram approval to return to their homes. For the second time, the village elders marched across the hill and presented the order to the Zionist soldiers...Without question or dispute, the commanding officer read the order...” This is fine”... We need some time to pull out. You can return on the twenty-fifth...On Christmas morning...the villagers gathered in the first light of day for the march to Biram...

At the top of the Biram...the marchers halted uncertainly. Far below them, Biram was surrounded by Zionist tanks, bulldozers and other military vehicles...

A canon blast sheared the silence. Then another—a third. The soldiers had opened fire—not on the villagers, but on Biram! Tank shells shrieked into the village, exploding in fiery destruction. Houses blew apart like paper. Stones and dust flew and the red flames and billowing black smoke...For nearly five minutes, the explosion rocked Biram. (*BB*, p. 85-86)

The use of military force to subvert the court’s order signifies terrorism through other means, using the state’s military infrastructure to systematically create a “climate of fear” and to operate outside the law. This state terrorism prompts the response of “violence whispered through the hills, bloodshed and terrorism everywhere in the land” (p. 76). The argument is that when the state makes extreme violence its sole means of response to citizens’ agitation, which may be terrorism through other means, non-state actors imitate this mode of violence and it becomes a currency in negotiating with the Zionist state.

Although Chacour's objective is to represent the nonviolent response of the people of Biram to the Zionist terror of occupation, which may not be homogenous as presented, he depicts subtly the violence and terrorism that the Zionist terror of occupation provoked.

Chacour also depicts the complicity between Zionists/Israel and members of some western countries, religious circles, and professionals. This group of people effaced Palestinians from their minds and ontology and support the Zionist narrative. In most post/anti-colonial discourse, critics like Said have validated the connection between culture and imperialism, how writers like Daniel Defoe in *Robinson Crusoe* propagate colonialism, and the bid to civilise natives like Friday. Shohat (2010) evinces how Marx himself, "in his writings on India, showed that he shared this colonial vision...while Engels supported the French conquest of Algeria as a progressive step for the advancement of culture" (p. 29). This symmetrical relationship between the imperial imaginary of nations and agents of institutions has long subsisted and the Other is considered as non-existent or an object for domination. Chacour represents this type of relationship in *Blood Brothers*. For example, the author states that within "sixty minutes, the United States officially recognized the new nation of Israel under Zionist rule" (p. 45) which makes Zionists/Israel a quasi-imperial agent of the United States in the Middle East. Also, at St Joseph's Minor Seminary where the author was a student in 1954, this complicity manifested in the Archbishop when he and the new ambassador of the United States in Israel visited the school. The author was introduced by the Archbishop as "Elias Chacour...from Gish" (p. 100), a form of erasure of his ruptured identity from his geography—Biram, but the author insisted that "I'm not from Gish. I'm from Biram" (p. 100) to inscribe his autochthonous identity in the consciousness of the Archbishop but the Archbishop replied "Biram does not exist" (p. 100). This exchange is meant to uphold the Zionist remapping of geography in which Biram has been obliterated, therefore, the Archbishop represents an agency of colonial closure. The possible closure that the agency wished to achieve is voiced in the stream of consciousness of the author that: "after all, the archbishop was right in one sense---it was destroyed and our land confiscated" (p. 101). The event also proves the superiority of the Zionist narrative about non-existent Palestinian villages which is meant to silence the narrative of people from Biram, Palestine in extension, as represented by the author, this is what Siad (1990) designates "blocking".

Another instance is in France as a student at the Seminary of Saint Sulpice. The author notes that whenever they told the other students about the debilitating conditions of his people,

Then a silence fell as we told about the displacement of nearly one million Palestinians, the deaths, the destruction of Biram and the terror that had come upon our families. Furtive glances passed from student to student, and they nodded faintly as if they were humoring us. (*BB*, p. 109)

The silence of the author's fellow students is the consequence of the dominant Zionist narrative in Europe at that time, the narrative that is rooted in the religious/romantic right of Israel's "sole" ownership of the Palestinian land as a Jewish homeland, hence, one should be displaced for the other to be planted. The Zionist narrative labels all Palestinians terrorists as voiced by one student who states that "we've heard all the news reports about Arab terrorists. The Zionists knew they had to clean out those villages or there would be no peace" (p. 110). Chacour portrays the Zionist narrative as attenuating its violence but magnifying the violence of the Palestinian *Fedayeen*. Although the author recognises the menace of the *Fedayeen*'s reprisal on Israel, he subverts the generalising Zionist label by refuting that "all Palestinians are not fighters." (p. 110) and states that not all Jews/Israelis abhor Palestinians. Therefore, there is a contest between narratives—the Zionist narrative on the one side, superior on the world stage, that brands "Palestinians...as ignorant, hostile and violent" (p. 110) while Chacour's narrative of not all Palestinians are violent is on the other hand.

Chacour also represents the Western gaze about the Palestinians as homogenous which is based on Zionist narratives about Palestinians. At one point, a "wealthy and influential man in the church" (p. 111) invited the author to his house for a Christmas celebration and introduced him as a "Jewish student at our seminary" (p. 112) and told him that he would get along better if he would stop announcing that he was a Palestinian. This process of replacement of identity is a form of rupturing and obliteration to assimilate the dominant Western imaginary. However, the homogeneity of the Western gaze about Palestinians is subverted by the Franz and Lony Guber family in West Germany as well as others in Europe and the United States that invited him for speeches at their churches. Hence, there is a heterogeneous perspective that is inherent in all stories of extreme violence.

Chacour in *Blood Brothers*, therefore, represents how his Autochthonous-Melkite identity is ruptured by the Zionist terror of occupation and the confiscation of his village, Biram. Since the *nakba* in 1948, he now wears a hybrid identity of Palestinian-Israeli whose geography is remapped from Palestine to Israel. He depicts how one round of violence can be a motivation for the other but maintains a heterogeneous perspective to every story of violence. While Palestinian terrorism has been focalised on the world stage, Chacour's autobiography has served as an alternative voice to the nonviolent approach of some Palestinians, especially Melkite Christians, in Palestine/Israel. However, Zionist terrorism through other means and necropolitics as a condition/motivation for the *Fedayeen* reprisal terrorism is subtly portrayed by Chacour as a dialogue that requires reconciliation.

#### **5.1.1.2. Spirituality and nonviolent alternatives in *Blood Brothers***

Elias Chacour's father and his family have a genealogy in Melkite Christianity and its precepts. Chacour in *Blood Brothers* through the teachings of his father projects a nonviolent humanist vision as a solution to the Palestinian-Israeli crises, an alternative to the violent actions of the *Fedayeen*. Through his Melkite Christianity background, which can be extended to any form of religious/spiritual endeavour as well as the secular domain, Chacour proposes nonviolent humanist ethos for the amicable resettlement of Palestinians in their homeland and represents the various methodologies of entrenching it. What are the nonviolent humanist alternatives proposed by Chacour? What are the conditions that necessitate these nonviolent humanist alternatives? How does he represent them?

Chacour opines a form of spirituality that respects "human dignity, justice and righteousness" (p. 150) for reconciling Jews and Palestinians. This humanism repudiates violence and passive acceptance but embraces passive resistance to injustice. Said (2003) conceptualises humanism as the final resistance we have "against the inhuman practices and injustices that disfigure human history" (p. xxiii) through alternatives to approved authority. Chacour appropriates true spirituality as a model for changing the perspectives of two warring sides about each other, which in itself may be mythical and inconsequential in a world of militarism. He believes human dignity can be restored by lifting human beings, poor Palestinians in this regard, from their "shattered human dignity" (p. 151) through messages of "love, hope and reconciliation" (p. 151). He asserts that all humans should be



seen as equal and recommends a message of “dignity for all and of reconciliation with our foes” (p. 152). This is an alternative to rhetoric of violence, monotheism, and fundamentalism that precedes terrorism.

Alex Houen (2002) asseverates that any “survey of the statements made by politicians in the aftermath of 11 September would certainly suggest that rhetoric and the figurative did play a major part in the event and the responses to it” (p. 4). The rhetoric of terrorism and war is hyperbolic and affects the materiality of events, violent rhetoric can precipitate war and genocide like in Rwanda. Chacour denounces this type of rhetoric that has become rife and a form of performative discourse in different international and global media outlets. In 1994 Rwanda, rhetorical words like “cockroaches” were used to symbolise the Tutsi, as supposed enemies, with the implication of crushing them. This rhetorical symbolisation morphed to the corporeality of genocidal actions that decimated approximately one million people. Chacour, through his autobiography, therefore, recommends the rhetoric of love, hope and reconciliation as a currency to mitigate violence and terrorism. However, the pragmatism of this approach remains elusive throughout his autobiography that incidentally concludes with the Israeli soldiers’ massacre of Palestinians in Sabra and Shatila.

Equally, Chacour promotes a syncretic and pluralistic outlook to reconcile the Palestinian-Israeli conflicts. He appropriates the metaphor of grafting to allude to the Abrahamic roots that connect the Palestinians and the Israelis as blood brothers. The metaphor of his father’s grafted fig tree posits variegated forms of hybridised parts that produce a syncretic form. He alludes to the Biblical Abraham as the template for pluralistic ontology. Chacour argues that Abraham ‘did not plow through the land, driving out its inhabitants, wielding power to establish the ownership by “right”. Though he was to become the father of faith for both Jews and Christians, he knew he was not by any means, the first inhabitant of Canaan to worship the one true God’ (p. 143). Chacour employs this allusion to explicate the type of amicable relationship that should exist between the Jews and Palestinians. Zionism is portrayed as monotheistic and fundamentalist, a colonialist ideology that the Palestinian-Israeli relationship is premised on. To promote reconciliation between Jews and Palestinians, the pluralistic thesis of “blood brothers” as equals from syncretic roots should be promoted.

Nonviolent protest is another alternative subtly proposed by Chacour in his autobiography. He organised various protests in the heart of Jerusalem to facilitate the returning of Biram to its people but the protests fell on deaf ears. He and Bishop Raya planned and carried out nonviolent protests at various times to demand the rights of the Palestinians uprooted from their villages. Farinacci (2013) states that the “camp-in was not just a form of nonviolent protest but can be considered an act of resilience” (p. 21). The contradiction is that the approach does not work and this causes disillusionment in the author. Similarly, Ibillin is employed as a metaphor for reconciliation and reconstruction. The construction of schools in the villages, the provision of health care to the poor villagers and the giving of lectures to enlighten outsiders on the Palestinian cause are all nonviolent models of reconciliation appropriated by Chacour. However, the autobiography ends on a note of hopelessness and disappointment that his nonviolent humanist approaches have not worked holistically, although it has at the private or micro level but not at the macro level. This poses a question on why violence and military intervention have been the model of responding to a situation of threats.

The argument is that these nonviolent alternatives can be appropriated outside the religious/spiritual circle as humanist tenets to promote a peaceful resolution of (protracted) conflicts like the Palestinian-Israeli crises. These should be the alternatives to the violent response to (neo)colonial conditions and terrorism

### **5.1.1.3. Tropes in *Blood Brothers***

In *Blood Brothers*, the trope or motif of dirt is employed to label the Palestinians. It is used by Israelis to mortify the image of Palestinians based on the binary of dirt/clean. The Zionists designate them “dirty Palestinians”, a form of stereotypical representation. Other images include that of contamination and a scab “that had never healed into the complexion of their new societies” (p. 180). This derogatory tropology has its provenance in the colonial imaginary that denigrates the Other (natives) as apes, dirty, naked, uncivilised, inter alia. Zionists appropriate the derogatory labelling to torment the Palestinians psychologically and present them to the world through their arrogant gaze. It also serves as a form of discrimination between the Ashkenazim (Occidental Jews) and the Palestinians.

Chacour also deploys Biblical characters to represent historical characters. This allusion signifies his Christian religious background and a subtle reference to the repetition of history. The father of the author employs the religious metaphor of “Satan” to describe “Hitler” for “killing Jewish people” (p. 25). Also, there is a metaphorical concatenation between Golda Meir, a former Israeli Prime Minister, and the Biblical Jezebel. Her aggressive confiscation of farmland from Palestinian villages makes one rabbi designate her the “the modern Jezebel” (p. 191) who has “sold herself to do evil” (p. 191). These Biblical allusions are used to draw a connection between historical characters, their deeds, and Biblical characters.

Equally, there is the trope of the olive tree and its metaphorical signification of peace, geography, and grafting. Other species of trees like grapevine and fig trees signify cordiality, hybridity, and syncretism. Chacour appropriates the metaphor of grafting to represent the syncretic lineage of Palestinians and Israelis, he contends that he “was grafted spiritually into the true family of Israel” (p. 147) just as his “Father had grafted six different kinds of fig trees to make a delightful new tree” (p. 142). Another recurrent motif in Chacour’s *Blood Brothers* which is also common in other Palestinian narratives is the desire to return to roots. This is ingrained in agitations and nonviolent protests to return to Biram which also reifies the trope of land as an identity. In Ashour’s *The Woman from Tantoura*, the desire to return to roots is signified in the house keys that the Palestinian women refugees carried in their bosoms. Similarly, there is the motif of rubble that signifies the Zionist destruction of Palestinian villages. When Chacour visits Biram after the conclusion of his studies, he describes the “ruined stone houses” (p. 140) as ghostlike and solemn. There is an image of wrecked homes and crumbled walls.

In conclusion, Chacour’s autobiography – *Blood Brothers* – represents the ruptured identities of people of Biram, in extension Palestinians, by the Zionist terror of occupation. Chacour mediates the nonviolent humanist alternatives as the option to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and portrays a pluralistic outlook for apprehending the relationship between Palestinians and Israelis. Although at the macro/political level, the nonviolent humanist approach has not yielded significant results, however, at the micro/individual level, through

his protests along with lectures as well as educational care, the model has produced remarkable results.

### **5.1.2. *Stillpoint* by Colin Mallard: plot overview**

Colin Mallard was born in England and has a deep interest in philosophy. In his novel, *Stillpoint*, which technically may not be regarded as Palestinian literature but a narrative about Palestine, he provides an outsider's view on the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts by excavating the past (from the 1947s) and connecting it to the present as well as portraying the interconnection between the Israeli-Palestinian crises and the imperial politics of the United States of America. He employs numerous characters like Nasir and Ali to portray the Palestinian subjective perspectives about the use of violence, terrorism, and war to uproot Palestinians from their villages, like Haifa and Acre, in the wake of the establishment of Israel and connects the colonial condition to the United States' financial and military support. Through characters like David Tremaine, the second protagonist, who later becomes the President of the United States after the demise of Richard Emerson, Mallard explores philosophical alternatives of seeking peace, imperial distancing, and quelling injustice as the solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian crises. After September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States, Mallard depicts Tremaine as the fictitious US President and employs his insistence on listening, acting within the law, and not adopting retaliatory violence as mechanisms of interrogating history and the imperial vision/actions of the US that have plunged the world into further violence like the war in Iraq and the continuous one in Afghanistan which has extended to other postcolonial spaces. Tremaine insists on responding with peace while Nasir, the sage, helps in rescuing Tremaine's wife, Sandra, and propagates peace as an alternative to his fellow Palestinians.

#### **5.1.2.1. Representing Israeli/Palestinian terrorism in *Stillpoint*: colonialism, imperialism and the metaphors**

*Stillpoint* is a general or popular fiction that provides a rare outsider's perspective by representing the Zionist terror in Palestine, Israeli's "reign of terror" in Gaza through its militarism, the terroristic responses of certain Palestinian groups to the crisis along with the transnational support for this, the peaceful alternatives adopted by some Palestinians like

Nasir and Israelis like Mikel and the complicity of the United States Government to the Israeli/Palestinian colonial condition. While postcolonialism has been the dominant discursive trend since the emancipation of many African, Asian, and Latin American states from their former colonisers, one can argue that the Palestinian experience is a sustained colonial condition of occupation and lack of nationhood. In line with this standpoint, in this subsection, Mallard's *Stillpoint* will be analysed to pursue the following arguments that the Israeli war of independence appropriates terrorism through gangs/paramilitary forces to establish a substitute for the British colonial order in Palestine and that witness account of characters like Ali, etc. depict this. Equally, Mallard's depiction of Gaza as an enclosed compartment invokes the Casbah compartment in French Algeria and the French colonial phenomenon in Algeria. Insights and interconnections will be drawn from Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* to portray the colonial condition in Palestine as bolstered by Zionist/Israeli militarism which makes violence and terror a means of exchange and necessitates the anti-colonial Palestinian terror. Analogies will be drawn between French Algeria of the 1950s and Mallard's depiction of Gaza. Also, the metaphor of killing peace by assassinating its arbiters will be explored while it will be posited that Mallard subtly subverts Palestinian resistance as inferior and futile and arrogates the resolution of the Israeli/Palestinian colonial situation to the United States, therefore, focalising the imperial force as the sole agency of resolving Israeli's colonising and terrorising of the Palestinians.

In *Stillpoint*, Mallard represents how Zionist gangs appropriated terrorist strategies and extreme violence to uproot Palestinians from their villages in late 1947 to establish the state of Israel. Mallard appropriates dialogue-as-flashback through the witness narratives of characters like Ali and Salman to depict the Zionist terrorism that ransacked villages like Haifa in the pre-*nakba* period. Ali notes that "tension had increased between local Palestinians and the new Jewish immigrants" but submits that "the Palestinian Jews, those who'd been our friends and neighbours for years, were not a problem" (p. 32). This is analogous to Chacour's position in *Blood Brothers* which differentiates between the European (Occidental) Jews and the Palestinian (Oriental) Jews. Salman informs Ali, who later narrates it to his granddaughter – Mera, how tyres of fire and "a river of gasoline" (p. 33) are set down the hills by certain European Jews to burn Palestinian homes in the valley. Ali narrativises how the "Carmeli Brigade and other groups" (p. 82) as well as the sappers

“dynamited their homes and opened fire on those who tried to flee” (p. 80). Ali’s wife was killed as well as many Palestinians, while many flee their villages to escape the terror of the Zionist gangs. This study contends that the Zionist groups, realising the impending departure of the British from Palestine, whom they learnt from and terrorised too, appropriated terrorism as a form of ethnic cleansing to substitute themselves with the British colonisers. Nasir reports how “armed Jewish gangs had been attacking Palestinian villages and homes” (p. 65), raping women, and terrorising Palestinians. He, like other Palestinians, believes that “the Jews had every intention of driving us out of Palestine...to repopulate it with Jewish immigrants arriving from Europe” (p. 82). This colonial imaginary is only achievable through extreme violence, terrorism, and ethnic cleansing.

Similarly, Mallard depicts the symbolic voice that precedes every violent campaign against Palestinians. The voice is a trope of psychological terror appropriated by Israeli military forces to torment the Palestinians as they were dispossessed of their villages. In Haifa, for example, Ali narrativises how “someone was shouting over the loudspeaker, ‘The Jews are on their way, get out! Get out while you can!’” (p. 55) while Nadia, Ali’s daughter, remembers “it was the voice she’d heard the morning of the raid on her village. It was the same voice, the same “*hatred-stopping fear*” (p. 65) **emphasis added**. In Haifa, the voice is followed by a melee that led to the crushing of people as “women, children and the elderly died underfoot in ensuing panic” (p. 55). The roaming and haunting voice over the loudspeaker “Get out or die” (p. 80) follows Ali and his remaining family members from their village to Haifa and then to Acre where it is silenced by Nasir who kills the person behind the voice. The symbolic voice is an instrument of terror to psychologically torment the Palestinians. Chacour, also, depicts the roaming voice in *Blood Brothers* and its terrorising influence on the Palestinians during their contacts with the Zionist/Israeli military forces. The symbolic voice is meant to terrorise Palestinians “so they’ll leave and never come back” (p. 116).

Mallard like Chacour portrays the link between romantic/religious beliefs and terrorism. According to Heatherington, a British Soldier, while discussing with Nasir, a Palestinian sage, he contends that the “Jews want your land, they’ve convinced themselves it’s theirs. They believe it’s their God-given right” (p. 116). This statement connects Zionist terrorism

to Biblical and religious beliefs. This informs the erasure of Palestinians from their villages and the renaming of the villages after Biblical names, a connection between religion, geography, and terrorism. It can be argued that Mallard's depiction of Zionist and Jewish occupation of Palestinian villages parallels colonial terror adopted by the British and French to conquer spaces in Africa and Asia. The Zionist gangs employ colonial terror to achieve their political objective of establishing Israel. The Israeli government uses renaming as erasure and palimpsest like Ali's village, Damum, that has been erased from the cartography of Palestine and remapped as a forest in Israel. Also, Mallard depicts the transnationalism of the romantic/religious beliefs that founded Israel as Christian Zionism. He represents Christian Zionists as people

who come to Israel believe that they, like the Jews are God's chosen people...They're fanatical supporters of Jewish Zionism; they contribute financially to Israel and come here to plant trees and look after the public lands. The Israeli government loves this kind of support...They help cover Palestinian villages that have been destroyed (*Stillpoint*, p. 178)

Mallard depicts internationalisation of the Zionist romantic belief/fundamentalism that supports Israeli's injustice against Palestinians by connecting Zionism to the Bible. With this analysis, there are conscious Christian Zionists like Jason Leopold in *Stillpoint*, while there are unconscious Christian Zionists around the world who support the idea of Israel as a Christian nation belonging to Zion. The central argument is that Mallard connects ideology to fundamentalism and Zionist terrorism. The Zionist's principal objective is to replace the British colonial system with theirs after establishing Israel in 1948. Therefore, after expropriating former Palestinian villages and repopulating them with Occidental Jews, the remaining Palestinian spaces like Gaza are turned to occupied and colonised compartments like the Casbah in French Algeria.

Mallard represents Gaza as an enclosed Palestinian space regulated by Israel. This is a metaphor for subsisting colonialism in Occupied Palestine where everything is controlled by the Israeli government, the colonisers. A close analysis of the control of Gaza by Israel parallels the colonial conditions in Gaza to past colonial spaces like French Algeria's the

Casbah as well as invokes the French's reign of terror through Israeli's deployment of militarism as its sole solution to the resistance of Palestinians. According to Mera in *Stillpoint*, the Israelis limit access to Gaza, "control access to water. They can turn it off at will. The same goes for food and medical supplies" (p. 198). These conditions signify a "reign of terror" in Gaza that treats Palestinians as colonised objects subjected to inhuman conditions. These conditions prompt terroristic resistance from the Palestinians which pronounces the inequality of military power between both sides in the consciousness of the Palestinians. Mera states that Israel deploys military forces in Gaza to stick fear (terror) in Palestinians and that "every hundred Israeli children who die, a thousand Palestinian children are killed" (p. 200). This foregrounds Said's argument that the Israeli Self is considered superior to the Palestinian Other and this colonial mentality guides the relationship between the two sides.

There are conditions in Gaza that parallel the French "reign of terror". These colonial conditions include the excessive deployment of militarism as an instrument of terror to both Palestinian terrorist groups and ordinary civilians, as retribution, the total control of mechanisms of subsistence in Gaza to quell dissension and objectify the Palestinians, and the regulations of Palestinians' movement through the use of permits. Significantly and ironically, Fanon explicates the same colonial conditions in French Algeria. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon (1963) argues that colonialism is based on the organisation of the world into a Manichean space of us versus them and this engenders the division of geographies into compartments to regulate the movement of the natives both physically and psychologically. The compartmentalisation of French Algeria into European quarters and native quarters like the Casbah is represented in *The Battle of Algiers*. This is analogous to the compartmentalisation of Gaza from the Israelis' Kibbutz to organise Palestinians based on the colonial present of us versus them. In this case, the Palestinians cannot move beyond Gaza without "permits" but the Israelis can do otherwise. Fanon (1963) describes the compartmentalisation of French Algeria into "native quarters and European quarters, of schools for natives and Europeans, in the same way we need not recall apartheid in South Africa" (p. 38). Fanon contends that the same colonial order in French Algeria applies to the South African apartheid system, and applies to Gaza as represented by Mallard in *Stillpoint*. This colonial imaginary applies in other Palestinian spaces like the West Bank.



This similar event is depicted in Sayed Kashua's *Let it be Morning* in which the Palestinian/Arab village within Israel is cut off from electricity, the sewage system is blocked, communication lines disabled and borders closed to regulate the villagers' access to the outside world while decisions are taken on behalf of the Arab/Palestinian village by the Israeli government to hand over the village to Palestine.

Mallard represents the currency of violence between the Israeli military and Palestinian terrorist groups based on the militaristic principles of Israel's new Prime Minister, Samuel Herzog. However, the colonial order of the "reign of terror" culminates in Gaza being "locked down, water shut off, no food or medicine allowed in or people out" (p. 315). This approach is analogous to the deployment of colonial terror by France in French Algeria during the anti-colonial terroristic resistance by Algerians between 1954 and 1962. According to Fanon (1963), the hemming of natives into compartments prompts dreams of aggression and breeds violence which he designates "the absolute line of action" (p. 86). The argument is that the Israeli government's militarism, expansion of settlements to hem in the Palestinian natives, and the deployment of terroristic mechanisms are provocative and a replica of the colonial past in the present which causes terroristic responses from Palestinian armed groups. Equally, the close analysis of the Israeli militarism against Palestinians as a whole like the wanton killing of Samara's family in their home and, on the other hand, Palestinian terrorist groups' deployment of extreme violence like the bombing of a bus by Mohammed sponsored by the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade suggests reciprocity of violence as well as parallelism between the two sides. While Israeli military forces operate under the cloak of the state to deploy military terror against Palestinian civilians, the Palestinian terrorist/guerilla groups deploy similar terror against Israeli civilians/settlements. This dialogue of terroristic violence is connected from the past (*nakba* period) to the present by Mallard in *Stillpoint*. This is depicted through the violence against Ali's and Nasir's family in Palestine by the Zionist gang/Israeli military force in 1947 and the decimation of Samara's family by the Israeli army in contemporary Palestine while the Israelis also suffer various bombings by Palestinian guerilla groups. Mallard also internationalises the crises between both sides by connecting various countries like Iran (which assists Palestinian armed groups and the United States that provides humongous financial aids to Israel).

Mallard in *Stillpoint* subverts generalisation by portraying a Manichean categorisation of Israeli governments into those who accommodate peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and those who are militaristic, promoting the Zionist-colonial proclivity of terrorising as well as cleansing the Palestinians from their land. Michael Levin, the Prime Minister of Israel, as well as Joseph Goldhirsh – Israeli Foreign Secretary – represents the former category while Samuel Herzog, hardline Prime Minister of Israel that replaces Levin after his demise, belongs to the latter. Levin and Goldhirsh concede with Tremaine to halt the settlement expansion and to resolve the “Palestinian idea” amicably but they are assassinated by an extremist that believes in maintaining the status quo. The assassination of the two leaders is a metaphor for killing peace, another form of terror, which reminisces the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin, a former Prime Minister of Israel, that was murdered after signing a peace accord with Palestine. Also, Mallard depicts those that teach Palestinian children to detest Jews and kill them anytime they have the opportunity. This representation is metaphorical and reifies the tendency of extremists to sustain the violent exchange between the two sides. In *Stillpoint*, Herzog repudiates the possibility of a peaceful reconciliation with Palestinians but promotes militarism and deployment of extreme force.

Also, Mallard represents the centrality of the United States’ position to resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through David Tremaine, the fictional President of the United States in *Stillpoint*. Tremaine’s stance is that he will “not be party to the abuse of Palestinian people” (297) by the Israeli government. Tremaine insists that

if settlement construction continues anywhere in the occupied territories, anywhere on Palestinian land or land in dispute, beyond September 15th we will no longer provide any financial assistance or guarantee any of your loans... We will no longer support you. There’ll be no military and economic assistance, no grants for research and business development. (*Stillpoint*, p. 216)

The excerpt above underscores Mallard’s representation of the imperial positionality of the United States in the Israeli-Palestinian crises and subtly undermines the possibility of any Palestinian resistance to yield any macro/political results. This means Mallard considers the

United States as central to the resolution of Israeli colonialism in Palestine but perceives Palestinian resistance as impotent. This is analogous to the argument of Gayatri Spivak in “Can the Subaltern Speak?”. The portrayal of the central imperial position of the United States seems genuine but evinces the predominance of colonialism and imperialism in (neo)colonial conflicts. The Palestinian voice is usually superintended by the United States like the Camp David Agreement which Said (1990) denounces greatly, nevertheless, this position is rife in literary representations of (re)solving the Palestinian conflict with Israel. The Palestinian call for peace like Chacour in *Blood Brothers* and Nasir in *Stillpoint* has usually been depicted as efficacious at the micro/personal level, not the macro/political level. The corollary is that Herzog’s obstinacy is metaphorical of the unwillingness of some sections in Israel to stop its “reign of terror” in Gaza as represented in *Stillpoint*. Violence, therefore, becomes a currency between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Lastly, unlike the circulation of terrorism between the postcolony as depicted in Khadra’s *Wolf Dreams*, Mallard represents the return of terrorism to the empire, the Imperial centres, through connecting the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States. According to Tremaine, “the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians is like an infected and open wound that never has a chance to heal. Not able to heal, the infection spreads” (p. 402). The conflict is linked to the “previous administrations’ support of Israel” (p. 402) which has generated animosity against the United States. Hence, (neo)colonialism generates violence as well as terrorism from both the imperial agents and the anticolonial counterparts. The Israeli government employs military terror to expropriate Palestinian lands, erects settlements to compartmentalise Palestine, and maintain a “reign of terror” in Occupied Palestine while some Palestinian guerilla/terrorist groups appropriate terrorism to counter/retaliate against Israeli’s violent and colonial domination of Palestine.

#### **5.1.2.2. Mediating nonviolent humanist alternatives to terrorism in *Stillpoint*: the nexus between culture and philosophy**

Mallard like Chacour in *Blood Brothers* mediates nonviolent humanist alternatives to violence and terrorism. In Mallard’s mediation of nonviolent alternatives in *Stillpoint*, he portrays philosophical reflections as a premise for responding to life/political situations, peace as an alternative to violence and injustice, and the theme of disconnecting imperial

support for new forms of colonialism in the contemporary time. These positions will establish the connection between culture (as in religion and literature) and philosophy. Culture in Mallard's *Stillpoint* examines the essentiality of religious and philosophical approaches to life as well as the concatenation among politics, culture, and humanist ethos like peace and justice.

Mallard's protagonists – Nasir and Tremaine – believe in peace premised on religious and philosophical precepts as models for approaching social and political situations. Nasir, a Palestinian sage, appropriates Sufism as a mechanism of interpreting life events and promoting peace. He is a former Palestinian guerrilla fighter who fought against the Israelis during the war of independence and silenced the “terror voice” that sent many Palestinians out of their villages. However, he discovers the futility of violence believing “hatred...makes monsters of us all” (p. 123), and seeks peace through the Sufi ideological alternative. While Mallard does not suggest this as a prescriptive alternative, he accentuates the impact of cultural models that promote inner/psychic peace that diffuses to the corporeal world. Sufism and clairvoyance avail Nasir the opportunity to see the alternative to violence: “I’ll do what I can to help but I’m not sure I can do it using a gun” (p. 104). This self-realisation is engendered through the cultural premise of Sufism passed to him by Bokhari. Nasir propagates the message of peace to many Palestinians like Khalid, reveals the pointlessness of violence to them and helps rescue many Palestinians from Israeli violent attacks through clairvoyance. However, as argued earlier, Nasir’s advocacy for a peaceful humanist alternative to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is depicted as only potent at the micro/individual level not at the macro/political stratum.

Nasir’s appropriation of Sufism to propagate peace as a model for approaching life difficulties is analogous to Tremaine’s perception of life through Zen teachings and the philosophical instructions of Lao Tzu. Mallard depicts Tremaine’s belief in Zen and Lao Tzu’s pedagogies as a nonviolent humanist alternative. Tremaine employs Tzu’s teaching as a model for interpreting and acting on life events like when he dissuades General Travis, Chairman of Joint Chiefs, from boasting about the United States Armed Forces as the best in the world. He advises that

Arrogance blinds us to the facts. Lao Tzu also said, 'There are three great treasures in life. Mercy, economy and daring not to be ahead of others.' What did he mean? He explains: 'Courage arises from mercy, generosity from economy and leadership from humility.' He must have lived in a time much like our own" (*Stillpoint*, p. 144)

Tremaine's advice is rooted in Tzu's philosophical reflections about life which has become a model for his perceptual interpretation of human relations. He further implores Travis that "I have no objection to you speaking your mind on anything, but do so with honesty, simplicity and humility. As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, you represent the American people...not alienate them" (p. 145).

Tremaine also deploys anecdotes from Zen masters and ethical inquiries to interpret life philosophically as a humanist precept. He employs the anecdote of the fish's lack of awareness to instruct on the salience of human awareness of cultural and socio-political beliefs, bias and assumptions. Tremaine uses Tzu's question to interrogate the phenomenon of death as a sacrifice in terrorism. According to Tremaine, "Tzu asked... 'why...do people care so little about life?' He answered 'When life becomes intolerable, death is welcomed. And he who has embraced his death lives without fear. A man like this makes a formidable enemy" p. (393). This concept of welcoming death as an inevitable sacrifice is traded for living in fear of imperial/military terror and a medium for remunerating terror with death.

Also, Mallard interrogates history through the philosophical lens of Tzu by using Tremaine as a mouthpiece. Post-9/11 led to the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan by the Bush administration and other United States' allies like Britain. The unjustifiable military incursion of the countries is examined through the character of Tremaine as a fictitious US President during the 9/11 attacks to invoke Robert Frost's poem: "The path not Taken". According to Tremaine, "History shows that we have lived more by the code of Hammurabi, 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' than with the guidance offered by Lao Tzu and Christ" (p. 394). As the President of the United States, Tremaine insists that there will not be any retaliatory attack by the United States after the 9/11 terrorist attacks rather there will be dialogue, reconciliation, and prosecution of the actual perpetrators. In contrast to the rhetoric of violence and terrorism, Tremaine adopts a rhetoric of peace. This position is

taken because of his philosophical background in Zen and his encounter with Tzu's teachings. While this is not prescriptive, Mallard uses Nasir and Tremaine to depict the connection between nonviolent humanist alternatives and socio-cultural philosophical undertakings as well as the essence of applying them during pugnacious situations like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Therefore, in *Stillpoint*, a general fiction about Palestine, Mallard deplors the currency of violence between the Israelis and the Palestinians, the colonial imaginary at the roots of settlement erections in Palestine and the Israeli colonial rule of Palestinians in Gaza. Also, he depicts the connection between culture, philosophy and society as well as proposes a nonviolent resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conundrum, although he accentuates an imperial resistance by the United States as more effective than the subaltern resistance by Palestinians. Albeit this subtle imperial-favoured representation in *Stillpoint*, the Israeli's extremists that covets the perpetuation of the colonial status quo remains a factor of concern as portrayed in Chacour's *Blood Brothers* too.

### **5.1.2.3. The tropes in *Stillpoint***

There are two dominant tropes in Mallard's *Stillpoint* namely the trope of olive trees and the trope of the roving voice. The tropes represent geography, ecology, and violence.

Olive trees are a predominant part of the Israeli/Palestinian flora and are usually represented in their literature. In *Stillpoint*, there is the trope of the destruction of an old Palestinian olive orchard by the Israeli government. Considering olive branches as symbols of peace, the destruction of an olive orchard by the Israeli Army is a metaphor for destroying peace. According to Sandra, Tremaine's wife,

They showed footage of an old olive orchard in Palestine. Local people had harvested the olives for generations and the reporter said some of the trees were a thousand years old. Olives were known to have grown in the area for five thousand years. A new Israeli settlement was built nearby, a huge imposing structure with high walls and what looked like watchtowers. It loomed over the orchard which sat in a shallow valley. It was harvest time and the Palestinians were picking the olive when the settlers tried to drive them off. In the past week five of them were shot; two died. According

to the report, there have been ten deaths in the past three years, all Palestinians...Israeli peace activists went to the valley to shield the Palestinians while they harvested the olives. The army showed up, ostensibly to keep the Jewish groups apart. They escorted the peace activists away, drove the Palestinians out and bulldozed the trees...They said trees provide cover for gunmen to launch attacks on the settlers. Did you know **2.5 million olive trees in Palestine have been destroyed** or stolen since 1967?" (*Stillpoint*, p. 314) **emphasis added**

The excerpt denotes the impact of violence on ecology. The destruction of the olive orchard by the Israeli army despite the intervention of the Israeli peace activists signifies two metaphorical meanings, first is the destruction of peace, considering the significance of olive branches in resolving violence while the second is the termination of the means of subsistence of the Palestinians. These two implications depict Israeli's appropriation of military terror as a mode of interacting with the Palestinians. The thesis is that such an approach engenders retaliatory violence and terrorism. The trope of the destruction of olive trees portrays the insensitivity of the Israeli army to the communal and existential needs of the Palestinians as well as the ecological impact of destroying such symbolic trees on the geography of the area. The bulldozing of the olive trees has psychological and materialist effects on the Palestinians. This is parallel to the forced abandonment of the fig and olive orchards by the Chacours depicted in Chacour's *Blood Brothers*. The Zionist/Israeli Defence Force forced them to leave their generational orchard. Also, there is the trope of the roving voice from the Israeli side that haunts the Palestinians from one place to the other. The voice precedes most Israeli military attacks on the Palestinians and represents an agency of terror. The voice is aired on the loudspeaker before Israeli attacks and on the radio to give alibis for military attacks on Palestinians.

In all, the operation of the Israeli military outside the law is an illustration of terrorism through other means or state terrorism. The Israeli army is used to terrorise, colonise and attack Palestinians. The Israeli rule of Palestinians in Gaza as depicted in *Stillpoint* is analogous to the "reign of terror" and based on the colonial imaginary of conquering and regulating native spaces or spaces that belong to the Other. On the other side of the coin, Palestinian terrorist/guerrilla groups adopt terrorism as resistance, especially against Israeli

civilians, like blowing up Israeli buses, as retaliatory violence. Chacour and Mallard portray a peaceful syncretic alternative of peace, justice, and equality of Israeli-Palestinian citizenry without considering one as above the other, a position of horizontal relationship rather than vertical relationship. The vertical relationship of the Israeli Self as above the Palestinian Other is colonial and engenders resistance and extreme violence. They also denounce the international support of one side against the other that has furthered various imperial motives. However, the nonviolent alternative has been efficacious at the micro/individual level but not at the macro/political level. This means effort must be made to propagate nonviolent humanist alternatives against popular imperial militarist tendencies.

## **5.2. Afghanistan: history, Taliban(ism) and literature**

Afghanistan is the crossroads to Central Asia and is described by some as the Middle East, others as Central Asia or Southwest Asia (William Maley, 2002). This thesis contends that the war against Russian invasion and occupation radicalised the mujahideen in Afghanistan like the Sicaris of the first century in Judea who revolted against the Roman occupation of its native homeland. This historical trajectory of resisting the imperial impulse of Russia morphed into the formation of the Taliban group and its Government that first governed between 1996 and 2001. In this section, the ideology of the Taliban will be designated Talibanism. At this juncture, it is pivotal to examine the historical trajectory of the Taliban, as a group, as well as Talibanism as an ideology, starting from the Russian incursion of Afghanistan in 1979. Similarly, the background of Afghanistan literature is examined and how Taliban(ism) has been represented by Afghan writers and how it has changed Afghanistan literature as a postcolonial form.

Afghanistan has multiple identity groups of Pashtuns (approximately 45%), Tajiks (about 25%), Uzbeks (about 10%), Hazaras (about 10%), and Aimaqs (about 10%), according to Daniel P. Sullivan (2007), citing Goodson (2001). The Afghans are predominantly Muslims with a Sunni majority and a Shiite minority with “small Hindu, Sikh, and...Jewish minorities” (William Maley 2002: p. 9). According to Sullivan (2007), Afghanistan was created in 1747 by the Abdalis and got its independence from Britain in 1919. Since its formation, the Pashtuns have dominated the governance of the country for almost 300 years as stated by Ahmed Rashid (2000). The Russian invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 changed



the dynamics of the country and turned it into a space for the proxy cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The contention is that the imperial invasion of postcolonial states has engendered terrorism like in Somalia, Palestine and, in this analysis, Afghanistan. Though Sullivan (2007) argues that the rise of the Taliban can be primarily attributed to ideology and external support, however, the rise of Taliban(ism) cannot be divorced from the Russian invasion which subtly served as the genesis.

Afghanistan became a republic in 1973 when King Zahir Shah was deposed by Mohammed Daoud. Daoud became the first President of the country and was helped by the leftist officers in the army to crush Islamist fundamentalists in 1975 (Rashid, 2000: p. 12). Russia, a next-door neighbour, aided Daoud financially and militarily in modernising Afghanistan but later disagreed with him on the use of NATO experts in Afghanistan. According to Maley (2002), after the assassination of Mir Akbar Khyber, a prominent Parcham ideologue, in Kabul, Daoud was overthrown on 27th April 1978 by Marxists sympathisers trained in Russia and this culminated in various leadership tussles especially between the Parcham (Flag) and the Khalq (People's Party) as well as other rural revolts until the Russian invasion in 1979 that led to the emergence of Babrak Karmal. Jonathan Lee (2011) states that Khalq and Parcham coalesced into the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). Also, before Karmal's government, there were two successive governments between 1978 and 1979, one by Nur Mohammad Taraki that was bloody and ruthless while Hafizullah Amin followed in the autumn of 1979. Amin's reign nearly led to the collapse of communism in Afghanistan which served as the alibi for the Soviet's/Russian invasion of Afghanistan. The Russian invasion of Afghanistan metamorphosed into a proxy cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States. Therefore, the United States trained the first generation of the mujahideen that served as anti-Communist troops.

As suggested by Maley (2002), opposition to the Russian invasion by Afghans started in the rural areas and was premised on Islam as a rallying ideology and an "ideology of resistance" (Maley, 2002:59). Hence, the mujahideen evolved to confront foreign/imperial occupation forces who were framed as atheists that should be eliminated from Afghanistan. The mujahideen struggle was structured without any centralised vanguard which made the resistance pervasive and difficult to undermine. However, political parties like "*Hezb-e*

*Islami* or Party of Islam” (Maley, 2002: p. 63) were formed based on various Islamic ideologies. In Afghanistan's urban areas, there was significant resistance too but it was met with brazen force by the Russian occupying forces and this led to the imprisonment of some Afghan intellectuals. Pakistan also supported Afghanistan’s resistance against Russia and provided a home for Afghanistan’s refugees while the United States’ Jimmy Carter administration supported the mujahideen with financial and military assistance which included procuring and shipping of lethal weapons to them. Other countries like Britain, France, Germany, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, inter alia, played parallel roles with the United States as the leading supporter of the anti-Russia invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. Equally, private Islamic and Arab organisations as well as non-governmental organisations like the World Muslim League, Medecins Sans Frontieres, International Committee of the Red Cross, provided humanitarian assistance to Afghans both within the country and those in Pakistan.

The Soviet invasion led to the inauguration of the Karmal regime that had limited freedom and faced factionalism within his party, the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). The regime was bolstered militarily, financially, and politically, primarily, by the Soviet Union. It formed structures similar to Russian organisations, structures like *khedamat-e Ettaalaat-e Dawlati*, or KhAD which served as the secret service model for Russia’s KGB. KhAD tortured and decapitated prisoners while the mujahideen deployed bombings and assassination of regime figures as their tactics of resistance as well as the launching of missiles against strategic targets. KhAD under the leadership of Najibullah also used armed militias for coercion and repression. Najibullah later replaced Karmal at the helm of affairs in Afghanistan and remained in office as Afghan leader till 1992. Russia withdrew from Afghanistan in 1988 after the signing of the Geneva Accord, but with dire consequences that culminated in the rise of the Taliban.

Regarding the Soviet withdrawal, points to note are that Afghanistan served as a proxy space for the cold war and there was also a contest against foreign (Russia’s) occupation and its imperial impulse of maintaining communism in Afghanistan. Also, the essence of weapons to First World-Third World conflict was accentuated. The Afghan war left many youths disenchanted, destroyed many schools, and made the madrassas the only option for

educating the Afghan youths. This provided the foot soldiers for the evolution of the Taliban, taking note that Talib means a religious student.

The Taliban government evolved after the fall of the Rabbani government that replaced Najibullah. Sullivan (2007) explicated some of the factors that precipitated the emergence of the Taliban which include state failure as a result of the rivalries between the various warlords and the atrocities they committed, ethnicity, debilitating socio-economic conditions, the predominance of disenchanting youths, fundamentalists' teaching in the madrassas and disillusionment. While the mujahideen warlords turned exploitatively to their fellow Afghans after the Soviet-Afghan war, the madrassas were radicalising the youths who had known war since their birth and the Pashtun fighters were consolidating ethnic solidarity for their takeover. The Taliban rose initially to provide order to the belligerence of the older mujahideen warlords that engulfed the country after the Soviet withdrawal. According to Rashid (2000), the Taliban's aims include to "restore peace, disarm the population, enforce Sharia law and defend the integrity and Islamic character of Afghanistan" (p. 22). According to Abdul Salam Zaeef (2010), the idea to end the mujahideen terror came from Abdul Qudus and Neda Mohammed in a meeting with him in his house in Pashmol. This morphed into the formation of the Taliban in Sangisar under the vanguard of Mullah Muhammed Omar who reportedly attacked an army base, freed two sexually assaulted girls, and hanged the commander for his sexual atrocities. Mullah Omar maintained a low profile throughout the Taliban rule.

The Taliban's epochal development is in four phases viz. the post-Najibullah period (1992-1996), the governance period (1996-2001), insurgency period (2001-2021) and the post-insurgency governance epoch (2021 until present). The 1992-1996 period was that of strife and wanton atrocities by the mujahideen warlords which the Taliban started combating in 1994. Rashid (2014) states that "in 1994, the Taliban leadership mobilized madrassa students to end the continual civil war and to punish the warlords" (83) and they took over the Pashtun ethnic space, the dominant ethnic group in Afghanistan, as a starting point for their nationalist drive. Rashid (2014) contends that the madrassas played a pivotal role in transforming the Pashtuns who dominated the Taliban leadership from "politico-religious

orientation” to “religious-nationalist” tendency, therefore, religion was employed to galvanise the Pashtun ethnic group.

The role of the madrassas and the type of education they provided remain central to the development of the Taliban right from the time of the war. They served as religious-ideological and quasi-military bases and many members of the Taliban leadership were graduates of Pakistani Deobandi madrassas, as posited by Rashid (2014). The madrassas de-ethnicised the Pashtun Taliban and transformed them into “religious nationalists”. Another great influence on Talibanism was the arrival of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan in 1996 which made the ideology of the group shift from Deobandism to the precepts of Ibn Taymiyya and Sayyid Qutb that favoured global jihad. With the entry of bin Laden and al Qaeda into Afghanistan through the invitation of Rabbani and later Mullah Mohammed Omar, the Taliban assimilated the ideologies of al Qaeda and turned brutal, deploying terror against the Others outside its Islamic interpretation/belief system like the Hazara who are Shiites. Therefore, our extrapolation is that the Taliban’s initial objective of maintaining peace and nationalism was subverted by the al Qaeda union.

The Pakistani support for the Taliban is also a predominant factor in the development of the group. The Pakistani Interior Minister, Naseerullah Babar, in Benazir Bhutto’s administration supported the Taliban with arms, ammunition, and international networking to favour his faction as the power holders in Afghanistan. The Taliban became the surrogates of Pakistan in what Maley (2002) designates “creeping invasion” (p. 221) of Afghanistan by Pakistan and underscores Sullivan’s (2014) argument that the Taliban received external supports. Mullah Mohammed Omar later became the President of Afghanistan during the Taliban rule between 1996 to 2001 and was deputised by Mullah Mohammed Rabbani. The Taliban had many foreigners in their ranks and some of them were rovided by al Qaeda. The Taliban’s support for al Qaeda later became its waterloo after 9/11.

Talibanism entails declaring other Muslims who did not believe in their ideologies *kafir* or infidels which was instigated by al Qaeda as stated by Rashid (2014), closing schools for girls, excluding females from paid employment, confining women to homes, forcing young girls to marry the Taliban, destroying cultural artifacts, inflicting terror through a brazen

display of cadavers, meting out severe punishments for infractions and enforcing “a strict interpretation of *sharia* law and Pashtun customary law; women were banned from working outside the home or leaving the house without a *chadari* and *mahram*” (Seran de Leede, 2014: p. 4), a *chadari* is a burqa while *mahram* is a male relative. Seran de Leede (2014) explores the history of women in Afghan society concerning tribal and religious codes. She contends that rulers like Amanullah Shah in the 1920s promoted girls’ rights, banned veils, established schools for girls, ended secluding of women, inter alia, however, these reforms were repudiated by local mullahs in rural areas, especially in southern Afghanistan, while it was accepted mostly in urban areas like Kabul. The reforms created two diametrical camps which generated violence in the 1950s and 60s, this brewing crisis was halted by the Soviet invasion but engendered indirectly when the Taliban switched to the US side as an anti-Communist faction which provided them access to western and Arabian financial networks and sophisticated arms and ammunition. Equally, all the precepts of Talibanism were enforced by the religious police, *Amr bil-Marooif wa Nahi An il-Munkir* (Maley 2002:234) with vicious terror.

The role of women with the Taliban is contradictory. Leede (2014) argues that the focus has virtually been on the abuse of women’s rights by the Taliban without examining the paradoxical roles of women’s supportive roles for the Taliban. Some women acted as spies and informers for the Taliban, some of them believed in the unalterable traditional roles of women at home. Women provided supportive roles for their Taliban husbands which include smuggling weapons and dealing with female prisoners. However, Leede (2014) cautions that the supportive roles of women for the Taliban remain speculative insisting the Taliban target men most times for their struggle, this underscores the patriarchal orientation of the Taliban which has tribal roots too.

Women that resisted the Taliban form the other side of the argument. Many women kept their families safe against the Taliban, some, according to Leede (2014), kept their male children and husbands away from recruitment or conscription into the group. Women professionals like doctors and women’s rights organisations operated underground during the Taliban Government to educate and empower women. Such women’s organisations include the Afghan Women’s Network (AWN). From this exposition, women’s relationship

with the Taliban can be categorised into three namely: the supportive women, the active resistant women and the victimised women, some passive while others turn active resistant, deploying their victimisation as a weapon. The first category supports the Taliban, the second resist the Taliban through their underground operations while the last are women that were victimised by the Taliban. However, the last two can be overlapping and intersecting.

Ethnic minorities like the Tajik, Uzbek, Hazara and the northern alliance as well as Karzai's men in the south resisted the Taliban government, Hamed Karzai later became the President after the Taliban Government was ousted in 2001. However, since then the Taliban has continued to terrorise Afghanistan, demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from its shores and the establishment of an Islamic state. The Trump administration of the United States is currently overseeing negotiations between the Taliban and the government of Afghanistan.

With the exploration of the historical trajectory of violence/terrorism in Afghanistan, we now turn to the role of literature in the socio-cultural context of Afghanistan by examining the literary history of Afghanistan and how literature about Afghanistan has responded to and represented Talibanism. Considering the argument that historical events shape the preoccupations of literature, it is pertinent to explore how the literature of Afghanistan has depicted the Taliban, their ideologies, the biases, the intersections, the socio-cultural and socio-emotional implications and the mediation of alternatives to the perpetual terrorism of the group. We opine that the Taliban's appropriation of terrorism is an aftereffect of the Russian invasion, the Russian invasion like the Israeli incursion/occupation of Palestine created a huge number of refugees and exiles and the literature responded similarly. Literatures written by exiles as well as those written by Afghans within the country respond to historical events in Afghanistan, represent and interrogate them.

The modern Afghanistan literature is written predominantly in Pashtun and Dari or Persian while those written in the diaspora are written in English. Modern Afghanistan literature like other forms of literature is rooted in oral literature as stated by Fazilhaq Hashimi (2016, online source). He traces the dawning of Afghanistan literature to fables, proverbs, and oral stories through his personal experience with his mother and grandmother who were

endowed with the art of storytelling. The art of storytelling was common in Afghanistan before the social and political upheavals of the late 1970s according to Arley Loewen (2011a) and it included reciting the poetry of battles from Abul Qasim Findawsi's *Shahnama* – an epic published approximately one thousand years ago, telling fables or religious stories and singing folksongs at weddings. Loewen (2011b) states that oral chroniclers were famous for their epic and romantic tales that were poetic. Similarly, classical Persian poetry had a genealogy of 1000 years and was promoted by monarchs. The classical Persian poets connected an array of Persian-speaking countries especially Iran and Afghanistan. Some renowned classical Persian poets, according to Loewen (2011b), are Abdullah Jafar Rudaki – the poet of “Fragrance of Home”, Abul Qasim Firdawsi – the poet of “Warriors and Battles” and *Sharhnama*, Ustad Unsuri – the poet of *Flattery*, Jalaluddin Balkhi Rumi – the poet of *Spiritual Couplet (Masnawi-ye Manawi)*, Mirza Abdul Qadir Bedil, *et cetera*. Poets were grandly celebrated by the royalty during the medieval Persian age.

Pashto poetry like its counterpart, Dari poetry, has a different origin. Robert Sampson (2011) traces the genesis of Pashto poetry to the “hauntingly beautiful love poetry of village life that expresses powerful yearnings of affection and remorse, bravery, and honour” (p. 164) and rooted in rich oral tradition like the oral poems of Malang Jan. The written form started developing in the sixteenth century which means Persian poetry's written form is farther than the Pashto genre. Pashto oral poetry includes *landay* which captures themes on various aspects of rural lives. Sampson (2011) traces the first written Pashto literature to Bayazid Ansari's (d. 1575) treatise: *Kyayr ul-Bayan* (The Best Explanation). Bayazid encouraged writing in Pashtun and bequeathed it to his grandson, Mirza Khan Ansari, who improved the style of Pashtun poetry. Some of the first Pashtun poetry include Khushal Khan Khattak, Abdul Hamid, Dawlat Lawani, Abdul Raman Baba, among others. Some of them deployed Arabic and Persian words in their poems. The Ghazal similar to the sonnet is the predominant type of Pashtun poetry and has been explored by the early and modern Pashtun poets. Pakistani Pashtun also enjoy Pashto poetry across the border of Afghanistan. In 1883, the British created the Durand line that divided the Pashtuns into two: one category in Afghanistan while the other are in Pakistan, formerly part of India under the British

government. This prompted Pashto nationalism as a thematic preoccupation in Pashto poetry.

Modern Pashto poetry has been enriched by both Afghans and Pakistanis. Such poets are Amir Hamid Shinwari and Ghani Khan. In Pakistan, Rahat Zakhali established *Afghan Jarida*, a paper, and utilised it as a platform for publishing his Pashto poems and by poets like Mahmud Makhafi, Fazel Ghar, inter alia. The themes of Pashto poems in both countries entail love, criticism against religion, Pashto nationalism, jihad especially in *trana* promoted by the Taliban. One can argue from the literature review that despite the underlying competition between Pashtun and Dari/Persian forms of poetry, the latter is more popular than the former.

Modern Afghan Literature has mostly been controlled by the state. Wali Ahmadi (2008) examining modernist literature in Afghanistan contends that from the reign of Abd al-Rahman known as the Iron Amir, politics has encroached into the “domain of cultural production” due to authoritarianism which has led to “social commitment and aesthetic purposiveness” (p. 18) in modern Afghanistan literature. The purposiveness of aesthetics targets literary expressions’ engagement of the Afghan nation’s development as a social responsibility that opposes the authoritarian-fostered modernity of the state. Ahmadi (2008) explicates literary intellectualism in Afghanistan in the twentieth century on a binary note of literary writers that supported the phenomenon of the state as the determinant/regulator of literary production while the resisting side perceives the state as a censure of literary liberty and the state as subverting dissension. The latter group believes the modernising effort of the state should be collective and extended to the rural masses through education and cultural revolution. However, Nile Green’s (2014) criticism of Ahmadi (2008) is valid that he dwells more on the “activist intelligentsia and not with the products of a literary or cultural marketplace” (p. 488). Ahmadi (2008) neglects essential forms of poetry and other forms of literature by the mujahideen which translates to his overt concentration on elite literature rather than the common man type.

The pioneering journal, *Siraj al-Akhbar*, established by Mahmud Tarzi at the beginning of the twentieth century served as the platform for interrogating the modernity of Afghanistan through intellectual discourse and poetic literary expression. According to Ahmadi (2008),



Tarzi through the journal advocated the pursuit of scientific and technological knowledge in the Islamic World – *ummah* – to subvert western domination and enjoined the “need for the unity of all Muslims in the era of modernity” (p. 22) not for violence but assistance. He eulogised the state as a promoter of modernity and Muhammad Sarvar Vasif, a prominent writer at that time too, through a *qasidah* in the journal, praised Amir Habib Allah whose rule engendered some forms of modernisation but prodded him for not doing enough. Vasif’s request for constitutionalism over absolute monarchy led to his murder in 1909. Other writer-critics of the Amir monarchy like Abd al-Hadi Dawi, Abdul Ali Mustaghni, Abd al-Rahman Ludin wrote poems in *Siraj al-Akhbar* that criticised the despotism and absolutism of the monarchy. Bashir Sakhawarz (2011) states that Tarzi challenged classical poets for writing about superfluous subjects, he urged his contemporaries to write about education, science, inter alia. He remained an immense inspiration for his contemporaries. Many of the poets he influenced like Ludin, Muhammad Ibrahim Safa, suffered imprisonment and persecution.

From 1963, during the reign of Muhammad Zahir Shah, literature developed greatly as a result of political freedom as stated by Sakhawarz (2011). Writers wrote freely and books from the West were translated. Private publishing houses were established with little stricture while newspapers published literary works freely. Free verse also became the dominant form of poetry in Afghanistan as a result of the Iranian *nima* (free poetry). Iran, therefore, influenced the Dari poetics of Afghanistan and engendered freer forms of expressing political and social issues through poetry. The poets within this circle include Mahmud Farani who later served as a cultural adviser for the mujahideen government in the 1990s according to Sakhawarz (2011), Assadullah Habib, Latif Nazimi, etc. However, this era of literary leeway was followed by censure and banning of privately-owned publishing houses under the reign of Muhammad Daud between 1973 and 1978. This led to the emergence of “poetry of symbolism” as stated by Sakhawarz (2011).

While poetry was dominant during the twentieth century in Afghanistan, fiction also flourished but not like poetry, perhaps due to its close attachment to nobility. Tarzi, the progenitor of modern Afghanistan literature, promoted modern Afghan fiction by translating many works by Western authors according to Loewen (2011c). Many Dari short

stories were published in his journal too while some were published by Afghans living outside Afghanistan like “Picture of Tears” (*Tasweer-e abrat*). The short story in Afghanistan, “like other literature, was used as a voice of the rulers” (Loewen, 2011c: p. 112) because the publishing houses were mostly controlled by the Afghan government. Dari short story writers include Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, Abdul Ghafur Brezhna – the writer of the collection of stories *Stories and Fables*. From 1964, the short story like other forms of literature, was appropriated as a medium of expressing social and political problems. Literature also served as a means of propaganda for socialist ideology. Such Marxist writers include Ali Ahmad Naimi, Akram Osman, inter alia. The modern Pashtun short story like its counterpart started in the 1900s and was promoted by Zakhali from Peshawar as Tarzi did with Dari short stories. Mohammed Zarin Ansur with Arley Loewen (2011) states that Zakhali penned the first Pashtun short story in 1908. Since then, modern Pashtun stories have flourished abundantly especially from the 1950s. A few prominent ones are Ghaws Khaybari and Musa Shafiq.

After the 1978 revolution, there is a shift to socialist realist fiction sanctioned as progressive by the state as well as the Writers’ Union which means the state predominantly regulated and determined the status of literary fiction and other literary expressions, especially through PDPA. Literature served as a medium of propaganda for Soviet Occupation like Babrak Arghand’s “Tak Marmi” (The Single Bullet). According to Ahmadi (2008), the story depicted the Russians as benevolent and compassionate in occupying Afghanistan, Husayn Fakhri’s “Dar Changal-i Duzkhim” (In the Claws of the Executioner) portrays a captured party man as faithful till death. Writers espoused the revolutionary ideologies of the Soviet/Russian occupation of Afghanistan and its supposed benefits in their literary works until there was a shift to “ambiguity and ambivalence” in the late 1980s by most Afghan writers who later emigrated. However, writers like Rahnaward Zaryab, Wasef Bakhtari resisted the state-sanctioned literary categorisation of aesthetic expressions by supporting “a literature of dissidence”. Hence, literary expressions post-1978 till the departure of Russia can be categorised as two sided, the first was the state-sanctioned aesthetics on one side while the dissident, experimental aesthetic was on the other side. Dissident poets like Qahar Asi through their poems praised the mujahideen’s resistance against Russia but later denounced them for their brazen violence and highhandedness.

One corollary of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was the emergence of a literature of dissidence outside the shores of the country. Due to the brazen brutality and repression by the pro-Soviet government and the Russians during the occupation, many writers fled to Iran, friendly European countries, and America. Khalil Allah Khalili was an example of exilic resistant literary expression against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan, he wrote poems that vilified the Russian occupation of his homeland and advocated national unity. Dari exilic prose includes Atiq Rahimi's novella: *Earth and Ashes* (2000), Zaryab's *Gulnar and the Mirror* (2003). Novels have also depicted the Taliban era like Khalid Nawisa's *Daily Bread* which portrays the lack of water and flour that frustrated the protagonist, Ramazan, to desert his village despite his wish to remain there. Some of the themes in modern Afghan fiction include poverty and pessimism, However, censorship has remained the bane of Afghanistan literature.

It is essential at this juncture to review the appropriation of literature during the Taliban and the representation of the Taliban in Afghanistan literature. The representation of the Taliban in Afghan literature can be categorised into: the representation of the Self (the group) by its members thereby deploying literature as a tool of propaganda for recruitment and face-saving tactics, while the other side of the binary is the representation of the group in literature by outsiders or observers. A good example of the former is Abdul Salam Zaeef's *My Life with the Taliban* while Yasmina Khadra's *The Swallows of Kabul* is an example of the latter. The former can be conceptualised as the Taliban narratives (system of stories) which, according to Thomas H. Johnson *et al* (2017), are mostly non-fictional and are "producing propaganda and influence documents" (p. 5) to recruit support for the group. Most times, these narratives are ubiquitous in speeches, poetry, (auto)biographies, sermons, night letters (*shabmamah*), website videos, among others, to recruit support for the Taliban as well as sentimentalise issues for ideological predilection.

Metaphors, especially religious, are common literary features of Taliban narratives according to Johnson *et al* (2017) which they propose can offer profound insights into the group's worldview. These narratives are shaped/framed to present certain trenchant perspectives that are rooted in monotheism and Islamic sectarian fundamentalism. Repetition is also a core feature of the Taliban narratives because, as Johnson *et al* (2017)

state, the Taliban play on tropes that most Afghans are familiar with, however, in addition, repetition essentially foregrounds/emphasises the points/messages the group wants the Afghans to identify. The Taliban writings are anchored on themes that affect the rural Afghans especially the Pashtuns. The themes include victimisation and the religious obligation of jihad.

Tarana and other messages are some of the forms through which the Taliban represent themselves. Johnson *et al* (2017) state that the Taliban deploy symbols concomitant to “emotions of sorrow, pride, desperation, hope and complaints” (*Taliban narratives: the use and power of stories in the Afghanistan conflict* 24) in their chants and messages. Although Johnson *et al* (2017) do not clarify these symbols, one can infer that these symbols are religious and a means for the Taliban to connect with their audience as an epitome of resistance and salvation. They represent themselves as defenders of Islam against violators, defenders of family honours – a critical aspect of Pashtun culture designated Pashtunwali, saviours of Afghans from oppression and their dead members are depicted as martyrs or *Shaheed* which venerates them more as well as motivates others to join the group. The *Shaheed* are eulogised in Taliban music and poetry which is analogous to immortalising them. These cultural products, therefore, become semiotics for veneration, motivation, and recruitment.

Night letters (*Shabnamah*) which are part of the Afghan folklore, according to Johnson *et al* (2017), are symbolic instruments employed by the Taliban to signify the engendering of Afghan tradition. In the night letters, the Taliban represent themselves as the “righteous” fighting the “infidels” or foreign occupiers or crusaders, defenders of Islam. The letters serve as a mechanism of mobilisation and typify the control that the Taliban have over the local population. Just as the mujahideen appropriated literature/night letters as an instrument of propagating rebellion, the Taliban do the same and, in the course, represent themselves as the legitimate trustees of the Afghan people. Poems and music were also used by the Taliban to represent themselves as the arbiter of Islam. According to Johnson *et al* (2017), the Taliban, in the night letters, employ the image of past Afghan leaders who used Islam to defeat occupiers, like Ahmad Shah Durrani and Mahmood Ghaznawi to represent themselves as defenders of Islam against the American corruption. The letters also contain

poems mortifying and disparaging non-Muslims. There is the deployment of the Manichean Muslim Self versus the non-Muslim Other in the night letters to persuade and goad the Afghan population to action.

Poetry is a dominant genre of literature employed by the Taliban in Afghanistan because of its centrality in Afghan oral/modern literature. The Taliban poems are centred on jihad and heroism and reminisce on Afghanistan's past contest with foreign occupiers like the Greeks, the Russians and the Americans. The poems are mostly written in Pashto and Dari and, parallel to night letters, represent the Taliban as defenders of Islam from contamination, protector of Afghans' honour and the homeland. According to Johnson *et al* (2017), some examples of Taliban poem include:

*Mujahid's wish to his mother*  
Mother, pray for me, I am going to Ghezaa [the battle]  
tomorrow  
I am going for Allah's satisfaction, I am not delaying  
Battle has many rewards,  
Allah will give me paradise  
If I am martyred, I'll go to my leader with white face  
I am getting to my trench  
For combating the *invader* (**epub copy, emphasis added**)

The extract from the poem is a supplication to the mujahid's mother, however, the poet uses the word "invader" to represent the mujahid as a defender of the homeland and that the protection is sanctioned by Allah. Another poem is:

*Good news*  
They are days of the insolent White House collapsing  
They are days of the infidels' Coalition collapsing  
Signs of disunity are appearing in these forces  
They are days of Islamic countries' unity  
Bad Abraha has come to ruin our Kaaba  
They are days of coming of the green birds  
Today as they are burning Ibrahimi nations with fire  
They are days of burning Nimrod's forces  
The pharaoh of the time has come, killing our children  
They are days of drowning the satanic armies  
Bush came impudently and wouldn't listen to anyone  
(**epub copy**)

The poem above celebrates the defeat of Americans and the coalition forces instituted by the United States. There is allusion to Abraha, a Christian ruler in the 7th century that ruled Yemen and part of Arabia. There is the use of us/them binary and the reference to pharaoh and Bush as enslavers that the mujahideen must fight. These poems reify how the Taliban represent themselves in literature as saviours of Afghans from the infidels, protectors of Islam and defenders of Afghan's honour against violation. These poems appropriate diverse propagandising techniques like comparing the Americans to Satan or infidels, comparing the mujahideen to past and respected Afghan heroes and portraying fighting the Coalition Forces of Kabul and the US as a religious obligation. In most cases, apart from employing persuasion, they also use threats against supposed betrayals among Afghans. Hence, literature for the Taliban is a means of propaganda and magnifying the United States' extreme counter-terrorism in Afghanistan to further the group's agenda of recruitment and drawing sympathy from Afghans and jihadists or Muslims in other countries.

While Johnson's *et al* (2017) critical attention to the Taliban narrative is from the United States' military perspective, they offer *sui generis* insights on how the Taliban have deployed literary and artistic expressions to represent themselves/one another in the positive realm and the propaganda behind these cultural works. Apart from Johnson's *et al* (2017) polemical contribution, there has been little or no robust interrogation of the Taliban's representation of themselves in literary expressions, both fictional and non-fictional, especially in English. On the other side of the coin, there is little polemical attention paid to the representation of the Taliban by Afghan literary writers. Therefore, this thesis examines how the Taliban represent themselves especially their drives through Abdul Salam Zaeef's *My Life with the Taliban*, while being wary of generalisation, Zaeef's autobiography is a rare opportunity to glimpse into the mind of a member of the Taliban, now former, without discarding the limits of autobiography as an edited form of reality. Equally, Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner* will be the focal piece of exploring how the Taliban is represented in a literary work by a non-member Afghan writer.

### **5.2.1. Abdul Salam Zaeef's *My life with the Taliban*: An overview**

Zaeef's autobiography, *My Life with the Taliban (MLWTT)*, is an insight into his life with one of the most controversial jihadi Islamist group in the world, the Taliban. Zaeef was born

in Zangiabad, Southern Afghanistan, in 1968 into a religious family. His father was a *mullah* and imbued in him the penchant for Islamic scholarship. He and his family migrated to Pakistan to avoid the violence that followed the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. He later sneaked back to Afghanistan to join the mujahideen as a *Talib* in the jihad, resistance against the Russians. Subsequently, he and others like “*Mullah Sattar and Mullah Neda Mohammed*” (p. 63) joined forces to form the Taliban in Sangisar. Their main motivations were to entrench peace and justice in Afghanistan against the mujahideen terror, post-Russian occupation.

His autobiography, politically, can be divided into the Russian Occupation period, the *mujahideen* warlord/Communist government period (1989 to early 1994), the *Taliban* period/government (1994 to 2001), and the post-Taliban/American war on terror period (2001 onwards). His autobiography explicates the motivations of the Taliban and the perception of America’s war on terror by him and the Taliban in extension. While he downplays the Taliban terror against women and religious Other as well as the Taliban’s implementation of *Sharia*, however, he subtly reifies the Eurocentrism of America’s war on terror and the lessons to learn from new forms of imperialism.

#### **5.2.1.1. Of homeland and Soviet imperialism in *My Life with the Taliban: jihad, drives and the nuances***

In Zaeef’s autobiography, the concept of jihad is emphasised in connection to the homeland. This is parallel to the anti-colonial struggle/resistance in Africa in the 1950s and its conceptualisation by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*. In this section, the analysis will explore how Zaeef represents the Soviet incursion of Afghanistan as the motivation for the mujahideen’s *jihad* and how “jihad” is conceived as using Islam as an anti-imperialist ideology. Equally, Zaeef’s representation of the drives for the *jihad* during the Russian occupation will be examined and the nuances of the dichotomy between mujahideen who are not Taliban and the Taliban who are also mujahideen. The thesis is that the drives of the Taliban government were formulated, though unconsciously, during the Soviet occupation and the resistance against it.

One of the most controversial phenomena in Islam concerning religious terrorism is the concept of jihad and its meaning. Jihad, according to Bernard Lewis (1988), has two predominant meanings which are either to be “in the path of God” (*Taliban narratives*, p. 72) or “to wage war” (p. 72). Jihad is an Arabic word that translates literally as effort, striving, or struggling to achieve something or striving in the path of God (*al-jihad fi sabil Allah*). The “something or path of God” becomes arbitrary in the context of using the word *jihad*. This means that the word *jihad* has its binary semantics of spiritual striving (greater jihad) and, on the other side, military striving (lesser jihad). Lewis (1988) noted that the more dominant one has been the side of waging war in the name of God and argues that all “the great collections of *hadith*...contain a section devoted to *jihad*, in which the military meaning predominates” (p. 72). The military perception is strongly promoted by traditionalists, fundamentalists, and jurists in Islam, while the spiritual effort as jihad is supported by reformists and modernists. Therefore, it is pertinent to inquire how Zaeef represents *jihad* in his autobiography. What are the parallels that can be drawn between anti-imperialist resistance and his representation of *jihad* or are they the same?

In Zaeef’s autobiography, *jihad* is used as a nominal word to represent the struggle against Russian/Soviet incursion into Afghanistan in 1979. Imperialism has always provoked resistance whether intellectually or militarily. As colonialism prompted anti-colonial resistance and terror in the Third World, (neo)imperial proclivities have engendered resistance couched in various ideologies. (Neo)imperial tendencies include trying to maintain a puppet government in a foreign country by a powerful country like Russia did in Afghanistan in the 1980s, violating the sovereignty of a country under whatever alibi to have access to its natural resources, among others. To Zaeef and others, Afghanistan is a homeland that was violated by the imperial impulse of Russia and should be defended. Therefore, *jihad* is couched as an Islamic ideology of resistance against Russian imperialism/occupation of Afghanistan. This perception is bequeathed to Zaeef and his contemporaries by the *mullahs*, Islamic teachers, in the *madrassas*. Zaeef illustrates that “at the mosques the *mullahs* were preaching to us about the holy *jihad*, about the obligation of all Muslims, about paradise, and about our homeland” (p. 19). This means that the *mullahs* create a nexus between defending the homeland and *jihad*.



Zaeef represents the war against Russia and their puppet communist government in Afghanistan as *jihad*. Instead of using the word war or resistance, he privileges *jihad*. To him, *jihad* means anti-Russian imperialism or “struggle” against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan using Islam as the galvanising ideology. He, thus, belongs to the side that perceives jihad as a military effort or striving. He states that “I had my first taste of *jihad* with Raziq and his fighters, learning how to handle weapons and how to behave under fire” (p. 22). However, he believes in the conjunction of Islamic teaching and *jihadi* operations, this is an added dimension that Zaeef depicted. This differentiation between fighters and scholar-fighters forms the nuances that will be examined shortly.

Similarly, as Lewis (1988) posited about the inclusion of *jihad* as a chapter in all *hadiths*, Zaeef titles a chapter “*Jihad*” in his autobiography where he chronicles his fighting or resistance against the Russians in the 1980s. In the chapter, he theorises his belief in jihad as a war against (neo)imperialism in the form of invasion and instituting surrogate governments by foreign countries, in this case, the Soviet Union/Russia. He opines that “*jihad* was not just about fighting...there had to be a strong educational perspective as well as a provision of justice borne out of their deep religious belief...and their faith in God” (p. 22). His theory of *jihad* coalesces intellectualism and the use of military force. This forms the evolving drives of the Taliban. He narrates how he sneaks out of Pakistan to join the *mujahideen* in Afghanistan. He depicts how the Russians and the Afghan army fought the *mujahideen* in places like Zangiabad. The Russian use of military firepower and bombs on another country’s territory amount to occupation and imperialism which drive the *mujahideen* to resistance. It is at this point that the Taliban started forming their drives and motivation to rule the people. Zaeef represents the brutality of the Russians, not only against the *mujahideen* but also against the Afghan civilians, and reifies *jihad* as a religious obligation. The contention is that Zaeef conceives *jihad* as a religious obligation of defending his homeland against the imperial tendencies of Russia. Behind this resistance are strong motivations/drives that serve as the foundation for the formal formulation of the Taliban.

A crucial aspect of Zaeef’s autobiography is his representation of the *mujahideen* drives for jihad against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan. This will later form the drives of the

Taliban government. The priority of the Mujahideen/Taliban drive for jihad is the quest to defend the Afghanistan homeland against foreign invasion, in this case, Russia, and, later, the United States whom Zaeef designates invaders. This impulse extends to the opposition of the surrogate government instituted in Afghanistan by the Soviet government. The fight against the Russians was depicted as a fight for the homeland. To show the scale of this belief, Zaeef narrativises that “every family had lost relatives, martyred in the fight for their *homeland*” **emphasis added** (p. 19). He further explicates his motive for *jihad* that

Like most young men at the time, I was eager to join in. We all wanted to fight the Russians. I often talked about it with my friends when we saw the *mujahedeen* leaving. I wanted to fulfil my obligation to *Allah* and free my homeland from the godless Soviet soldiers. (*MLWTT*, p. 20)

There are two points to note in this extract which are Zaeef’s belief in *jihad* as a religious obligation and the representation of the Soviet soldiers as godless which alludes to the metaphor of the infidel. Considering the tumultuous/suspicious history between the Muslim world and the West, any invasion of a predominantly Muslim country is perceived as an aberration. This is analogous to the invasion of Somalia by Ethiopia that indirectly led to the emergence of Al Shabaab. Equally, in Afghanistan, communism as a system of government is perceived as godlessness which is anathema to Islam. Zaeef’s position is understandable as anti-imperial resistance, therefore, the drive to defend the homeland is the strongest motivation for the mujahideen/Taliban *jihad* as represented by Zaeef. He even emphasises that “if we don’t fight the *jihad*, then the Russians will conquer our homeland” (p. 46).

Furthermore, the image of communism as godlessness engenders the drive for an Islamic government to rule Afghanistan which later led to the emergence of the Taliban government in 1996. Zaeef represents the Communist government during the Russian occupation of Afghanistan as a government of terror where “people disappeared without trace” (p. 10) and the “government ruthlessly suppressed the opposition” (p. 10). The corollary of the government of terror and its image of godlessness stimulates the drive to establish an Islamic government. With every defeat of the Taliban, Zaeef always prays “to God that he would let me to see Afghanistan as a free and independent *Islamic* country with an *Islamic*

*government*” (p. 48) **emphasis added**. Thus, when the Russians withdrew from Afghanistan and the succeeding Communist governments only instituted an Islamic government by name, the Taliban regrouped again to establish an Islamic government. Equally, concomitant to the drive of establishing an Islamic government is the desire to entrench Taliban’s brand of *sharia*, an Islamic judicial system.

Also, there is the drive for fighting to get income by some mujahideen. Zaeef portrays some mujahideen commanders as fighting/resisting the Russians for money. Thus, when the Russians departed, the pecuniary supply from the United States and its allies dwindled which made some of the mujahideen commanders turn to Najibullah’s Communist government that represented what they were fighting before. This brought to the fore the contradiction and complexities in the motivations for resistance. While some mujahideen contested the Russians as religious, ideological obligations, some were driven by the dollars provided by the United States to halt the spread of communism. Zaeef notes that

The United States started to de-escalate their funding of the *mujahideen* in 1990 and the commanders started to run out of money and weapons. Many turned to Najibullah’s new government. Some of the commanders had even been paying their *mujahideen*, and without a steady income they would lose their men. (*MLWTT*, p. 48)

The image painted above is that of mujahideen driven by money to fight the Russians. This essentialises the nuances of representing the mujahideen employed by Zaeef.

Zaeef dichotomises the fighters against the Russians and Afghan Communist government into the ordinary mujahideen and the Taliban-mujahideen. The former is portrayed as greedy and knowing nothing about Islam. Zaeef narrativises this when *Hajji* Latif contends that the Taliban should not fight the jihad because he is

concerned about the *Taliban* and the *Ulema*, for they are the spiritual heart of our country and they need to be protected. Most of the fighters I have on my fronts smoke hashish, shave their beards and know nothing about Islam. They would fight against the *mujahideen* if I let them. Making them stay stops them from joining the government forces. If they die along the way, they would be martyred and enter heaven. (*MLWTT*, p. 46)

The image evinced in the extract is contradictory because fighters who do not believe in Islam will be martyred and will enter heaven for fighting despite being mercenaries. This Manichean portrayal accentuates the nuances of the complexities in categorising the mujahideen and their drives. However, Zaeef maintains an austere and sanctimonious image of the Taliban-mujahideen as fulfilling a religious obligation rather than a financial wish. The veracity of this is unverifiable and contestable because no group is homogenous in characteristics or motivations. Similarly, Zaeef provides a clear history of the genesis of the Taliban and posits that the history of the Taliban goes beyond 1994. He states that “there is a misconception that “the *Taliban*” only came in 1994. In fact, the word Taliban is the plural of *Talib*, meaning student. As such, as long as there have been *madrassas*, there have been religious students or *Taliban*” (p. 10). While this may be a generalisation, we contend that most of the drives of the Taliban were formed during their resistance against Russia’s imperial occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s. This eventually morphed to the Taliban government between 1996 and 2001.

#### **5.2.1.2. Representing the Taliban in *My Life with the Taliban*: the mujahideen terror, the drives and the self/group identity**

The post-Russian/Soviet imperialism is a watershed in the history of Afghanistan. The end of the Soviet’s imperial occupation of Afghanistan evinces the efficacy of resistance against a dominant power and the power of Islam as a mobilising force. At this juncture, it is expedient to extricate the image of the Taliban from the mujahideen and examine how Zaeef represents the Taliban, the drives that galvanise them and the contradictory images that he maintained in his autobiography. Some relevant questions to answer include how Zaeef represents the drives of the Taliban especially the crucial role of the mujahideen terror as well as the self/group identity that Zaeef employs in *My Life with the Taliban*. The Self-identity identifies as well as dissociates from the Taliban group identity, thus, the corollary is that there is an ambivalent image of association and dissociation that Zaeef appropriates in chronicling his life with the Taliban.

The gap that Russia’s withdrawal and the dwindling of the United States’ funding created in Afghanistan in the early 1990s culminated in the mujahideen terror. Zaeef portrays the mujahideen terror of the post-Soviet/Russian imperialism against the Afghans as the

galvanising drive that led to the emergence of the Taliban as a formal group. Thus, he represents the Taliban as the saviour of the people from the terror of the mujahideen's warlords. He narrativises how the mujahideen warlords shared Afghanistan's key areas among themselves, exploited the people, and terrorised them which he experienced personally

The next day I took my son to see a doctor in Kandahar city. *Ustaz* Abdul Haleem and *Mullah* Naqib were still fighting when we passed through the area near the prison. A group of shaggy, dirty-looking men stopped us and told everyone to get off the bus. They ordered us to start digging trenches. I told one of them that I had my six-month old son with me who was ill. "We are on the way to the doctor", I explained, "and his mother is not with me". But the man just shouted at me, telling me to get to work and not talk about things I wasn't asked about. If I spoke one word more, he said, he would riddle my body with thirty bullets. (*MLWTT*, p. 53)

Zaeef recounts the rumour of travellers' disappearance, how commissions were taken from trucks that transport goods for safe passage through a warlord's territory, the ineptitude of the Communist government that succeeded the Soviet's withdrawal and the terror deployed against the people by some warlords. He illustrates how commanders like "*Ustaz* Abdul Haleem, *Haji* Ahmad, *Mullah* Naqib" (p. 57) terrorised the people. Demonstrators were shot at directly by Baru, a former *mujahid*.

Similarly, he represents the checkpoint terror that characterise most spaces of terror(ism). He explicates that "checkpoints had sprung up all over the south like mushrooms, with chains across the street, and demands for money and goods were being made from passing buses, cars and trucks" (p. 58). At the checkpoints, people were subjected to terror. He narrates his experience

On our way to the city we were stopped near *Haji* Lalak Mama Saray yard by a young boy who looked like a fifteen year-old virgin girl wearing an expensive Chaman hat. He was carrying a semi-covered Makarov pistol and smoking an LM cigarette.

He told the driver of our car to hand him a cassette of Naghma. "Son! I would happily give you a Naghma cassette if I had one", the driver replied. "I don't have the tape. I don't

even have a tape player in my car. I am sorry”. The boy became furious and snatched the car keys out of the car—turning off the engine—and started walking away. No one said anything as we waited by the side of the road. There were three men with shaved faces next to the boy. The bus driver muttered under his breath, “God! How insulting are the times in which we live! Look what this boy is doing. And no one can stand up and teach him a lesson!” But the boy heard him, and wheeled round, demanding to know what he had said. The driver looked nervous and answered that he had said nothing. The boy started swearing at the driver, cursing him and making foul remarks about his mother and sisters. He drew his pistol and cocked it. We were filled with terror, and begged him: “Blessings, Blessings! Don’t do this! For the sake of God! What do you want to do?” But the boy got more and more agitated, swearing and talking himself into a rage. The men who were with him came and grabbed him by the arm, pleading with him to get a hold of himself. One of the men stood close to me and I spoke with him briefly and slowly. “Brother!” I said. “You can see that there are old men, women and children on the bus and it’s standing in the middle of the road blocking all traffic. You meanwhile are trying to reason with this boy. You should slap him and take the keys from him. He is not a commander. Take his gun from him. Why do you beg him? You are elders and this is a shame for all of us to see”. (*My Life with the Taliban*, p. 58)

According to Zaeef, the boy exhibits this power because he is Baru’s, the commander’s, boy/lover. The mujahideen terror of the early 1990s led to the kidnapping of many women and boys for the sexual pleasure of the commanders while the gun becomes a weapon of domination. Rashid (2000) describes a parallel situation. Thus, Zaeef employs the Taliban’s defeat of the warlords/commanders to depict the group as the saviour of Afghans, especially those in Southern Afghanistan, from the mujahideen terror. Therefore, Zaeef evinces the Taliban as the saviour of the people/homeland from anarchy and terror. The other drives include forming an Islamic government that will rule Afghanistan and instituting *shari’a*.

How does Zaeef represent the Taliban? In his representation of the Taliban, he employs two identities, the first is the Self-identity that associates and dissociates for exoneration in some cases while the second is Group-identity which identifies with the ideologies and actions of the group. This contradictory and ambivalent posture reflects in his various representations

of the Taliban. As discussed in the penultimate paragraph, at the onset of the Taliban, Zaeef represents the group as the saviour of the Afghan people from criminality and terror. In this regard, Zaeef employs a group-identity as identification with the group. This is evinced through the Taliban's clearing of the warlord's checkpoints. Zaeef narrates how checkpoints like that of "Mohammad Nabi's post from Ghra" (p. 72) were cleared. Even while adopting the image of the Taliban as the saviour of the people, he deploys his Self-identity frame as justification

I was in Hindu Kotai at the time. I had been given fifteen men and ordered to control the area of Naredalai Maktab near to *Ustaz* Abdul Haleem, blocking possible attacks. *Even though I had not intended to take any responsibility and made many attempts to avoid it*, a fierce fight erupted the same day from the direction of Takhtepul, and *I was forced to act.* (MLWTT, p. 72) **second and third emphasis added**

In this extract, Zaeef employs the pronominal "I" to foreground his Self-identity within the Taliban Group-identity for exoneration/dissociation and justification. He states that "I was forced to act" to subtly dissociate from the fighting and maintain a sanctimonious image of himself.

Similarly, Zaeef represents the *Taliban* as promoter/defender of all Muslims. It is under this rubric that he defends the protection of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan against the United States. He explicates that as an "ambassador, of the *Taliban*, my colleagues and I promoted brotherhood among Muslims" (p. 116). In the chapter "Osama Issue", while depicting the role of the Taliban to protect Muslims like bin Laden, he deploys his Self-identity frame for dissociation while maintaining a group-identity of belonging. In a meeting with Francesc Vendrell (the head of United Nation's Office in Pakistan), Zaeef states that "I was not in the position to decide about Osama bin Laden" (p. 131), a form of defence mechanism while defending the rights of Afghanistan and the Taliban government's refusal to hand over bin Laden to the United States "to preserve the dignity of Osama bin Laden" (p. 136), hence, he maintains the image of the Taliban protecting all Muslims, especially *jihadi* Muslims like bin Laden. Also, he represents the Taliban as detribalised, not a Pashtun group. He explains that "many *Taliban* belonged to the same ethnic group, and often people get confused by this and say that tribal heritage was important to the movement. In reality, it

was purely incidental” (p. 116). Despite this explanation, most of the leaders of the Taliban are Pashtun and the massacre of the Hazara contradicts this hypocritical position.

Furthermore, Zaeef represents the Taliban as protectors of Islam but monotheistic, abhorring any form or relics of religious pluralism or cultural tradition. The destruction of the Buddha statues in Bamyan spearheaded by “*Mawlawi* Abdul Wali, the Minister for the propagation of Virtue and the Prevention of Vice” (p. 126) typifies this. He narrativises how many countries like Japan, China, and Sri Lanka diplomatically pleaded with Afghanistan not to destroy the ancient statues. The Japanese even “stressed that Afghans had been the forefathers of their religion and that they merely followed us by accepting Buddhism” (p. 127) but Zaeef’s response and position that “Afghans...had realized that Buddhism was a void religion, without any basis, and had seen the light of Islam” (p. 127) represents the monotheism and absolutism of the Taliban Government. However, Zaeef displays his ambivalent Self greatly in this case. Albeit depicting his belonging to the Group-identity frame of the Taliban by defending Islam against Buddhism, he depicts his Self-identity frame that accentuates a dissatisfied/dissociation Self by stating that

the time of the destruction of these monuments was tiresome and particularly hard for me...I played no part in the eventual decision that was taken about the statues, and was never consulted on the issue. While I agree that the destruction was within the boundaries of *shari’a* law, I considered the issue of the statues to be more than just a religious matter, and that the destruction was unnecessary and a case of bad timing. (*MLWTT*, p. 128)

In the extract, Zaeef’s concession that the destruction “was within the boundaries of *shari’a* law” validates his Group-identity of belonging while his stance that “I considered the issue of the statues to be more than just a religious matter, and that the destruction was unnecessary” epitomises his Self-identity of dissatisfaction/dissociation.

Conversely, Zaeef subtly represents the Taliban government as not free from the imperfection of governance and maintains a contradictory identity. He portrays the arbitrariness of his selection as an ambassador to Pakistan by *Amir ul-Mu’mineen*, *Mullah* Mohammed Omar, and criticises it subtly. He states that “I wrote a letter to *Mullah* Mohammed Rabbani explaining the problems and why I would not be able to do good work



as ambassador” (p. 102) but “they told me that it was too late; I had been formally announced, and a decree had been issued” (p. 102). Thus, he depicts his dissatisfied/dissociating Self-identity frame because he was nominated for a position and formally announced without any personal notification. Administratively, he portrays his sense of belonging and dissociation especially when he was in the ministry of defence. He protests that “I had grown tired of my work, and several issues that I had been commanded to look into lay uneasy with me” (p. 90). He resigned due to investigations that would lead to terroristic tendencies. His account shows self-justification, dissatisfaction with some actions of the Taliban, and belonging to some of the group's actions, an ambivalent representation. He represents his Self as an agency of learning and circumspection, as ascetic and incorruptible. He acknowledges indirectly that despite the Islamic ideology that the Taliban Government was premised on, there existed corruption among different individuals.

To conclude this section, Zaeef mostly represents the Taliban positively and downplays negative reports about the group as misrepresentations like the revenge killing of Zamina and maintains silence on the deployment of terrorism by the group and the highhandedness of the group's Islamic judicial system especially against women. However, despite his defence to show belonging, his representation of the Taliban accentuates contradiction and ambivalence. The argument is that the ambivalent and contradictory depiction reifies his push for a Self-identity frame of dissatisfaction/dissociation while his Group-identity posture evinces belonging. One wonders the reason for this contradictory image if not for the silence on the misgivings he has on some actions of the Taliban. Therefore, his autobiography typifies ambivalence, silence and belonging simultaneously.

### **5.2.1.3. Representations of the United States' war on terror in *My Life with the Taliban: the state of exception and othering***

There is a nexus between imperialism and war on terror. When the popular “war on terror” led by the United States after the 9/11 terrorist attacks is analysed, parallels can be drawn between war on terror and terror itself and the coloniality behind its mechanisms as well as the othering impulse behind the “war on terror” that subjects the Other to conditions of a state of exception and space of exception. Achille Mbembe (2003) posits that sovereignty

is the power to kill which is mostly exercised by the state against its enemies. Significantly, he opines that during a state of exception, “power continuously refers and appeals to exception, emergency, and a fictionalized notion of the enemy” (p. 16). Therefore, there is a connection between politics, othering, and death. This necropolitics is deployed by the United States after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. Racial/national othering has been a means of grouping in the war against terror and this becomes a mechanism of prosecuting the war on terror, not on legality but state-of-exception principles in which the Other is connected to death for the security and survival of the Self. Mbembe (2003) contends that the “perception of the existence of the Other as an attempt on my life, as a mortal threat or absolute danger whose biophysical elimination would strengthen my potential to life and security” is ingrained in the imaginaries of sovereignty. The corollary is that imperialism protects itself at the expense of eliminating the Other at whatever cost, establishing a nexus between justice and revenge.

Giorgio Agamben (2005) explicates the historical evolution of the state of exception in the Global North and examines the concept within the purview of politics and law. Agamben (2005) traces the state of exception to the institution of the “state of siege” in the French Constituent Assembly in 1791 during the French Revolution. During the period, civil authority was passed to the military authority to act without bounds. Afterwards, the state of siege was extended to the police to quell internal sedition, “thus changing from a real, or military, state of siege to a fictitious, or political one” (p. 5). This extended to the Nazi regime in which citizens were stripped of their rights in the name of security while more nuances of the state of exception which has been described as a state of necessity appeared during the two world wars culminating in the expansion of the executive’s power to act militarily without resorting to the legislature. Hence, there is the question of the legality of the state of exception whether it is within the juridical order or it is extra juridical. While this has been well debated according to Agamben (2005), however, he raised some pertinent questions: “if the state of exception’s characteristic property is a (total or partial) suspension of the juridical order, how can such a suspension still be contained within it? How can an anomie be inscribed within the juridical order?” (p. 23). Agamben (2005) perceives it as a form of indeterminacy between democracy and absolutism. Despite this subtle submission, this thesis argues that any human power that lacks control is susceptible to abuse which

makes a state of exception/necessity an abuse of executive power in most cases, especially in a disproportionate world. From the postcolonial perspective, especially with the global war on terror, state of exception practices have become new forms of coloniality for subjugating the Other to animalistic and living dead conditions

Despite Agamben's (2005) review, he does not connect the state of exception of even President Bush to the colonial imaginary like Mbembe (2003) does. It is easy to execute a state of exception principle with the non-western Other who has suffered racism, colonialism, and imperialism or is culturally different from the West. In President George W. Bush's order of November 16, 2001, the title: "Detention, Treatment and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War against Terrorism" (online source) speaks volume. The "certain non-citizens" have been altered and othered under the principle of the state of exception. In the order, in section 1 (e), the citizens "to be detained, and, when tried, to be tried for the violations of the laws of war and other applicable laws by military tribunals" which means those detained can be tried or not tried depending on the implementer of the order without reference to the Geneva convention. The corollary is that there is a colonial imaginary underpinning this order that the Other can be treated as a subject (non-definitive in most cases) outside the normal law as stated in section 7, subsection b (2) that

the individual shall not be privileged to seek any remedy or maintain any proceeding, directly or indirectly, or to have any such remedy or proceeding sought on the individual's behalf, in (i) any court of the United States, or any State thereof, (ii) any court of any foreign nation, or (iii) any international tribunal.

Significantly, the Taliban is perceived as an Other for protecting Osama bin Laden and are subjected to the state-of-exception principle. This is the crux of the war on terror that Zaeef represents in his autobiography. In this section, we will analyse how Zaeef represents the United States' war on terror as based on the principle of the state of exception that allows the violation of the sovereignty of the Other, how Guantanamo is represented as a space of exception where juridical-legal procedures are undermined and how the Other as a subject is categorised into an enemy, the Other-as-enemy is treated as a subject outside the law.

In *My Life with the Taliban*, Zaeef represents the war on terror as Eurocentric, and that leads to the principle of the state of exception in which spaces, where law and human rights are effaced, are created to dehumanise supposed Othered subjects who are designated terrorists. While some are terrorists, others are captured in the wide net of “war on terror” and subjected to inhuman treatments, without any form of prosecution. Zaeef depicts himself as an example in this regard. He is othered and captured in the wide net of war on terror without any evidence because he is part of the Taliban government. While Zaeef maintains his self-righteous image, he depicts how the state-of-exception principle is employed to dehumanise him in Bagram and Kandahar prisons before he was transferred to Guantanamo. His imprisonment is portrayed as a quest for revenge rather than the actual war on terror. He gives instances of how he and others were beaten by soldiers, tortured, deprived of nights of sleep, and kept in difficult positions for several hours despite the directive in President Bush’s executive order in section 3 subsection b that individuals subject to the order should be treated “humanely, without any adverse distinction based on race, color, religion, gender, birth, wealth, or any similar criteria”. In this case, the Other-as-enemy is turned into a shadow of himself. He narrativises an instance of such dehumanisation:

My clothes were torn to pieces and soon I was lying naked in the fresh snow. I lost all feeling in my hands and feet from the restraints and the cold. The soldiers were singing and mocking me...I lay in the snow for a long time before I finally lost consciousness. (*MLWTT*, p. 176)

Zaeef represents the war on terror as terror, without any form of prosecution of those captured in the wide net of counter-terrorism.

Furthermore, the war against terror typifies arbitrariness and dearth of accountability. Zaeef portrays the US and its allies’ war against terrorism as arbitrary and lacking any form of judicial or legal accountability. Zaeef and those captured were considered Othered from the US legal/judicial system, therefore, were subjected to state-of-exception mechanisms like torture, physical abuse and humiliation. The prisoners were animalised and subjected to demeaning conditions both culturally and physically. The apogee of the US war on terror arbitrariness is the inability of the interrogators to circumstantially link most of the prisoners to the 9/11 attacks. According to Zaeef, “they said that they believed I know about *Al Qaeda*,

the *Taliban*...about the attacks on New York...I had been arrested to investigate all these allegations. Given that they had not found any proof of what they had accused me of...I...should be released without any conditions” (p. 194). However, despite the lack of evidence, he remained incarcerated like others who were captured by both Afghans and Pakistanis that were financially induced by the US and its allies. Thus, militarism underlies the war on terror and it deploys military terror to detain suspected terrorists who were later released due to lack of evidence. Zaeef alleges that false informants who provided the foreign troops false information are not held accountable for their actions which signifies that “military operations, based on false information, are actually planned and executed for other reasons” (p. 243).

Equally, Zaeef portrays America’s war on terror as not only militaristic but also cultural. He portrays how some of the soldiers treated the Quran to punish the prisoners in Guantanamo. While this may not be part of the initial objective of the US’s war against terrorism, the representation of the soldiers typifies the cultural war between the West and the non-West Other which is usually perpetrated by agencies of the West. He depicts himself as not believing in the international law that offers co-education and allows “women to take off their scarves” (p. 241), this stance is contradictory to his demand of the United States to stick to human rights when prosecuting its war against terrorism. He deplores the closure of *madrassas* to stop Islamic education and the erasure of the word *jihād* from the curriculum. Also, he narrativises how the prisoners are punished psychologically by maltreating the Quran like a second-witness account he gives of Mohammad Nawab “that a soldier had taken the holy *Qur’an* and had urinated on it and then dumped it in the trash” (p. 183). He explicates that in Guantanamo “the holy *Qur’an* and Islam are insulted and used as a tool to punish and further degrade prisoners” (220) which makes the war against terrorism in Guantanamo as not only militaristic but cultural.

Zaeef represents Guantanamo as a *space of exception* for the war on terror. The conceptualisation of a *space of exception* is analogous to Mbembe’s (2003) colonial formation of terror where the Other is not perceived as equal and does not have access to the law of the Self in this case the law of the United States. Guantanamo is operated like a colonial frontier by the United States where its denizens do not have access to the laws of

the United States like the habeas corpus. Although Guantanamo like colonised spaces are properties of the United States, the Other-as-enemy are objectified as not having access to the laws of the United States except the law of exception in the prison. In Guantanamo, Zaeef describes the cage in Camp Echo where humanity's existence is obliterated through erasing the prisoner's access to nature's transition of time. This leaves psychological marks on the inmates, he stresses that "the mad and the psychotic are forgiven...but not by the American soldiers" (p. 195). Thus, Guantanamo is not just operating under the principle of the state of exception but also as a *space of exception* where law is effaced for arbitrary military actions like using gas on prisoners and force-feeding prisoners intravenously, therefore, inscribing Mbembe's (2003) theory of necropolitics, linking sovereignty to colonial imaginary, othering and biopolitics. The most disconcerting aspect is that Zaeef is later released and acquitted which means the war on terror *otherwise* both the guilty and the innocent as an act of revenge for hurting the Western Self.

Therefore, the operation of the Global North's war against terrorism as spearheaded by the United States within the principle of the state of exception raises ethical questions on the legality of how it is perpetrated and the colonial imaginary of othering underpinning it. While terrorism should be prevented, denounced and punished, only the guilty should be and within the realms of the law that guides civilisation. Zaeef's representations of the United States'/Global North's war against terror raises suspicion on how the non-Western Other has been continually, historically, subjected to demeaning and inhuman conditions from slavery, racism, colonialism to imperialism by the Western Self. The war against terrorism should not be an imaginary for objectifying the Other by the Global North or a colonial form of othering to achieve the arbitrary aim of a state of exception.

#### **5.2.1.4. Silence in the text: a critique of Zaeef's representations of the Taliban**

In this section, the silence of Zaeef on some salient issues regarding the Taliban Government will be examined and conceptualised as "silence in the text". It will be viewed as an omission to downplay the significance of those issues.

The first issue is the near silence on women's rights or treatment of women by the Taliban Government in Zaeef's autobiography. Considering his demand for the implementation of

human rights in international law while representing his deplorable incarceration in Guantanamo, however, it is contradictory that he downplays the equitable rights of women in the Afghan society. Zaeef explicates that, in implementing the *shari'a* law, “women were no longer working in government departments” (p. 84). One wonders why Zaeef is silent on how this was implemented and the women that suffered this implementation. He devotes only a clause to depict a major decision that affects nearly half of the Afghan population, therefore, maintaining near silence on the implementation of the exclusion of women from government work and the consequences on them. One wonders if all the women evicted from their positions subscribed to the implementation of the *shari'a* law or were coerced to obey the law because they had no option which is tantamount to the violation of their rights as his was violated in Guantanamo. Perhaps, to Zaeef, it does not matter that their rights were violated under the rubric of implementing the *shari'a* law. He is silent on the denial of girls' right to education (those above the age of eight) especially those in the urban areas that were most affected.

Similarly, his representation of the forgery case between him and *Mawlawi* Obaidullah under *Mawlawi* Pasanaï symbolises that the *shari'a* judicial system practised by the Taliban Government was not flawless and was susceptible to manipulation. Therefore, to what extent were these manipulations detected as Zaeef did in his case? How did individual manipulations affect the implementation of the *shari'a*? Zaeef narrativises the revenge killing of Zamina who killed her husband as misrepresentation but he is silent on some salient background issues like why her execution was delayed by the group as allegedly influenced by her brother-in-law and the supposed selling of her daughters, Najeba and Shaista, by her brother-in-law according to Anton Anntonowicz (2002, online source). He is silent on the brutal lashing of women and the “terrortainment” of public execution to propagate fear. One wonders if the implementation of *shari'a* by the Taliban include the violation of human dignity as a means of punishment while the same government sought to protect the dignity of Osama bin Laden. Is it a question of financial resources, gender, or religion? Zaeef is reticent on these factors that require the protection of Osama bin Laden but not Afghans which is paradoxical.

Zaeef also tries to downplay *Mullah* Mohammad Omar's, *Taliban's* leader, highhandedness. The first instance is the unwillingness of Zaeef to serve as the ambassador to Pakistan because of his dearth of experience but he was forced to accept the position. Despite his backdoor lobbying to reject the position, he was not obliged the volition to accept or reject the position. Zaeef states that "God is witness to my unhappiness about leaving Afghanistan again" (101). This event typifies the arbitrariness of *Mullah* Omar's power as the vanguard of the Taliban Government which subverts freewill in the guise of divine authority. If an influential person like Zaeef could not reject a position he abhors, one wonders what others have been forced to do by the leader. Another instance is how *Mullah* Omar tried to force him back to the Ministry of Defence and threatened him: "You will return to the Ministry, or I will throw you in jail" (p. 92). This represents *Mullah* Omar's dictatorial penchant that Zaeef represents subtly through the deployment of an understatement. While portraying his self-righteous image, he accentuates implicitly the tyrannical tendencies of the Taliban leader which is a Freudian slip.

Equally, Zaeef downplays the ambivalence of following instructions that contradicts his principles like when he was asked to submit the files of the Afghans that supported the Russians and the Communist governments. Unlike his critical chronicling of the military/Imperial terror of the United States/Global North, he maintains near reticence on the reason for some arbitrary requests from his superiors in the Taliban Government. He expresses dissatisfaction only with the demolition of Buddha statues. He deploys rhetorical questions to interrogate the United States' adoption of the state-of-exception principle against Afghanistan but remains silent on the terror of the Taliban which the Editors add as footnotes like the beheading of spies (p. 81), the reported poisoning of wells, and the destruction of irrigation channels on the Shomali plains (Rashid, 2002: p. 271).

However, despite these aporias and silences in the text, Zaeef offers solutions to the Afghanistan debilitating crises which include the promotion of unity among Afghans, respecting Afghanistan's sovereignty, and a campaign of peace. His submissions are essential and accentuate the faults of (neo)imperialism that violates the sovereignty of Othered nations on the ground of terrorism. Thus, albeit the contradictions, silences and propaganda in Zaeef's *My Life with the Taliban*, it offers a rare insight into the motivations



of the Taliban from both the personal and the group levels and the (neo)imperial proclivities inherent in the counter-terrorism of the Global North.

### **5.2.2. The literary representations of the Taliban's terror and its nuances in Hosseini's *The kite runner***

Fundamentalism subverts many cultural activities and ravages wherever it is practiced. In *The Kite Runner* (TKR), Hosseini depicts Afghanistan of the pre-Soviet invasion through the prism of Baba's family and Ali's and chronicles the socio-cultural and the political vicissitudes that Afghanistan underwent from the late 1970s to late 2001 when the Taliban were forced out. Baba is the father of Amir, the protagonist, and they are Pashtuns. They live together with Ali and his son, Hassan, who are Hazaras, an ethnic group that is discriminated against in Afghanistan. The two families' stories are interlaced from one generation to the other. Although Baba and Ali grew up together, Amir and Hassan do the same, flying kites and running for it, until a callous event draws a line between the two. This is later escalated by the political turmoil that exiles Baba and Amir to the United States. Decades later, Amir returns to a terror-devastated Afghanistan by the *Taliban* to seek his nephew, Sohrab, after discovering from Rahim Khan, his father's bosom friend, that Hassan who dies in the hand of the Taliban is his half-brother. Rebecca Stuhr (2009) delineates the novel as a *bildungsroman* that fits within the Anglo-European literary tradition of chronicling the day-to-day events of human beings but in this case of Afghans, not Westerners.

In this section, the third part of Hosseini's *The Kite Runner* which is the protagonist's homecoming will be examined. Hence, it is argued that Hosseini's inclusion of Amir's homecoming in search of Sohrab in *The Kite Runner* subtly represents the state terrorism perpetrated by the Taliban that has become an indelible part of Afghanistan's history and the diametrical opposition between the Afghanistan of his childhood and the one under the Taliban. His representation of Afghanistan during the first Taliban rule subverts Zaef's sanctimonious portrayal of the Taliban in his autobiography. Equally, it is contended that the smuggling of Sohrab out of the Taliban's Afghanistan signifies the dearth of restorative tendencies in a postcolonial Afghanistan ruled by the Taliban which underscores the diasporic inclination of the writer. While the representation of the Taliban is a sub-plot in

the novel, one could not but notice the author's vivid depiction of the state terror perpetrated by the Taliban, their Islamic fundamentalism, and the nuances that have affected the Afghans he confronts on the streets.

Hosseini represents the Taliban as a mutant group that metamorphoses from the saviour of Afghans to terrorising the Afghans that they saved from the mujahideen. In consonance with Zaeef's representation of the *Taliban* as saviours, Hosseini depicts the Taliban initially as saviours through the account of Rahim Khan, second-person narratology. Rahim Khan explicates to Amir that "when the Taliban rolled in and kicked the Alliance out of Kabul, I actually danced on that street...and...I wasn't alone. People were celebrating...greeting the Taliban in the streets, climbing their tanks and posing for pictures with them" (p. 200). This evinces the image of the Taliban as the saviour at the genesis of their rule in Afghanistan. This image is amplified by Zaeef in his autobiography but the contrasting side of terrorising Afghans is omitted. Dr. Rasul, a university lecturer turned beggar, also recounts his euphoria when the Taliban came to power: "the first time I saw them rolling into Kabul. What a joyous day that was! An end to the killing!" (249) On the contrary to Zaeef's silence on the mutation of the Taliban from a saviour to a terror agency, Hosseini, fictionally, depicts the terroristic activities of the Taliban after they came to power. He deploys a second-witness account to represent the state terror of the group.

The first instance of such employment of state terrorism intersects ethnicity, class, and sectarianism. The Taliban are dominantly Pashtuns and operate Sunni-based Islamic fundamentalism. However, the Hazara are perceived as low-life people based on ethnic minority and their Shia leaning. Hosseini employs the extra-judicial killing of Hassan's family by the Taliban as a case study of state terrorism. Rahim Khan narrativises it that

Soon after I took my leave, a rumour spread that a Hazara family was living alone in the big house in Wazir Akbar Khan, or so the Taliban claim. A pair of Talib officials came to investigate and interrogated Hassan. They accused him of lying when Hassan told them he was living with me even though many of the neighbors, including the one who called me, supported Hassan's story. The Talibs said he was a liar and a thief like all Hazaras and ordered him to get his family out of the house by sundown. Hassan protested. But my neighbor said the Talibs were looking at the big house like—

how did he say it? —yes, like wolves looking at a flock of sheep. They told Hassan they would be moving in to supposedly keep it safe until I return. Hassan protested again. So they took him to the street...and order him to kneel...and shot him in the back of the head...Farzana came screaming and attacked them...shot her too. Self-defence, they claimed later. (*TKR*, p. 219)

The extract depicts the Taliban's killing of Hassan and his wife extra-judicially because of their ethnic provenance and Islamic sectarian leaning. Hosseini employs this event to accentuate the state terrorism by the Taliban and subverts Zaeef's claim, in his autobiography, that the Taliban are detribalised. The corollary of the illegal killing of Hassan and his wife by the Taliban leads to the turning of their son, Sohrab, into an orphan. This symbolises the Taliban as responsible for turning numerous children into orphans in which Sohrab is just one out of many.

Similarly, Hosseini represents the Taliban as perpetrators of massacres. They deploy the instrument of the state to massacre the Hazaras in Mazar-i-Sharif, according to Rahim Khan, and halt the cultural activities of the people like flying kites. Hosseini parallels the Taliban to savages and employs the trope of animalisation to depict them. Farid, Amir's guide and driver, also narrativises the terrorism of the Taliban after pointing to the "crumbled, charred remains of a tiny village" (244). Farid states that "I had a friend there once...He was a very good bicycle repairman. He played the table well too. The Taliban killed him and his family and burned the village" (244). Thus, through the second-witness narration of characters like Rahim Khan and Farid, Hosseini represents the state terrorism of the Taliban during their rule in Afghanistan. Contrastingly, Assef, a Talib, triumphantly offers a first-person account when he narrates how the Hazara massacre was perpetrated by the Taliban: "Door to door we went, calling for the men and the boys. We'd shoot them right there in front of their families" (p. 277).

Furthermore, Hosseini employs Assef's character to depict the nuances in the Taliban and subvert the homogeneous Taliban image that Zaeef employs in his autobiography. Hosseini valorises the nuances in the Taliban's members, therefore, portraying a member of the Taliban as an opportunist. Assef's character does not represent the deep Islamic ascetic personality that Zaeef exemplifies in his autobiography but an individual terror that joins

the Taliban to further his gains. Stuhr (2009) explicates that Assef “embodies the religious and ethnic intolerance that Hosseini sees as the dark side of the Afghan culture” (p. 39). Assef is responsible for the rape of Hassan in the alley and disparages him as a Hazara. He embodies the representation of the Taliban as child molesters and sexual exploiters of children. He sexually exploits Sohrab through anal intercourse and keeps him for his entertainment until he is rescued by Amir. He withdraws orphans from orphanages and does whatever he likes with them.

Hosseini also represents the climate of fear/terror that the Taliban operate in Afghanistan through various instruments of terror. Such a mechanism of terror is the “Beard Patrol” which Amiri delineates as “stern-faced young men...Kalashnikovs slung on their shoulders” (p. 247). The gaze of one of them terrifies the protagonist and he is warned never to stare them in the eyes again. Dr Rasul, the old beggar, explicates that they (the Taliban) “drive around looking. Looking and hoping that someone will provoke them. Sooner or later, someone always obliges. Then the dogs feast...and everyone says ‘*Allah-u-Akbar!*’ And on those days when no one offends...there is always random violence” (p. 248). The atmosphere of terror is reinforced by the Taliban’s public execution that serves as the interlude in Ghazi Stadium. The offenders are stoned by Assef during half-time of the football match as a part of implementing the *shari’a*. The atmosphere of terror is characterised by horsewhip-carrying Taliban, hitting of women, and beating of anybody that trespasses their rules.

Hosseini also represents the Taliban’s maltreatment of women and the effects of excluding women from working, a lacuna in Zaeef’s representation of the group. Hosseini uses the congestion of the orphanages to accentuate the repercussion of the Taliban’s terrorism against Afghans. According to Zaman, the director of the orphanage, “many of them have lost their fathers in the war, and their mothers can’t feed them because the Taliban don’t allow them to work. So they bring their children here” (p. 253). Hosseini portrays the implication of the Taliban’s fundamentalist ordinance of excluding women from work which Zaeef is reticent about. The women are not able to feed their children but send them to orphanages where they are still vulnerable to the Taliban’s terror. Women are forbidden

from speaking loud and they are hit when they do so. This symbolises the patriarchal underpinning of the Taliban's Islamic fundamentalism and extremism.

Afghanistan under the Taliban is depicted as full of rubble and dangerous for a Hazara orphan like Sohrab. Hence, Sohrab emigrates from his homeland to the United States where he remains silent and aloof from his hosts. This portrays the dilemma of the diaspora penchant of the author who is an Afghan diasporic writer. In this case, foreign land becomes the panacea of what the homeland has destroyed. While Zaeef represents the motivations of the Taliban and maintains a sanctimonious image of the group, Hosseini depicts the hypocrisy, highhandedness and terrorism of the Taliban. Hosseini, through his literary representation of the Taliban, chronicles the terror of the group through the agency of characters that represent the downtrodden.

In conclusion, culturally, literature plays an essential role in representing how terrorist groups or states shape/carve perception about themselves for patronage. Equally, literature mediates solutions to terrorism while portraying state actors and non-state actors as guilty of deploying terrorism. In the Israeli-Palestinian situation, the Israeli state and non-state actors are guilty of what is conceptualised as terrorism by other means/through the state architecture or state terrorism while the Palestinian non-state actors perpetrate parallel terrorism. However, literature presents the Melkite-Christian, peaceful alternative that is being promoted in contrast to the overwhelming mediated terrorism on both sides. Similarly, imperialism and neocolonial penchants breed violence and counter-violence in the case of Afghanistan. Imperial violence in the form of the incursion of the Third World's sovereignty and the drive to national-religious fundamentalism propel terrorism. While terrorism is condemnable, the war against terrorism should be perpetrated within the instrument of international law and respect of sovereignty. The war against terrorism should not be practiced as a war against the Other, whether guilty or not, based on the principle of the state of exception. The United States' counter-terrorism should put into consideration the socio-cultural, political, and historical trajectory of the Other to avoid the cultural/political suspicion of the hegemonic proclivities of the Global North towards the Other.

### **5.3. Representations of terrorism and the other in selected North American 9/11 novels**

The representation of non-western subjects in western novels, especially American novels, has been contested by postcolonial critics like Elleke Boehmer, Edward Said, among others. The non-western figures have been framed through stereotypical, generalised, and mediatised lens of western fantasy. These forms of depiction have been sustained in western novels of terrorism in which the non-westerners are usually portrayed as the terrorist or the Other that undermines the western Self. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States of America (USA), the representation of the Other in western terrorist novels has received polemical attention, coupled with the perceived Eurocentric war against terrorism that was launched by the Bush administration in the United States and the Global North in general. Scholars like Frank and Guber (2012) have inquired whether there has been continuity or disjuncture in the representation of terrorism in literature since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Considering Ella Shohat's (2010) argument that there are Third World subjects in the First World, this means that in a globalised and multicultural world, no society is homogenous. However, the West still tries to differentiate its Self from the Others through reinforced stereotypical socio-cultural, prejudicial and historical lens since the 9/11 attacks. Thus, this is reflected in mediatised image of the Others that have dominated cultural works like novels. This is a concern for postcolonial critics who perceive these undercurrents as neocolonial tendencies that lump the Other as homogenous. In this subsection, this thesis examines how the Other, both terrorist and non-terrorist, is represented in four 9/11 American literary expressions (three novels and an autobiography), the prejudice/facts behind the representations and the ethical questions that the sanctimonious image of the West about postcolonial subjects raise.

#### **5.3.1. Representing the Other in western novels about terrorism: a postcolonial perspective**

One of the critical fault lines of representing terrorism especially those perpetrated by the Other in western novels is the appropriation of the motivations of terrorism through the western prejudice/fantasy that Robert Eaglestone (2010) delineates as “blaming it on evil, illness or on universal desires” (p. 368). This means the non-western terrorist's violence is

rarely linked to the (neo)colonial/imperial violence of the west that has diffused from the postcolony to the metropolitan. Rather than representing the drives of the non-western terrorist Other as resistance against imperial violence and terror of the hegemonic military actions of the West/Global North, on the contrary, the terrorism of the Other is linked to superficial and personal motivations that strip him of political understanding of global matters. Eaglestone (2010) focalises this perception in his analysis of Martin Amis' short story: "The Last Days of Mohammed Atta". He wonders why the impulse for Atta's terrorist actions is linked to "bodily disgust and a death drive" (p. 367) by Amis rather than the "complex explanation involving Islamism" (p. 367). This study contends that this is a form of othering that the non-western Other is being motivated solely by personal drives rather than political drives. The non-western Other is essentialised as overtly emotional rather than rational like the western Self. This is analogous to the rationale behind colonialism as a "civilising mission" which is categorised as rational as against anti-colonial resistance that is designated "savagery attacks" on rationality. Therefore, there is a subjective/sentimental connection by western authors between the representation of terrorism, the non-western terrorist Other, and the motivations of terrorism. Eaglestone (2010) contends that this westernised framing limits the ways of defeating terrorism. From the postcolonial perspective, it is a way of turning a blind eye to the material/political motivations of terrorism for the Other by western authors.

Similarly, there is the negative homogeneity of the non-western Other in western novels of terrorism. For example, Marta Bosch-Vilarrubias (2016) delineates the stereotypical representation of Arab American masculinities as a threat, "a fear of the Other's hypermasculinity" (p. 18), and designates it a phobia of Arabo-Islamist masculinity that is pervasive in mainstream American media. She posits that Arab American men are homogenised as Muslims and are stereotypically characterised as billionaires, bombers, and sex maniacs while the "attacks on American soil...reinforced the racialization and vilification of Arabo-Islamist masculinity as abnormal" (p. 21). The implication is that it is generalised that Arab men as non-western Other are all Muslims and are terrorists which reflects in their representation in cultural works and this fits into the "enemy within narrative". Equally, this homogeneous/stereotypical representation obfuscates the Arab masculinity that is not a terrorist because of the negative image of Orient men that is

pervasive in the west, especially in the United States of America. This Eurocentric image also triggers western, traditional masculinist notions of the hero that protects the homeland from the non-western hyper-masculinist villain.

Furthermore, Bosch-Vilarrubias (2016) explicates the racialisation of the terrorist figure in her analysis of the *Homeland*, a television series. The white terrorist, Sergeant Brody, is humanised as becoming a terrorist for a good justification while the non-white terrorist has no acceptable justification. Therefore, in the western frame, race is ascribed to the categorisation of justifiable and unjustifiable terrorism. Brody, a white American, turns into a terrorist because Issa's school was bombed by the United States military and wishes to revenge the death of Issa. While this depiction subverts the non-western image of a terrorist, it still sustains the ambivalent representations of terrorism in western cultural works by representing Brody as a Muslim. The corollary is that although Brody is a white American soldier, he is a Muslim which indirectly transgresses his personality. This is described by Bosch-Vilarrubias (2016) as the "negative racialization of Islam". Albeit the representation of Islamic terrorism in this western cultural works, one wonders why Christian/Zionist terrorism, rightwing extremism, and white supremacist extremism are usually underrepresented.

There is also a prescriptive frame of representation that is predominant in western or American narratives of terrorism especially those that include the Other. According to John N. Duvall and Robert P. Marzee's (2011) analysis of Salman Rushdie's *Shalimar the Clown*, there is the fictionalised prescriptive account of perceiving terrorism "as an aggression by fundamentalists, Islam against an Innocent America, second as an attack by ideologues that hate freedom, and third as an isolated incident" (p. 390) which Rushdie subverts through the character of Shalimar. These are stereotypical frames of portraying the Other as evil and the West/American Self as innocent as well as the focalising of Islamic terrorism at the expense of other forms of terrorism practised by the Imperial Global North. This is analogous to Joseph M. Conte's (2011) observation in Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* that there is a contradiction in perceiving religious fundamentalism as alien but state-sponsored terrorism as one of the usual parts of "western political imbroglio" (p. 573), even though both are resisting the hegemony of the west. Correspondingly, the "global relations" of



events like the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts have undermined the framing of terrorism as an isolated event that accentuates Islamic terrorism over imperial hegemony sustained by western military interventions.

9/11 novels as they are popularly designated also reinforce the equation of Islam generally to terrorism which reinforces the western generalist perception of the Other. Caroline Mala Corbin (2017) expounds that in the United States, there abound the false narrative that “terrorists are always Muslims” (p. 456) because of “unconscious cognitive biases” (p. 457) and translates sometimes to all Muslims are terrorists. Robert Gray (2011) historicises this perception and states that “with the collapse of communism, a sinister other that enabled American self-definition may have disappeared. It is a truism, however, to say that it has now been replaced with Islam” (p. 32). He contends that writing the Other is now a challenge because of its “difference and danger” (p. 32). Thus, writing the “difference” for western writers, especially Americans, encompasses generalisation and stereotyping, adopting a narrow view of the Other that labels the generality of the Other, what Jack G. Shaheen (1997), citing Esposito, designates lumping Muslims together “based on stereotyping than on empirical research”. Margaret Scanlan (2010) observes that popular American novelists like Don DeLillo, John Updike, and Sherman Alexie also deploy this frame of representation and contends that “none of these writers creates a context large enough to include ordinary Muslims, people with differing political and religious perspective” (p. 267). The corollary of portraying only the Islamic terrorist entrenches the trenchant view that this is the single existential form of Islamism and promotes divisiveness. The postcolonial perspective is to evoke Islam, an othered religion in the West, as not only the narrow terrorist form but also one divorced from violence and militant *Jihad* like in Scanlan’s (2010) analysis of Hisham Matar’s *In the Country of Men*.

The representation of the Other in western novels of terrorism involves deploying isolationist and apolitical frames. The Other as terrorist is depicted in isolation to the political motivations of imperial violence in postcolonial spaces. Gray (2011) deplors this portrayal by many 9/11 American/western authors like John Updike as artificial and superficial reduction. The Other is either portrayed as apolitical but being motivated by superficial religious impulse or in isolation. Gray (2011) recommends that writers of 9/11

should register at once the communal tragedy of a place and the structural connections to tragic experiences elsewhere “(the devastation wrought on other particular places and people in other parts of the globe)” (83). The implication is a postcolonialist appraisal of terrorist events and their connections to variegated violent forms of imperialism in the postcolony, thereby, subverting the isolationist and apolitical representation of the Other in western novels of terrorism. This signifies that no terroristic event is isolationist or apolitical, any representation in this line is reductionist and superficial. While Gray (2011) underscores the “sense of *convergence* and a belief in the hybrid as the only space in which...the bearing of witness to trauma can properly occur” (83), a reification of “deterritorialization”, he overlooks the recovery and restitution that the Other needs, mostly, from the imperial west which is usually (easily) accessible to western subjects but not its Other like Changez in Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* still suffers racial profiling and discrimination after the 9/11 terrorist attacks despite being affected traumatically too by the 9/11 terrorist attacks and has to leave the United States.

Another argument is the deployment of the discourse of sympathy to represent the non-western terrorist subject in western novels of terrorism. Jessica McDonald (2016) posits that this representational approach overshadows the “historical, political, and contextual issues out of which these acts of protest and resistance arise” (p. 2). Her arguments focalises the portrayal of the non-western terrorist subject as an object of “fellow-feeling and relatability” that is irrational and inferior but compassionate. She explicates that DeLillo employs frames of sympathy by representing Hammad as “a figure of destitution and exclusion”, admitting “confusion and social uncertainty”, “his relationship with Leyla in Hamburg”, sexualised being and empathetic about other’s death but one wonders why Hammad does not halt his actions in the plot if he is actually compassionate. However, McDonald (2016) emphasises the lopsidedness of DeLillo’s representation of only radical Islam but one wonders why she characterises the frames of sympathy as “westernized ones”. Does this mean the sympathetic traits are not universal traits? She indirectly becomes a victim of what she denounces DeLillo of by characterising the pleasing sides of Hammad as westernised rather than humanised ones. It is rather apt to designate the positive behaviours as the humanised qualities that advance the question of humanising terrorists and terrorism that she raises as well. However, she reifies the motivations of terrorism that are overlooked in DeLillo’s

work which we contend as a politicisation of representation that pretentiously rises above the orientalisising argument against western authors.

Hence, this background review exposes two spectra of representations. The first reveals western writers that narrativise the non-western terrorist through the prejudicial frame of generalisation, a form of Orientalising the Other, while on the other side are those that try to humanise the non-western terrorist through the representational lens of sympathy. Therefore, this thesis analyses how the non-western terrorists or subjects are represented in John Updike's *Terrorist*, Amy Waldman's *The Submission (TS)*, Don DeLillo's *Falling Man (FM)* and James Yee's *For God and Country (FGAC)* as a form of continuity or disjuncture. The inquiries include how the non-western subjects are portrayed to entrench continuity in representation or a rupture for becoming.

### **5.3.2. Representations of the hybridised postcolonial (terrorist) subject in John Updike's *Terrorist*: orientalisising and continuity**

John Updike's *Terrorist* is one of the 9/11 terrorist novels that responds to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and has been criticised by critics like Gray (2011) as superficial and his imagining of the Other as never fitting "together as a meaningful story" (p. 34). Updike, a prolific American writer, narrativises the life of Ahmad, an Arab American, generally described as an Arab in the novel, and his confluence with the American lives of college bullying, capitalism, sexual wantonness, immigrants' lives and that of a single mother. Ahmad is the son of Omar Ashmawy, an Egyptian who wanted to enjoy the American dream by marrying an American, and Teresa Mulloy, an Irish-American. Ahmad's father is absent throughout the novel, thus, he is raised by his sexually wanton nurse-aide, artist mother who sleeps with his school guidance counsellor, Jack Levy – a Jew. Ahmad is devoted to Islam, struggles with alienation from the American society, and finds ambivalent solace in the Islamic tutoring of Shaikh Rashid, a Yemeni. Considering Frank and Guber's inquiry on whether 9/11 has engendered continuity or disjuncture in the representation of terrorism – terrorists as an extension, it is pertinent to interrogate how Updike represents the non-western subject in *Terrorist* based on orientalist frames. In this section, this thesis contends that Updike, an American author, represents the non-western subject, Ahmad, Charlie Chehab, and Shaikh Rashid, who will be referred to, sometimes,

as hybridised Other through subsisting Orientalising frames of generalisation and negativity. Equally, Updike's one-sided portrayal of non-western subjects, postcolonial subjects like Ahmad, as exuding anti-Americanism symptomises anti-immigration proclivities for Muslims that 9/11 engenders. This, therefore, undermines the hybridised identity of the postcolonial subjects in American society and signifies them as the imperfect object of a pure western subject. The corollary is that hybridised identities like Arab Americans are still categorised by the rubric of Arab, a form of othering in the American society. This form of representation is a continuity of the old order of depiction.

The most obvious form of Orientalising the Other in Updike's *Terrorist* is the seeming racial profiling in the text especially of Muslims from the Middle East who are postcolonial subjects. Although many critics like Gray (2011), Peter C. Herman (2015) have concentrated on the character of Ahmad, it is essential to examine how Updike profiles Shaikh Rashid, a Yemeni, as an ideologue of terrorism that radicalises Ahmad. The representation of Shaikh Rashid is problematic and its generalist tendency profiles Muslims from Yemen/Middle East as radical Islamists without depicting any exception. The portrayal of a monotheist Shaikh is a single story that Orientalises the Other as homogeneous. In Levy's discussion of pluralism and tolerance with Ahmad, Ahmad informs him that "Shaikh Rashid... feels that such a relativistic approach trivializes religion" which means Shaikh is intolerant of "a variety of viewpoints" and a monotheist. However, one wonders why Updike does not portray a contradictory standpoint from another Shaikh but Mr Levy, an atheist. This rendering subtly underscores a generalist frame that portrays Shaikhs with Middle Eastern provenance as radical and irrational. This in itself reifies the Orientalising of the Other by the West as typified by Updike. The ethical burden of representation is that it should be balanced, depicting the radical and those that denounce it. Although Herman (2015) contends that Updike "uses these characters to channel the actual view of America among radical Islamists" (p. 702), this does not suffice for the unbalanced portrayal of only the radicals without depicting the views of those from the same Middle Eastern or postcolonial extraction that have rejected these radical views. This representation also exudes anti-Americanism among the Muslim Middle Easterners which is stereotypical.

Similarly, the depiction of Omar, Ahmad's father, is exotic, negative, and more of Updike's imagination. Omar is depicted as exploitative and patriarchal. According to Teresa, his ex-wife, "I was...in love mostly with him being...exotic, third-world, put-upon, and my marrying him showing how liberal and liberated I was". One can extrapolate that Teresa's expression subtly represents Updike's vision to humanise the non-western subject by being liberal, a frame of Orientalising the Other for western readers. The crux is that Updike still represents Omar, a postcolonial subject, negatively and foregrounds the tradition of the absent father in most marginalised families in American literature like in Richard Wright's *Native Son*. Blacks, especially Black Muslims, are also represented negatively. The narrator describes Omar's ancestors as "baked since the time of the Pharaohs" and describes African-American congregants as bringing "their dishevelled, shouting religion" and "their award-winning choir dissolving their brains in a rhythmical rapture". The narrator employs derogatory words to describe Arabs and Black Muslims while Levy ascribes simplicity to Arabs and Black Muslims, which is a form of othering.

In addition, Charlie Chehab's role is ambivalent swinging between the positive of being a CIA agent, the negative of wrongfully influencing Ahmad to "get...laid" and becoming a *shahid*, a martyr. While Habib Chehab represents a positive representation of the generational gap between the old migrants and their descendants, Charlie's role as a CIA agent cast aspersion on him as a postcolonial subject that turns a western agency. Therefore, examining Updike's portrayal of most Muslim characters with Middle Eastern ancestry as negative and radical, Charlie's role as an exception does not fit a plausible representation. The corollary is that if Charlie is not a CIA mole in the jihadi group, he will probably be a radical Islamist. Although Herman (2015) posits that Charlie occupies a liminal position, the liminality of Charlie is a form of othering that makes him an object to be deployed by the CIA for its purpose of cracking the jihadist cell. Updike's narrative about his death, as explained by Levy, does not satisfy the positivity and exception that Charlie would have occupied as a hybridised American with a Middle Eastern ancestry.

Equally, the Orientalising of the non-Western subject also problematises ethnic hybridity in post-9/11 American society that Updike depicts. Hybridity described by Antony Easthope (1998) as an individual "having access to two or more ethnic identities" (146) which should

be a common form of asserting ethnic *difference*, pluralism, multiculturalism and neo-global identity is undermined in Updike's *Terrorist* and this presents the American disposition that follows the 9/11 terrorist attacks which assert the postcolonial condition of the hybrid as an Other. Although Homi Bhabha (1994) theorises the hybrid as a space of *difference* – the “possibility of cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (4), however, in the diasporic space of the First World, the *difference* has become a tool of othering by imperial subjects as expressed in the post 9/11 American society represented by Updike. There are still manifestations of hierarchical authority based on what races are hybridised like the case of Ahmad and Levy. Muslims that have hybridised identity like Ahmad, an Arab American, are othered as an imperfect/impure form of the Eurocentric American identity. Ahmad, an Arab American, despite being a product of an American conjugation is perceived by characters, like Tylenol, as an “Arab” not American, despite being a hybrid subject. Ahmad's hybridised identity is foregrounded by characters like Tylenol to typify his “outsider”/in-betweenness position in the American society that places him as an object of racial profiling. While Tylenol, the Homeland Secretary, and Hermione, his undersecretary, represent the predominant perception of Americans especially in the US government about hybridised Americans from Islamic extractions, this should not be a general view of all Americans which Updike misses to represent. Lisa Hartnell and Anna Hartnell (2011) in a likely manner state that Updike's Muslims may be “not quite American”, borrowing Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad's book title, their position signifies the othering of the hybridised Muslim American like Ahmad. One would inquire why they are “not quite American”, mainly, because of race and religion. The corollary is that a Levy, a Jew American, is more acceptable than Ahmad, an Arab American, because of his Islamic background and this perception shapes his relationship with the post 9/11 American society.

Updike's narrativisation of the connection between Islam and violence also signifies the Orientalist trope of knowing the Other. As Hartnell and Hartnell (2011) state that Updike perceives “Islam as a religion tainted with violence” (p. 486), this standpoint undermines the pluralism in Islam. Updike focalises the radicalism of some fringes in Islam while neglecting those that avow peace as a way of Islam which Ahmad later admits at the end of the narrative. The representation of religion as the only motivation for Ahmad's attack and

that of Shaikh Rashid's radicalisation is a form of othering that places a non-western subject within the prism of religion rather than the political. Updike underscores the impulse for Islamic terrorism as predominantly religious, attacking "the godless Western culture", but this vantage point neglects the imperialism of America that prompts the radicalism of some fringes in Islam. The representation of the non-western subject or the liminal, hybridised postcolonial subject in the west, as a religious being more than a political animal is more of othering than of balanced representation. This becomes more plausible when the only non-western subject, Charlie, that moots the subject of imperialism turns out to be a CIA spy, a western agency. This connotes that political reasoning is for the West or its agency while the non-West is majorly perceived from the frame of religious extremism, mostly detached from socio-political and historical nuances. Charlie explains to Ahmad that "in a war between an imperialist occupier and the people who actually live there, the people will eventually prevail" and states that the true believers believe that "the Muslim peasant in Mindanao need not starve...that the Palestinians need not be strafed by Israeli helicopters". Thus, Charlie, a non-western subject turn western spy, is the only character that connects the foreign policy of America to the home-grown jihadist movement. This type of subtle categorisation of characters based on the political versus religion reifies the othering of the non-western subject as basically a religious subject. The corollary is that Updike's representation of the motivations of the Other's terrorism in America becomes reductionist, based on extreme religious fundamentalism and not the implications of America's imperial foreign policy. This type of representation shifts the gaze of an unwary reader from the effects of imperialism in all forms on both the postcolony and the metropole to superfluous reasons for terrorism. Updike typifies this by basing the radicalisation of Ahmad by Shaikh Rashid on purely Islamic religious extracts that are pulled out of context.

Another symptomatic problem of Updike's representation of the Other in *Terrorist* is the racialisation of Islam. Neil Gotanda (2011) conceptualises racialisation as the "inscription of an ascribed subordination on a raced body linked to a raced category" (p. 187) which means racialisation is connected to bodies, subordination, and prejudicial categories. The additional perspective is that ideas or cultural concepts can be racialised. Considering the historic, acrimonious relationship between the West and its Other, culture is a part of the warring domains which means Islam is framed as a religion of the Other, as Jennifer E.

Cheng (2015) posits that there is evidence that “Islam is conflated with a ‘non-white’ religion” (p. 563). This translates to the trope of Orientalising the Other as well as intersecting Islam with race which is part of the discourse of Islamophobia and Muslimophobia, without getting into the contention of the more appropriate term. Updike maintains this mode of representation in *Terrorist* by representing Arabs, hybridised subjects with Middle Eastern background, and Blacks as practitioners of Islam who “want to go back to simple”, according to Levy. They are represented as strange and an object of bewilderment for western agency like the Secretary of Homeland security and Levy, a Jewish American, an assimilated western agency. This is invoked by Hermione who deploys the animalisation trope to reify the Manichean portrayal of Islamists, whose majority are connected to terrorism in the narrative, as hating light versus the western subject as the light that “shone in the darkness”. This depicts the binarism of non-western/hybrid subject with connection to Islam as agents of darkness versus the western subject as an agency of light, this underscores the negativity associated with the Other in cultural works like *Terrorist* without portraying the Other that does not fit the negative, stereotypical category. In Updike’s *Terrorist*, the hybrid Other is mostly connected with Islam, an interest in terrorism and the “racial category” of spying, adopting Gotanda’s (2011) categorisation.

Also, Updike employs the western agency as the arbiter of regulating and correcting the hybrid Other. In *Terrorist*, while Levy occupies a liminal position like Ahmad, he is more favourable to be ascribed a positive image because of his Jewish heritage which is connected to the western imaginary of its Self. This categorises him as a western agency. Hence, it is not surprising that Levy keeps monitoring and interrogating Ahmad to know him as an Other. This means an immoral western agency oversees a non-western terrorist subject to make him rational, an indirect invoking of the master-slave trope between Robinson Crusoe and Friday. This leaves Ahmad as a confused object that needs the guidance of a western subject. While Levy’s action is commendable, it still inscribes the western/non-western master-slave trope of driving reason into the slave which means the slave is not capable of reasoning on its own. One will wonder why Updike does not inscribe an alternative imam in the position of Levy to correct Ahmad’s inculcation of Shaikh Rashid’s misleading teachings. The appropriation of Levy as the guidance counsellor that stops Ahmad from his planned terrorist attack connotes the politics of representation implicit in western novels



like *Terrorist*. This politics signifies western intervention like guidance counselling as the epitome of rationality while subverting Islam, an Othered religion, as an option for correcting irrationality or extremism. Also, the representation of Shaikh Rashid as the only imam in *Terrorist* is trenchant and closes the worldview of the reader to the alternative imams whose preaching does not promote violence and terrorism. While Updike states that he wishes to represent radical Islamists in his novel, he is culpable of representing only the radical ones without including Muslims that oppose these mediatised Islamic figures that have generalised as the sole constituents of Islam. This makes Updike guilty of generalisation and stereotyping in *Terrorist* and this is more pronounced with the omission of the definite article from the title of his novel, “terrorist” as a title generalises rather than “the terrorist” which would have valorised the culpability of the individual rather than a group.

#### **5.3.2.1. Tropes and representations in *Terrorist***

The predominant trope deployed in Updike’s *Terrorist* to represent the relationship between the hybridised western subject and its Other, the hybridised non-western subject, is the master-slave paradigm. The relationship between Levy and Ahmad is premised on the master-slave dialectic, although depicted subtly. Levy is Ahmad’s guidance counsellor at Central High School and occupies a master position over him because he is to know him and guide him while Ahmad represents a student, a seeming slave occupying a subordinated position, that is confused and directionless. Even after Ahmad leaves Central High School, Levy continues to master him, seeking to know him and control him. This depiction positions Levy, a hybridised western subject, as an agency of rationality, a master, that guides to correct the excesses of the Other, Ahmad. Despite Updike portraying Levy as the person that stops Ahmad from perpetrating a terrorist act, which is commendable, the relationship between Levy and Ahmad reifies the master-slave imaginary that has been adopted by many Western fiction writers to depict the relationship between a Western Self and its Other. A veritable example is the type of master-slave relationship between Robinson Crusoe and Friday in Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*. From the postcolonial perspective, Defoe employs this master-slave dialectic between Crusoe and Friday to signify Crusoe, a Western subject, as an epitome of reason that stops Friday from cannibalism and teaches

him “civil” ways. This is the similar tropology employed by Updike in *Terrorist* by positioning Levy, a hybridised western subject, as the master that seeks to know the Other and curtails its excesses. The postcolonial argument will interrogate the essentiality of Levy in that position of representation rather than a non-Western subject.

Another trope is the animalisation of the Other. While Hermione tries to assuage the Secretary of Homeland’s spirit, she refers to the assumed Islamic terrorists as “cockroaches” and “bats” that blossom in darkness. The appropriation of the animalisation trope signifies the death sentiment associated with the Other as terrorist which represents extermination rather than prosecution. Cockroaches and bats should be obliterated. Equally, there is the trope of the non-Western/hybrid subject as a threat, especially those with Muslim extraction. In narratives about terrorism like John’s *Born on a Tuesday*, the Other through ethnic/religious differentiation is perceived as a threat to the local space. Updike appropriates the same imaginary in *Terrorist*. The hybrid subjects like Ahmad, Shaikh Rashid, Omar (Ahmad’s father) with Muslim provenance are negatively portrayed to signify the threat of the Other to the western Self that is, however, not homogeneous. The threat of the Other also foregrounds anti-immigration sentiments that has exponentially increased post 9/11 in the American society and other European metropole.

In conclusion, John Updike’s representation of the western Other as a terrorist is a continuity of the representation of terrorism, deploying stereotypical and generalist frame to suit the Western readers’ perception of the Other. Updike’s single story appeals to anti-immigrant sentiments and anti-Islam/Muslim sentiments because of its single-story portrayal.

### **5.3.3. Representing post-9/11: fundamentalism, agencies and paradox in Amy Waldman’s *The Submission***

Amy Waldman’s *The Submission* represents a shift from the generalist and stereotypical representation of the Other, hybrid postcolonial subject, in 9/11 novels to a polyphonic narrative, adopting Paula Martin-Salvan’s designation (2017). *The Submission* depicts the uproar that follows the discovery that a Muslim’s commemorative design has been chosen to memorialise the victims of a terrorist attack in Manhattan, revealing the complexities of multiculturalism in post 9/11 America and the required sympathy for the discrimination

against Muslims. In an anonymous competition to commemorate the victims of a terrorist attack, probably 9/11, in New York, Garden is advocated fervently by Claire Burwell, a widow, and a representative of the victims' family on the jury, and is selected as the winner. Everything changes when members of the jury discover the entrant's name is Mohammed Khan. The subsequent actions portray the endemic American paranoia of Islam, the manipulation of politics by characters like Governor Bitman, and the misrepresentation of the hybrid postcolonial subject by the media represented by Alyssa Spier and Lou Sarge. Mo, Mohammed's popular sobriquet, later submits to pressure by withdrawing his submission and leaving America. The novel concludes with ruses about the dearth of a befitting commemorative memorial for the victims. The plotting is based on the controversy of an Asian-American Artist Maya Lin winning the commission to design the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington.

Previous critical studies, like Sonia Baello-Allue (2016), Margarita Estévez-Saá and Noemí Pereira-Ares (2016), Sini Eikonsalo (2017), Paula Martin-Salvan (2017), have examined Waldman's *The Submission* from the cultural trauma perspective. Baello-Allue (2016) describes Waldman's *The Submission* as a shift from the previous depoliticised psychic trauma in 9/11 novels to the political and cultural/collective trauma model. While she observes correctly the shift to the political, she does not examine the implication of the shift on the depiction of characters like Mohammed Khan and Asma. Estévez-Saá and Pereira-Ares (2016) contend that some post-9/11 novels like Waldman's *The Submission* represent ways of moving beyond trauma, a form of transcultural positioning. A position that undercuts itself. For example, Estévez-Saá and Pereira-Ares (2016) note that most of the eastern characters, like Changez in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, Mo in Waldman's *The Submission*, left America to escape from "a public rhetoric that conflates "Muslimness" and terrorism" (p. 272). While this thesis concedes with them that it is a long-time project, however, the characters' desertion of America is not an illustration of living together and that conjecture of a long-term project is merely a fantasy.

Also, Sini Eikonsalo (2017) observes Waldman's shift from the depoliticised narrative technique to a cultural traumatic paradigm that portrays complex identities and "turns the reader's sympathy away from the traumatized victims towards new targets" (p. 82) but the

question is why sympathy should be the pedestal for accepting the (hybrid) postcolonial subject in America. She opines that Waldman in *The Submission* deconstructs stereotypes through her characters, that “identities are not fixed but fluid” (p. 91), and that *The Submission* does represent a “new phase in the subgenre of 9/11 novels” (p. 91). In this section, this thesis extends Eikonsalo’s (2017) exposition of Waldman’s deconstruction of the stereotypes to a deeper examination of the postcolonial subjects represented, especially Mohammed Khan and Asma. On the other hand, Martin-Salvan (2017) contends that Waldman employs polyphony as a narrative strategy in *The Submission* and that memorialisation of 9/11 in America is more of anationalistic ideology than the embodiment of a community’s grief over a traumatic effect which means the national ideology dictates the memorialisation of 9/11. Any contrary conception erupts friction but she asserts that Waldman projects “antagonism as manageable difference” (p. 102) in *The Submission*. What they conclude as continuing “to learn about the unknown other” (p. 277) is a subtle continuation of Orientalising the Other like the documentary that ends Waldman’s *The Submission*.

The gap in these previous studies is the failure to perceive Mohammed Khan and Asma as a different shade/guise of fundamentalism. Similarly, previous critical studies have observed the movement from sympathy for the victims to sympathy for Muslims like Mohammed Khan and Asma. This sympathy model evokes the ambivalence in Waldman’s *The Submission* which is both a discontinuity in some aspects and a subtle continuity in other aspects. Why should the (hybrid) postcolonial subject in America, a First World country, be accepted based on sympathy and not the merit of human dignity? Why should the Garden be accepted after Asma’s visceral outburst at the public hearing? From a postcolonial perspective, these are some of the questions that the adoption of sympathy by Waldman in *The Submission* arouse. This narrative strategy still panders to the American reader on the perception of the Other which continues the domineering power relation between America and its Other.

### **5.3.3.1. Fundamentalism and deconstruction of the stereotype in *The Submission***

9/11 novels as they are notably designated have depicted postcolonial subjects as religious/Islamic fundamentalists, extremists, and terrorists. A veritable example is Shaikh

Rashid in Updike's *Terrorist* who is depicted as an Islamic fundamentalist, ideologue, and extremist and similar to Don DeLillo's depiction of Hammad in *Falling Man*. In postcolonialism, representations play a crucial role in discourse and can be compromised/prejudiced by the person representing a subject. Waldman's *The Submission* does not only deconstruct the negative stereotypical portrayals of hybridised postcolonial subjects in America that have populated most 9/11 novels but also suggest that there are different guises of fundamentalism in which Mohammed Khan is cast in the positive perception while Debbie Dawson, the leader of Save America from Islam, is cast on the other side. Though many critical studies have omitted the examination of Debbie Dawson, this study compares her actions with that of Mohammed Khan to evince the shades of fundamentalism that are often accentuated while there is silence on others.

Although fundamentalism originates from religion especially Protestantism, most times, fundamentalism is still usually conceived in the box of religion, however, there are various shades of fundamentalism that have evolved in various aspects of non-religious spaces. Malise Ruthven (2007) asserts that, historically, the applications of fundamentalism "have strayed far beyond the umbrella of the Abrahamic monotheisms" (p. 20) and that fundamentalism "now encompass many types of activity, not all of them religious" (p. 21). Although Ruthven (2007) later opines that the extension may not be necessary, however, we contend that it is in a broader sense because the later explication that "the original Protestant use of the anchors it in the responses of individual or collective selfhoods, of personal or group identities, to the scandal or shock of the other" (p. 22) justifies our argument that fundamentalism should not be limited to religion.

Traditionally, fundamentalism is "an American invention" (Klaus Stierstorfer, 2007:143) with the publication of *The Fundamentals: A Testimony* funded by "Lyman and Milton Stewart between 1910 and 1915" (Stierstorfer, 2007:143). Stierstorfer (2007) defines fundamentalism as "one reaction against the basic tenets and consequences of modernity and its eventual culmination in modernism" (p. 144). This delineation restricts fundamentalism to religion which does not consider "secular fundamentalism" (Helga Ramsey-kurz, 2007:161). This makes the assertion of Kevin L. Cope (2007) that "incongruity is a fundamental condition of fundamentalism" (p. 181) relevant in analysing

the representation of Mohammed Khan in Waldman's *The Submission* and other characters. In the novel, Mohammed Khan represents an "out of place" character for his connection to Islam, submitting a memorial design for victims of an Islamic terrorist attack and his refusal to alter it. In this study, we conceptualise fundamentalism as an incongruity that causes political implication or upheavals. This incongruity is caused by sticking to definite principles or the fundamentals of an endeavour be it religious or secular. In this analysis, we will extract fundamentalism from its religious circle to the secular.

Mohammed Khan can be conceived a fundamentalist because he conceives his original commemorative, architecture design of Ground Zero as sacrosanct, fundamental, and unchangeable like the religious fundamentalists in 9/11 novels that consider the doctrine sacred and impermissible to jurisprudence. Terrorist-characters like Hammad in DeLillo's *Falling Man*, Shaikh Rashid, and Ahmad in Updike's *Terrorist* base their fundamentalism on the Quran and their religious ideologies, on the other hand, Mohammed Khan's fundamentalism is based on his memorial design that should not be altered but to reify his self-identity as a liberal Muslim and professional architect. The former representation like Ahmad is cast in negativity while the latter, Mohammed Khan (Mo), is deconstructed by Waldman to depict how fundamentalism exists in various realms of human endeavours. In the case of the preponderant negative characters that characterise early 9/11 novels, their fundamentalism engenders violence while Mohammed Khan's seeks to stimulate memory and healing. According to Mo, "my idea felt like it had the right balance between remembering and recovering" (p. 63). This contrasts him with Updike's characters like Ahmad and Shaikh Rashid. Mo is represented as what Gordon Campbell (2007) designates "peaceful fundamentalists" (p. 11), what is termed passive fundamentalism in this study.

It is his fundamentalism that makes him reject Paul Rubin's offer to make the memorial proceed under the name of Emmanuel Roi, Mo's boss. Paul Rubin attempts to gratify the dominant American exceptional populace that perceives anybody connected to Islam as a threat. Mo's repudiation of this offer parallels the religious zealots that will not tolerate change to their religious interpretation or ideology. Paul Rubin offers to proceed with the project but with a different name that will pander to the American public but Mo rejects the offer. Mo insists that "I want the same credit for my design as any other winner" (p. 63).

Mo insists on the fundamental of the rule that makes one perceive him as intolerant like the previous stereotypes in early 9/11 novels. While this positive representation evinces essentialist representation, one cannot but notice this departure that deconstructs the previous stereotypical representation despite being ambivalent because Mo's portrayal projects an unyielding, uncompromising, and insensitive character that will be discussed later as a form of resistance. Mo, therefore, exhibits professional fundamentalism.

Similarly, to portray Mo's fundamentalism to his profession and individual identity, he rejects Claire Burwell's manipulation to alter the architectural design to suit her vision to keep supporting him. In *The Submission*, Claire Burwell is the only family of the victims on the jury and represents the perspective of the deceased's family. She is the champion of the Garden as a befitting memorial for the victims of the unnamed terrorist attack, possibly 9/11, in Manhattan but she wavered when Alyssa Spier, a desperate journalist, informed her that Mo travelled to Kabul, Afghanistan, and that he "made a threat against the embassy there" (p. 160). However, Spier in her manipulative proclivity does not reveal the circumstances behind Mo's threat to Claire. Claire's simplistic and generalist imagery of Kabul as a place for terrorists makes her doubt her support for Mo more and tries to convince him to alter/change the commemorative design to her taste. Claire advises Mo to "make some changes to the Garden to calm the fears. Take out the canals, so your opponents won't be able to say it's the paradise in the Quran" (p. 269) but Mo repudiates the advice. Claire proceeds that "just some common ground, that you're flexible" (p. 269) but Mo insists on maintaining the fundamentals of design that follows the geometric tradition of artists like "Mondrian, Mies, Agnes Martin, LeWitt, Ad Reinhardt" (p. 269). Mo's insistence on maintaining the memorial design as it is makes him a fundamentalist of his profession and arts in general, maintaining the tradition of previous artists and entrenching his self-identity. This Mo's proclivity represented by Waldman in *The Submission* accentuates the various guises of fundamentalism in which Mo represents the opposite side of the spectrum that focalises healing and recovery in contrary to the negative hybridised postcolonial fundamentalists that characterise early 9/11 novels like Updike's *The Terrorist*.

Mo's fundamentalism makes him withdraw his memorial design from the competition rather than succumb to the pressure of modifying the design. Mo treats his design like a

sacred text that should not be modified because of the symbolic interpretation of some sections of the American populace that compares it to martyr's paradise in the Quran. Waldman's representation of Mo's unyielding impulse parallels Mo with earlier characters in 9/11 novels like Shaikh Rashid and Ahmad in Updike's *Terrorist*, however, in a positive and interrogative guise that reifies Sini Eikonsalo's (2017) argument that Waldman's characters challenge stereotypes. This position conceives fundamentalism as fluid and existing in various guises in (trans)culture.

The contrasting figures of characters as fundamentalists in Waldman's *The Submission* that have been omitted by critics are Sean Gallagher and Debbie Dawson. While Mo represents a fundamentalist of his profession and self, Sean Gallagher and Debbie Dawson signify nationalist/American fundamentalists contesting what A Wall Street Journal op-ed in the novel designates "an assault on America's Judeo-Christian heritage" (p. 116). Debbie Dawson, for example, conceives America as a Christian nation that should occlude any Islamic influence and, therefore, establishes Save America from Islam. The nomenclature of her organisation typifies fundamentalism and intolerance for the Other, Islam, or its adherents in this case. Debbie Dawson is a nationalist fundamentalist that considers Islam abhorrent to the American Judeo-Christian tradition. This fundamentalism makes her mock the Other by showing herself in "a see-through burka with only a bikini underneath" (p. 130). She deploys the symbol of burka that is connected to the Other of America to mock the Other to establish an American Self of Christian exceptionalism. Her national-Christian fundamentalism makes her lead a group that mock Islam deploying symbols that undermine the other. Mortifying symbols like "a pig eating a Quran" (p. 150), "drawing of a gun aimed at a turbaned man" (p. 150) exhibits fundamentalism that borders intolerance and extremism that parallels the Islamic extremist/terrorist characters in early 9/11 novels. Claire's fundamentalism upholds the American/Judeo-Christian tradition by stating that:

For generations immigrants came to this country and assimilated, accepted American values. But Muslims want to change America—no, they want to conquer it. Our constitution protects religious freedom, but Islam is not a religion. It's a political ideology, a totalitarian one. (*TS*, p. 151)



Waldman employs Debbie Dawson to depict the crescendo of nationalist fundamentalism and its ridiculous extent and compares her and members of her association to “some lost Judaic tribe” (p. 130). It is absurd that she anticipates that the construction of Mo’s Garden can lead to the conquest of America and most superfluous that Debbie states that Islam is not a religion. This type of rhetoric culminates in terror like the headscarf pulling in the novel. This type of nationalist fundamentalism parallels the Islamic fundamentalism that drives terrorism. This analysis portrays the subtle different symptomatic guises of fundamentalism that Waldman interrogates in *The Submission*.

Another typical example of nationalist/American exceptional fundamentalism *The Submission* is Sean Gallagher whose brother, Patrick, died in the terrorist attack two years ago. Sean employs the Memorial Support Committee as a pedestal for self-gratification of his ego. He exhibits the typical American nationalist fundamentalism that projects the masculine figure as dominant and this makes him underrate Claire as a representative of the victims’ families on the jury. Waldman deploys Sean as a representative of an average American/Judeo-Christian fundamentalist that utilises the contention about the memorial design as an avenue of self-actualisation. Sean’s treatment of Claire and the pulling of Zahira Hussain’s headscarf depict the misogynist inclination that underpin his nationalist fundamentalism. Waldman uses Sean to depict the interconnection between national fundamentalism and gender oppression.

However, despite the variations of fundamentalism that Waldman represents in *The Submission*, she delineates Mo and Sean as sensitive enough to retract while Debbie Dawson signifies the unrepentant fundamentalism. Mo later withdraws his memorial design to douse the tension while Sean retraces his steps to accept diversity as a necessary feature of American life. Conversely, Debbie Dawson continues to misrepresent Islam *generally* as a threat that the American tradition should repudiate. Waldman’s depiction of American fundamentalism does not exonerate liberalism which Claire Burwell and Paul Rubin typify. Waldman uses Claire and Paul to mock the sanctimonious disposition of liberalism that seeks openings for self-gain which Claire valorises when she joins Issam Malik, the director of The Muslim American Coordinating Council, to disavow Mo’s commemorative design. Issam Malik is peeved because of Mo’s statement that the Quran was written by a man while

Claire's annoyance is that Mo does not comment/reject the possible connection between his memorial design, the Garden, and the supposed martyr's garden. Waldman's theme is that fundamentalism is inherent in various spheres of life and that liberalism that focalises seeming pluralism can be undermined by self-interest.

### **5.3.3.2. Symbolism, resistance and manipulative agency in *The Submission***

Symbolism plays essential communicative roles in terrorism and culture. With the preponderance of terrorism since 9/11, critics like Houen (2002) contend that 9/11 is symbolic and target symbolic centres in America that represent western civilisation. Jonathan Matusitz (2015) defines symbolism as the language of symbols that may be material or immaterial, like a concept, event or action, and channels communication between a sender and a receiver. Terrorism can be analysed as a symbolic act from the date of the attack to the target(s). Matusitz (2015) contends that terrorism is performative violence that aims to produce symbolic acts of violence. The symbolism inherent in terrorism has created suspicion and exchange of communicative narratives in culture and everyday life. Symbolism can be religious, secular, national, or multivocal. Waldman in *The Submission* represents the fear of symbolism that 9/11 has promoted in American culture.

Waldman depicts the fear of and contest between symbolism that succeeds 9/11 which has dominated the American culture. Mo's Garden is perceived as a "martyrs' paradise" because he is a Muslim and it is mediated by most media outlets as an Islamic symbol of paradise on earth. The statement by a Fox News anchor that "the memorial design may actually be a martyrs' paradise" (p. 116) represents how the media promote the culture of symbolism that succeeds 9/11. Mo's memorial design, the Garden, is connected to the martyrdom motive of the terrorists and linked to Islam and a subtle means of replicating it on earth. However, Mo conceives the Garden as a symbol of mourning and healing. The variations in the interpretation of the symbolic meaning of Mo's memorial design present a contestation in the culture of symbolism and the link between the material and immaterial. To those opposed to Mo's Garden, "he's trying to encourage new martyrs" (p. 116). The mediated symbolism fuels suspicion and hostility towards the Other. According to Claire, who later succumbs to the mistrust, "a garden's just garden until you decide to plant suspicion there"

(202). However, Claire fails to realise the age of symbolism that terrorist attacks have birthed.

Also, the contestation of the symbolic meaning of Mo's Garden depicts the power relation between the West and its Others within its space. Mo is a hybrid(ised) postcolonial subject in America, a First World country, and a dominant western country. Waldman depicts the power relations between America, that is not a pure identity but rooted in European identity, and its Others, with roots to the Third World. Mo occupies the space of a Third World subject in the West whose design is presumed as a medium of performative action to conquer America. Mo's Garden is not only operating in the realm of the symbolic but the suspicion of his work is also symbolic, communicating the perennial mistrust between the West and its Other. This symbolic contestation is promoted by Orientalists like David Albon, a Professor of Middle Eastern studies, and journalists like Lou Sarge. Albon states that "Islam is an expansionist religion and where Islam has gone, gardens have followed...So here we have, right in Manhattan, an Islamic paradise" (p.2220). This means he reads Mo's memorial design as a site for martyrdom which contrasts Mo's conception of the Garden as a place of healing and place. Mo explicates that

To me the wall framing the garden, the wall with the names, is an allegory for the way grief frames the aftermath of this tragedy. Life goes on, the spirit rejuvenates—this is what the garden represents. But whereas the garden grows, and evolves, and changes with the seasons, the wall around it changes not at all. (*TS*, p. 217)

Mo designs the Garden as a symbol of rejuvenation and secondly as a symbol of multiculturalism that the American fundamentalists repudiate. According to Mo, "my point is that the Garden with all of these influences is what makes it American" (p. 218). Waldman employs the contestation on the symbolic semantics of the Garden to depict the mistrust between most Americans and postcolonial subjects connected to Islam. Equally, Waldman's connection of the Garden to Kabul in the last part of the novel is ambivalent but cautions against generalisation. Kabul in the media is a centre of conflict but the Garden in Kabul visited by Mo is a site of peace which means peace and conflict subsist in some places. Waldman uses the subtle connection of the Garden to Kabul as a rejection of generalisation and stereotyping of spaces.

Furthermore, the contestation of the symbolic meaning/source of the Garden invigorates Mo's resistance against Western domination by its culture and agencies. Mo's refusal to adjust/modify the memorial design is a resistance against the American culture that perceives arts/commemorative design through its hegemonic prism of exceptionalism and uses its supposed liberal and political agents like Paul Rubin and Claire Burwell to exploit the Other. Claire queries Mo that "You've never answered that question...about whether it's a martyrs' paradise, or a paradise at all" (p. 268) but Mo replies that the question will be left hanging forever. This is because he has explained the Garden and its influences during the public hearing and considers his identity as the reason for the continuous questioning of the symbolic interpretation of his design.

Also, Mo's eventual withdrawal from the memorial design contest, which is the climax, is a form of resistance. His withdrawal is to repudiate the frame of sympathy that the American populace later subject his commemorative design to rather than its merits, the parameters of the judges. Asma, an undocumented immigrant, whose husband died during the terrorist attacks in New York, possibly 9/11, lamented about the othering of his husband as a victim and her lack of position among the families of victims. Her bemoaning of the hypocrisy of America's self-professed multiculturalism and pluralism arouse sympathy in the American public for Mo's design. However, from a postcolonial perspective, why should Mo's design be accepted as the winner on sympathy rather than merit even after the jury has considered it the winner based on merit? Will the same public outcry arise if Mo is not connected to Islam? We therefore contend that Waldman's representation of Mo's withdrawal is a resistance against American hegemony that accepts the postcolonial subject on its term. Coupled with his withdrawal, Mo's emigration from America is a resistance too that puts him in the same category like Changez in Moshid Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and it is symbolic of the West's forceful eviction of postcolonial subjects from its space due to the Occidental paranoia of the Other caused by 9/11.

Also, most of the characters that represent others are depicted as manipulative for self-gratification. Paul Rubin, the representative of Governor Bitman on the jury, is an agent of the West's political structure and he is depicted as manipulative and suggests that Mo proceeds in the competition under the name of his boss, Emmanuel boss. Another

illustration is that of Claire who represents American liberalism but collaborates with Issam Malik to denounce Mo's commemorative design because Mo refuses to disavow the connection of his design to a mythical martyrs' paradise, even after explaining the meaning and influences of the design at the public hearing. The collaboration between Issam Malik and Claire Burwell signifies the height of hypocrisy and self-interest that drive various agencies that represent others. Issam Malik rejects Mo because he does not submit to his whims and caprices and makes the slip of saying the Quran was written by a man which Mo retracts later, Claire's grouse is the refusal of Mo to answer her questions and supposedly appreciate her for supporting him on the jury. Waldman deploys these characters to represent the manipulative tendencies of various agencies to satisfy their self-interest and gratification.

### **5.3.3.3. The politics of representation and its ambivalence in *The Submission***

Waldman's representation of Mo in *The Submission* is a discontinuity from the previous representation of postcolonial subjects/Muslims in 9/11 novels. While this is commendable, it is also political, political in the sense of narrative intrigues deployed by Waldman to satisfy certain aesthetics.

Unlike the previous postcolonial subjects like Hammad in DeLillo's *Falling Man*, Ahmad in Updike's *Terrorist*, Waldman depicts Mo, the central character, as a non-fervent Muslim, close to a secularist that has assimilated the American secular, liberal culture. This depiction raises essential questions that complicate Waldman's representation and politicise it. Is Mo's partial practicing of Islam the reason for him not being a terrorist? Is Mo's secular proclivity the reason for him not being a terrorist? What does Waldman intend to achieve by portraying Mo as a non-fervent Muslim? The previous postcolonial masculine characters in early 9/11 novels are portrayed as zealous Muslims and terrorists, however, Waldman's portrayal of Mo as a lukewarm Muslim who is not a terrorist gives room for the assumption that Muslims like Mo are those that are desired in America, not practising ones that are most times portrayed as terrorists. The counterbalance would have been Asma who is another central, Muslim character but she is genderised as female which raises more questions about the representation of Muslims in 9/11 novels. Considering the tradition of masculine terrorists that dominate 9/11 and its novels, Waldman's representation presents a subtle

guess that Muslims, like Mo, are the non-terrorists that are needed in America. The more deconstructive argument would have been an adherent Mo that is not a terrorist. Other Muslim characters like Issam Malik, Laila Fathi fit into the previous stereotypical representations of Muslim characters. Issam Malik is portrayed as selfish and manipulative. He goes to the extreme to get attention and funding for his organisation. Mo observes this motive and rejects participating in the advertorial campaigns of The Muslim American Coordinating Council because it is exploitative. Laila Fathi, on the other hand, is an astute lawyer that works with characters in the margin and has sex with Mo, one of his clients. She falls in the in-betweenness of positivity and negativity, liberalism and extremism, sincerity and manipulation.

Similarly, this study contends that Waldman's portrayal of Mo panders to the American readers, which is a political portrayal for her acceptance in American culture. Considering the Islamophobia that sequels the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the American culture perceives a character, like Mo, that does not practise Islam regularly, that is more of a secular Muslim, more liberal and acceptable than a practising Muslim who may be a passive hardliner. Although Islamophobia may still make the American culture wary of anybody with Islamic roots, a Mo character is still preferable. The Muslim characters that Waldman deploys in *The Submission* liberalise or exist on sympathy like Asma. Waldman's casting of Mo as a secular Muslim raises questions about the Islamophobia that she tries to deconstruct. One would wonder why she does not portray Mo as a practising Muslim. Does it mean that America is safe with Mo because he does not practise Islam fervently like the previous male characters in early 9/11 novels? Waldman's representation of Mo signifies ambivalence: although she represents more deconstructed characters than the previous 9/11 characters, she still falls into some of their pitfalls like pandering. Mo's statement that "maybe man wrote the Quran in response to his context" (p. 18) depicts the type of Muslim he is which panders to the American reader. Some of his statements like the Quran as a man's document evinces pandering to the American audience that is common in American culture. Although Waldman depicts what some Americans have become and their perception about Muslims, the Other, she equally presents the type of Muslim characters that Americans will like to read and connect with easily unlike a character like Changez in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*.

Lastly, Waldman's employing of the frame of sympathy for Mo and Asma raises questions about her representation and the American culture. This is analogous to McDonald's (2016) representation of Muslim terrorists by humanising. Waldman's representation in this context is ambivalent and lopsided. In the case of Asma, the reality is that she is an undocumented migrant who operates in the space of illegality that needs to seek documentation but she is not making any effort. She travels to the United States in the guise of tourism and she is caught up in the web of terrorism that kills her husband, Inam Haque. Her only claim to America is her son who was born in America. She realises this by stating that "I want to know, my son—he is Muslim, but he is also American. Or isn't he" (p. 231). Her inquiry raises sympathy for her as a mother and as a widow. The sympathy frame is reinforced with Waldman's portrayal of her visceral outburst at the public hearing for Mo's design. Hence, Waldman deploys widowhood as a frame of sympathy to perceive Asma rather than an undocumented migrant that exists in an unknown space to the law and refuses to seek documentation. This raises the contradiction of legality and ethics. While it is ethical to commiserate with Asma, as a postcolonial subject, that loses her husband in an Islamic terrorist attack, her existence as an undocumented migrant unwilling to seek documentation raises legal questions about her existence in America. However, Waldman's representation favours Asma's illegal existence in America on the frame of sympathy as a widow and mother while simultaneously registering the altering/othering of Muslim victims of the unnamed terrorist attacks in *The Submission*, which is probably 9/11. Conversely, Waldman employs the later acceptance of Mo's memorial design by the majority of the jury and the American audience to confirm that America and its culture accept the Other based on sympathy rather than the human ethos of equality.

In conclusion, in *The Submission*, Waldman's representation of the aftermath of Islamic terrorism in America is more deconstructed and interrogating than the early 9/11 novels written by renowned authors like John Updike and Don DeLillo. She presents a more balanced view through the variegated characters she depicted and moved beyond the hybrid postcolonial subject as a perpetrator of terrorism in America to the hybrid postcolonial subject as a victim of American Judeo-Christian fundamentalism. However, her representation of postcolonial subjects like Asma and Mo is ambivalent considering the framing of these characters to satisfy liberal American culture and the aesthetical intrigues

she deploys present a fixed postcolonial subject that should be accepted by the American culture and reader based on liberalism and sympathy. Conversely, Updike's depiction of the postcolonial subject in Islamic terrorism is stereotypical, narrow, and generalist and forms a continuity in the representation of the Other while Waldman's depiction of the postcolonial subject in post-Islamic terrorism, American society is interrogating, deconstructive and balanced. Her portrayal signifies a discontinuity from the stereotypical representation of the Other by American authors.

#### **5.3.4. Representations and tropes of terrorism in Don DeLillo's *Falling Man***

Don DeLillo's *Falling Man (FM)* is a 9/11 narrative that fictionalises the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States of America. It narrativises the pre-, the moments of and the post-terrorist attacks, valorising Islamic terrorism, the perpetrators and the trauma of the acts on the victims. DeLillo's *Falling Man* has been examined from two dominant perspectives as it relates to Hammad's representations (McDonald, 2016: p. 3). The first view is that Hammad is Orientalised, while the second perspective is that he is Westernised because he covets Western life. This study upholds the first argument that Hammad is Orientalised, despite his ambivalence. McDonald (2016) extends the argument to the space of sympathy which deviates from the dangers of presenting characters like Hammad in a generalist frame that endangers others not in that category. However, it is pertinent to first examine how DeLillo represents the 9/11 terrorist attacks as Islamic terrorism.

DeLillo depicts Islamic terrorism as fuelled by jihadi discourse which is a representation of reality. This is analogous to John's representations of Islamic terrorism as fuelled by jihadi discourse or *dawah (BOAT)*. In *Falling Man*, the terrorists "received instruction in the highest jihad, which is to make the blood flow, their blood and that of others" (p. 124). Significantly, this representation reifies the cardinal role played by jihadi discourse in promoting Islamic terrorism. Jihadi discourse from proponents like Tamiyyah, Qutb, among others, is the ideology that promotes Islamic terrorism. The essentiality of this representation is that counter-Islamic ideologies are expedient for deradicalising and undermining the jihadi discourse.



Equally, in *Falling Man*, fatalism underpins Islamic terrorism and this is derived from jihadi discourse that Allah has chosen the terrorists to die, therefore valorising sacrifice. The narrator states that “there was the claim of fate, that they were born to this. There was the claim of being chosen, out there...there was the statement that death made, the strongest claim of al, the highest jihad” (p. 124). Fate is employed as an arbitrary ideology to propel the Islamic terrorists to perpetrate terroristic acts and this is anchored on death as a sacrifice to earn martyrdom. Hence, fate, death as sacrifice and martyrdom are interwoven in Islamic terrorism and DeLillo represents this to reveal the underlying impulses in a terrorist’s mind. Although Hammad reflects on how “a man have to kill himself in order to accomplish something in the world” (*FM*, p. 124), he still “did not feel deprived” (p. 125). Amir avows that to Hammad that “the end of our life is predetermined...It is only long written” (p. 125).

DeLillo also portrays Islamic terrorism as absolutism, the conception that others do not exist. When Hammad questions Amir about the lives of others that are taken in a suicide mission, he “said simply there are no others” (p. 125). Amir further asserts that “those who will die have no claim to their lives outside the useful fact of their dying” (p.125). DeLillo aptly represents the absolutist proclivities of a terrorist’s mind and absolutism that underlie Islamic terrorism. This absolutism conceives their subjectivities as the only fundamental existence and links their fate to die with their victims. Also, DeLillo figures this within the death drive that underlies Islamic terrorism. Albeit these representations of Islamic terrorism, from the postcolonial perspective, DeLillo’s representations are still problematic and accentuates traditional biases that lump Muslims/Others and Islam as one entity to achieve his literary goals of gratifying his Western/American readers.

DeLillo depicts Islamic terrorism as struggling “against the injustice” (p. 63) that haunted Muslims and combating the attack against Islam. Although the characters do not clarify this point, the reference, however, alludes to the popular motivations that Islamic terrorists adopt as their alibis for attacking America and reifies the contest against West’s globalisation, imperialist and capitalist drive. This historically can be linked to the Palestinians’ struggle against the Israeli neocolonial occupation of their land which many Islamic terrorists have imbibed as a personal struggle.

#### **5.3.4.1. Postcolonial unravelling: stereotypes, generalisations and continuity of representations in *Falling Man***

How the Other is depicted especially by Western authors is one of the subjects of postcolonialism because these representational strategies have corporeal implications on how the non-Westerner is perceived and treated in the West. DeLillo's representations of the 9/11 terrorist attacks in *Falling Man* is limited and focalises the stereotyping that has been critically analysed by postcolonial scholars like Edward Said. One of the grey areas of DeLillo's representations of Islamic terrorism in *Falling Man* is his representation of Islam only through the perspectives of the terrorists. Through Amir, Islam is portrayed as only the "struggle against the enemy...Jews first...then the Americans." (p. 61). This limited representation of the Other's religion depicts Islam as homogenous and makes DeLillo join the various Western authors that portray the single story of Islam as violent, exempting Muslims that reject violence but promote peace and plurality. This limited representation of Muslims as violent and terrorists is more accentuated by the 9/11 terrorist attacks and gratifies the Western readers. DeLillo as an established writer adopts this representational strategy intentionally as a continuity of the traditional frames of the non-Westerner as a form of evil to the West. The implication is that the average Western reader ingest this representation and perceives Islam as homogenous and a unifying form of violence.

To support the intentionality of DeLillo's representational strategy is his adoption of Percy Shelley's *The Revolt of Islam* in *Falling Man*. The history of the anthology shows the conviction to implicate Islam as a form of subversion. The original poem was titled *Laon and Cynthia* and considered too political by Ollier, the publisher, due to its subject matter about political uprising, and was revised and published as the revolt of Islam (Maria Valentini 2018: p. 99). Indirectly, DeLillo links the 9/11 terrorist attacks to the "revolt" of Islam. Although this may seem correct at the surface, Islam is homogenised as a single entity. A close reader should ask what type of Islam, Shiites or Sunnis, what sect, what variance, rather than lumping the whole Islam as a single entity. DeLillo adopts this generalist trope to satiate the Western readers and perpetuate the Orientalist Islam, the Other's religion, as a general mass. Hence, DeLillo's portrayal of Islam through the single perspective of Amir and Hammad, though justifies his literary objective of representing Islamic terrorists, undermines the postcolonial perspective of multiplicity inherent in every

culture and continues the tradition of perceiving Islam as generally violent like in Updike's *Terrorist*.

Similarly, DeLillo's quest to portray Islamic terrorism makes him portray all Muslims in *Falling Man* as terrorists. Hammad and Amir are the named Muslim characters and they are terrorists. Hammad is depicted as ambivalent, oscillating between rationalising their planned attacks and the validity of them, while Amir is the "intense...small thin wiry man" (p. 61) who justifies their planned terroristic attacks. The problem of depicting all Muslims in *Falling Man* as terrorists is DeLillo's authenticity and canonical figure. His portrayal undermines the image of Muslims in the West that do not fall in this violent category, therefore, subtly promoting prejudice against all Muslims as terrorists. While it is undeniable that there are terrorists who project themselves as Muslims and employ Islamic ideologies as their motivations, there also subsists Muslims that embrace peace as Asma asseverates in Waldman's *The Submission*. DeLillo's representations of Muslims in *Falling Man* is limited and does not encompass non-violent Muslims that repudiate terrorism. The image of these non-violent Muslims are blocked in *Falling Man*. This type of "politicised" representation fulfils two roles: first is the quest to satisfy the American readers by projecting Muslims as terrorists to assuage the trauma of terror that the 9/11 terrorist attacks engender and second is the reliance on traditional frames of the non-Western subjectivity as violent, irrational, ambivalent and evil. The implication of this limited representation is DeLillo's subtle promotion of non-Western stereotypes and the gaze of generalisation. Hence, this entrenches a continuity in representations of the Other as "evil" in Western narratives.

DeLillo also presents the Islamic terrorists in squalid conditions and environments which is another frame of stereotyping the West's Other as dirty and poor. The location of the mosque in Marienstrasse is "on the second floor of this shabby building with graffiti smeared on the outer walls and a setting of local strolling whores" (p. 60). This type of rendering ghettoises the Other and places their images along with "whores" and other unwanted and debased elements in society. DeLillo's location of the Islamist terrorists in the Ghetto of Germany reifies the stereotyping of the Other as poor and dirty. Albeit these squalid conditions may be a metaphor for their terroristic acts, the depiction still aligns with

stereotypical frames of the Other as dirty and poor. DeLillo also portrays Hammad as “clumsy” and that he “basically stopped changing his clothes” (p. 125), wearing the same clothing and underwear. This narrativisation focalises the stereotypes of the Other as strange, dirty and poor, thereby continuing the old narrative frames.

DeLillo’s representations of 9/11 combines the trauma perspectives of the aftermath, the motivations of Islamic terrorism and the personalities of Islamic terrorists. He tries to maintain equilibrium in these tasks but the representation of the postcolonial subject is disproportionate and continues the traditional representational strategies that homogenises the Other and generalises its culture as harmful to the West.

#### **5.3.4.2. Tropes and metaphors in *Falling Man***

DeLillo deploys old Orientalist tropes in *Falling Man* to achieve his narrative strategies. One of such is the association of beard to the terrorists. All the terrorists grow beard to show their commitment to jihad, except when in America. They (the terrorists) “were all growing beard. One of them even told his father to grow a beard...men in and out...growing beards” (p.60). Beard is a sign of belonging to the jihadi brotherhood and DeLillo deploys it in relation to the image of the Taliban who mandate their members and men generally to grow a beard. However, in America, cutting the beards makes the men invisible to the American system of surveillance and reconnaissance. A beard is a common Oriental trope and stereotypical symbol that is linked with Islamic terrorists and Muslims generally, especially in Western novels like *Falling Man*.

Similarly, madness is another subtle tropology deployed by DeLillo. He links it to state terrorism employed by legitimate governments. The man that tells Hammad about Iran and the sacrifice of boys as martyrs comments that “most countries are run by madmen” (p. 60). Although he mentioned it only once because his literary objective is not to examine state terrorism, his allusion to madness in connection with political leaders reifies the tropology of madness in rendering terrorism as deployed by other authors like Nwaubani in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, among others. Hence, state terrorism is treated as a form of madness. DeLillo also thematised sacrifice as a motif in representing terrorism. The terrorists conceive death as a sacrifice for martyrdom. The motif of sacrifice in Islamic

terrorism is recurrent in narratives about terrorism. This trope is linked to personal death of terrorists to gain martyrdom.

In DeLillo's *Falling Man*, metaphors also play prominent roles in the narrative structure. The confusion of bin Laden as Bill Lawton by Robert, Justin and the other "Siblings" metaphorises DeLillo's textual misrepresentation of the Other as terrorists (p. 58). While radical Islamic sects have deployed Islam for violent jihads, their actions and perception of Islam is focalised in Western narratives about terrorism, relegating the non-violent Muslims to the background. The textual corollary is that the confusion of the children is a metaphor of the confusion that DeLillo's *Falling Man* creates by using a section of the Muslim population and their definition of Islam to represent a whole. Another level of the metaphor of Bill Lawton in *Falling Man* is its signification of the confusion of majority of the West about Islamic terrorism: "he was hearing Bill Lawton. They were saying bin Laden" (p. 58). The children develop the "myth" of Bill Lawton and Lianne states that Katie, one of the children, "keeps the other name going precisely because it's the wrong name" (p. 58) which sublimely metaphorises the stereotypical rendering of Islamic terrorism by American authors like DeLillo and Updike. This means the representation of a part as a whole perpetuates stereotyping of the Other and confusion in the West.

David Janiak's character as the Falling Man accentuates the performance that the 9/11 attacks have engendered. His performance replicates the photograph of the falling man from the north tower after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and "all his falls were headfirst, none announced first" (p. 156). His performances blur the line between reality and the imaginary and creates a notoriety of re-inscribing the terror of the 9/11 attacks in the viewers' minds. His character metaphorises DeLillo's *Falling Man* as a form of performance that blurs the line between reality and the imaginary. Hence, DeLillo's *Falling Man* is a performance of the 9/11 terrorist attacks that both document the terror and the fall of man into the abyss. Also, the comparison of the falling man's image to the "falling angel" (p. 158) and the description of its beauty as horrific reifies the Biblical Lucifer story. This metaphorisation evinces the sublimity of representing terror as terrortainment, especially the spectacle, shock and entertainment that rendering terrorism engenders. The Falling Man's acts condense performativity and the shock of terrorism. The performativity is what DeLillo's *Falling Man*

suggests and it follows the traditions of stereotyping, generalising and Orientalising the Other to fit certain frames.

In all, DeLillo's *Falling Man* represents the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the trauma they create and the Islamic fundamentalism and extremism that underlie the attacks. However, in the pursuit of these literary engagements, DeLillo's representations of the Other are limited and re-inscribe the common prejudices about the Other and their culture.

### **5.3.5. James Yee's *For God and country*: war on terror, colonial present, resistance and the question of hybridity**

James Yee or Chaplain Yee is a Chinese American and a former Muslim Chaplain of the United States Army. He worked at the infamous Guantanamo Bay as a Muslim Chaplain for the detainees. He converted to Islam from the "Lutheran faith" (*FGAC*, p. 11) of his childhood and perceives himself as terribly American. Although he sees himself as an American, he is a postcolonial subject based on his Chinese roots and his conversion to Islam. He is a hybrid(ised)/hyphenated Westerner who the Western subjectivity considers as impure and still treats with prejudice. In this section, the textual representations of war on terror as colonial present through arbitrary violence on the other, Guantanamo Bay as a *space of exception* and the resistance of the Other as well as the alterity of the hybrid and its deconstruction are examined in *For God and Country* (*FGAC*). Chaplain Yee occupies the postcolonial interstice that is contradictory and contentious. Although he considers himself American, the American system sees him as an Other because of his hyphenation to China and Islam. James Yee's *For God and Country* is a memoir that chronicles his life, most especially as a Muslim Chaplain at Guantanamo Bay and how he is caught up as an Other in the web of war on terror. The subjectivities of the Other are categorised into two: the detainees that Chaplain Yee designated "enemy combatants" and Yee, himself, as a hybridised Westerner, a postcolonial subject.

#### **5.3.5.1. Representations of war on terror as state terrorism and colonial present in Yee's *For God and Country***

Gregory (2004) conceives war on terror as the 'violent return of the colonial past, with its split geographies of "us" and "them," "civilization" and "barbarism," "Good" and "evil" (p.

11). This means that the violence against the non-Western Other and the hybridised Westerner (as a postcolonial subject) in the cloak of war against terror connects the colonial past to the colonial present. The imaginative geography of us versus them, the non-Westerner and the Westerner and the pure Westerner and the hybrid/hyphenated Westerner still underlies the war on terror and this imaginary concretises the empire's new forms of violence against the Other in all its corporeal sense. War on terror also parallels state terrorism against minorities. Hence, war on terror has drawn twofold of metaphors: the first is its analogy to slavery while the second is its parallel to colonialism. To distill the first analogy, William Rowlandson (2010) compares the war on terror by the United States and its Allies to slavery. He asseverates that the "peculiar nature of capture, transportation and detention of terror suspects in the War on Terror" (218) parallels the Atlantic Slave Trade. He expounds that many Guantanamo detainees were captured for bounty, transported across the Atlantic like slaves, manacled, separated from family members and relatives and denied the privilege of habeas corpus. While this argument is reasonable to an extent, the purpose of slavery is not commensurate with that of war on terror. Transatlantic Slavery was purely economical and imperial. The slaves were acquired as work objects for plantations and their masters.

Conversely, the second comparison is more relevant in war against terrorism. Gregory (2006) draws a ligature among colonialism, violence and law. In this sense, there is an extraterritorial proclivity in which the empire governs spaces outside its borders in brazen lawlessness and despicable violence. These spaces are "zones of abandonment" where the Other is subjected to the arbitrary violence of the empire. There are concrete examples in former colonies like Algeria, Kenya, Nigeria, among others. This is similar to the detention of alleged terrorists in Guantanamo Bay, a space in Cuba where the US law does not apply, and the governing of the Other with abject violence to extract resources, in this case intelligence, while in the case of colonialism, natural resources and raw materials. Hence, this thesis upholds the parallelism of war on terror to colonialism and this reifies the argument of war on terror as the colonial present.

The West's imaginary of the Other as a subject to be ruled and violated is compared to Agamben's concept of the *homo sacer*, as cited by Gregory (2004). *Homo sacer* is a person that has a bare life in Roman law and can be killed with impunity but cannot be sacrificed

according to ritual because they are outside the law. Gregory (2004) opines that the *homines sacri*, the plural presumably, are the “objects of sovereign power” (p. 62) that can be acted upon and deprived of any political and legal rights. The concept of the ancient *Homo sacer*, though may seem extreme, metaphorises how the West perceives its Other and the imaginary that underlies war on terror. Consequently, the Other are regarded as *homines sacri* that can be captured, detained and denied any juridical or human rights. This perception underpins the analysis of Chaplain Yee’s representations of war on terror in *For God and Country* which incidentally parallels Zaeef’s representations of war on terror in *My Life with the Taliban*.

Chaplain Yee represents war on terror as terror against the Other which is a form of state terrorism. The Other is terrorised by the empire and its agents. The Other in this sense are both the Guantanamo detainees who Yee designates “enemy combatants” and Yee himself and they are otherise because of their ligature to the postcolony and to Islam. Yee narrativises how the detainees were renamed by President Bush as “enemy combatants” (p. 47) and they are not “guaranteed the rights typically enjoyed by prisoners of war. Nor did they have the right to be charged with a crime” (p. 47) because all the detainees do not occupy the West’s subjectivity. They are renamed by the American sovereign and subjected to the brazen terror of torture. The detainees were allowed outside of their cells fifteen minutes in three days (p. 60). Yee represents how the detainees were terrorised by the military police especially at Camp Delta. The terror of the Other commences from the point of capture to their final detention. Although most of the detainees’ accounts presented by Yee are secondhand, they raise serious concerns about the procedures underlying the war on terror which parallels terrorism. Rhudel Ahmed, Asif Iqbal and Shafiq Rasul, although from England, bear a common Muslim identity and undergo the West’s alterity and are captured and detained in Guantanamo Bay. Rhudel’s testimony to Yee presents how the Other’s physical and mental beings are subjected to terror and dehumanised in the war against terror.

He said that after they arrived at the camp, the prisoners were brought to a large open area...covered in gravel and had no shading from the sun. They were forced to kneel here for several hours. Their hands and ankles were shackled and soldiers put painted goggles



over their eyes and heavy, industrial earmuffs over their ears. (*FGAC*, p. 63)

They were subjected to physical and mental assaults that Yee describes as “sensory deprivation” and kept in that position for hours, enduring kicks in the ribs and the sweltering sun. The detainees were subjected to the *living dead* condition, adopting Mbembe’s (2003) description. According to Rhudel, some of the “prisoners passed out in the dust and flies were swarming around them” (p. 63). In another instance, a detainee was hit “until his head was split open” (p. 109). The detainees underwent this animalistic condition as the Other whose body and mind can be terrorised because they occupy a position outside the American law.

Also, in *FGAC*, torture and incessant interrogations were used as a mode of exchange between most of the US personnel and the detainees, the Other. The torture and the harsh conditions that the detainees in Guantanamo endured are forms of violence that underlie the colonial present that the West subjects its Other to in the guise of war on terror. While terrorism should be condemned and its perpetrators prohibited, it should not become a motivation for lumping the West’s Other together and subjugating them. The detainees are the *homines sacri* that occupy the space outside the American/international law. While the detainees were in Camp X-ray, “they weren’t allowed to speak to the guards or to one another” (p. 63), therefore, torture and other harsh conditions become the language between the detainees and their captors. War on terror is an extreme form of violence against the Other by the West and parallels the terrorism the West is fighting. Another form of such violence in Guantanamo Bay is the Initial Response Force (IRF) carried out by the guards against the detainees. According to Yee, rules were relaxed in Guantanamo and General Miller, the head of the Joint Task Force Guantanamo, encouraged the infractions against the detainees because they are objects of the sovereign. IRF is an excuse for the guards to violate the detainees and subjugate them through extreme violence. IRF involves eight guards against one detainee, weakening the detainee, tying his wrists behind his backs and ankles with plastic ties and then dragging “the detainee from his cell and down the corridor...to solitary confinement” (p. 71). These forms of violence parallel the colonial violence against postcolonial subjects during the colonial past.

The “interrogations for several hours” (p. 76) are another form of terror against the other characterising the colonial present that postcolonial subjects endure. The interrogations are mental violence against the psychological being of the detainees. It is not surprising that the interrogations are enshrouded in secrecy. The violence and living dead conditions that the detainees experience in Guantanamo prompts suicide as resistance. Yee’s depiction is analogous to Zaef’s critique of the war against the Other that underlies the US war on terror. The violence in Guantanamo is arbitrary and the US vanguard like General Miller supports it.

Yee represents war on terror as a cultural war, specifically as a war against Islam, based on the Judeo-Christian heritage of the United States. This is analogous to Zaef’s representations of war on terror as a war against Islam. Symbolically, the soldiers treated the detainees’ Qurans with disdain to provoke them, this is attested to by Zaef too. While Muslims treat Qurans with utmost respect, the guards and military police disregarded this cultural norm to depict their religious sentiment against Islam. In some cases, the soldiers allegedly threw the “detainees’ Qur’ans into the toilet buckets” (*FGAC*, p. 69), “pat down the prisoners” (p. 72) in sensitive areas which is forbidden in Islam, made the detainees defecate in open cells and disturbed the detainees while they prayed. Yee represents the military police and interrogators as intentionally provoking the detainees to show their aversion to Islam, the Other’s culture. Yee narrativises how a detainee was taken away for interrogation “a few minutes before the call to prayer” (p. 79) and he gives instances of guards mocking detainees during prayers which is against Islam. Most times, the guards desecrate the detainees’ Qurans (p. 111) during their search and the female guards pat and touch the detainees, who were all males. These actions signify that cultural prejudice underpin war on terror and its corporeality is deployed to torment the detainees psychologically, a vertical form of deploying power over the Other. As a Muslim, when Yee was incarcerated, he was given access to only the Bible until later that he was provided an English-Arabic translation of the Quran and was given “pork, sausage...or ham” (p. 143) as meals, though some are anathema to his religion.

This cultural war also manifests as hostilities towards the Muslim personnel working in Guantanamo. Yee was investigated because he was a Muslim Chaplain and defended the rights of the detainees. The Christian soldiers had reduced work and working hours than the

Muslim soldiers (p. 84) and the Muslim personnel were denied some basic rights like the halal food for Muslims. Despite working for the United States Army, the Muslim personnel were still othered and altered because they were not considered a part of the American, Judeo-Christian subjectivity, The Muslim personnel were also suspected of collaborating with the detainees. Underlying the cultural war is the stereotyping of all Muslims as terrorists which makes other soldiers label the Muslim soldiers “radical Islamists” (p. 133). Most of the Muslim personnel that worked in Guantanamo were detained and imprisoned after leaving the place. Yee was arrested on his leave away from Guantanamo, cuffed and shackled like the detainees he served as their chaplain and was denied any legal right.

Like terrorism, Yee represents rhetoric of terror as buoying war on terror in Guantanamo. All the military personnel at Guantanamo were informed at the newcomers’ briefing that all the detainees were terrorists and members of Al Qaeda and the Taliban which is the fictioalisation of the enemy. The personnel were proselytised that they were fighting the terrorists that were responsible for 9/11 attacks. This fictioalisation and rhetoric invoke revenge as a drive of war on terror rather than the quest for justice that should be within the purview of law. General Miller, the head of Guantanamo, notified Yee that he felt ‘a deep anger toward “those Muslims” who attacked the World Trade Center...that he sought counseling with a chaplain” (p. 125). While this seem humane on the surface, from the actions of the military personnel against the detainees, it is obvious that General Miller’s anger drove the operations at Guantanamo, allowing the personnel to subjugate the detainees, postcolonial subjects, without any discipline from the military leadership. Also, Yee’s arrest was an act of revenge, part of the scope of revenge that underlies war on terror as championed by Western agencies like General Miller.

In all, Yee represents the war on terror at Guantanamo as another form of terrorism against the Other – postcolonial subject, a colonial present that signifies a continuity of colonial violence. This is feasible because the subjectivity of the West perceives Muslims and other non-Westerners as *homines sacri* that have bare lives, are outside the law and can be acted upon with liberty.

### **5.3.5.2. Space of exception, necropower and resistance in *For God and Country***

In this section, this thesis examines Guantanamo Bay as a contemporary, colonial space of exception where the Other is subjugated in the guise of war on terror and interrogates the various forms of necropower employed. Guantanamo Bay re-inscribes the space of exception that characterise necropolitical spaces where postcolonial subjects experience banal violence. A space of exception is enclosed and operates outside the law such spaces historically can be traced to the Nazis. This formation works outside the law to promote arbitrariness against the fictionalised enemy of the American subjectivity. The deployment of torture is rooted in colonial violence against the other. Agamben (2005) traces the state of exception farther to the French Reign of Terror and then to the Nazi regime. Mbembe (2003) traces it to “Nazism, totalitarianism and the concentration/extermination camp” (p. 12). Mbembe employs the slave life as a metaphor and states that slaves exist in a form of death-in-life, this thesis deploys this metaphorical prism to analyse postcolonial subjects as living a “death-in-life” or “phantom-like world of horror”. The Guantanamo detainees are kept alive to experience the world of horror and the spectre of the empire. Significantly, Yee textually represents the conditions that characterise Guantanamo Bay as a space of exception which Gregory (2004) designates a “zone of abandonment” (p. 62).

The first is that Guantanamo Bay operated as an extraterritorial space which Gregory (2004) considers as colonial present. Guantanamo Bay has a colonial history and it is a greatly controversial place between Cuba and the United States. US Naval Station Guantanamo Bay was selected because it is located outside the American geography and in Cuba to practice illegality. For example, denying the detainees’ rights to habeas corpus is illegal under the American judicial system (p. 48). This means Guantanamo operates outside the law in a space of abandonment. Ironically, this space was created for postcolonial subjects perceived as terrorists. Hence, Yee arrived at Guantanamo and discovered that there was no Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Muslim Chaplains like him. Basically, in Cuba, Guantanamo operates like a colonial space located in another country and detainees, postcolonial subjects, are subjected to the horror of living. This means that Guantanamo is a space of exception for colonial and necropolitical practices.

Mbembe (2003) conceptualises necropower in two major forms although it can take numerous form: the first is “the terror of actual death” (p. 22) while the second is benevolent form which is ‘the destruction of a culture in order to “save the people” from themselves’ (p. 22). The latter is the civilizing mission that underpinned the colonial past, however, it still subsists in the present time. The detainees in Guantanamo experience the second which aims to destroy their belief in their religion (culture) to “redeem” according to the empire’s needs. The state of exception makes the Joint Task Force Guantanamo to create another tribunal for the detainees instead of allowing them to be prosecuted in federal courts (p. 216). The detainees are *beings of exception* that are not within the American juridical purview and the international law because they are outside the Geneva Convention. The treatment of the detainees as *beings of exceptions* is stimulated by the West’s prejudice against the Other/non-Westerner.

Space of exception operates as an extension of state of exception dwells on the alibi of national security. Guantanamo as a space of exception existed as a component of the alibi of national security that degenerates into militarism, arbitrariness and brazen violence against the Other. Yee states that he was imprisoned because of the government’s willingness to deny his ‘civil liberties in the name of post-September 11 “national security”’ (p. 199), the same applies to the Guantanamo detainees who were incarcerated indefinitely and without charges under the rubric of America’s national security. Hence, Guantanamo is a condition fostered by the alibi of national security that empowers the executive to deploy necropower against the Other. In the case of the detainees, they were subjected to *living dead* conditions like not having their baths for days, living in wire cages like animals, enduring long and incessant interrogations, defecating in an open cell, among others. Yee’s inability to get a Quran on time when he was imprisoned in a solitary confinement and the supply of meat like pork signifies the second form of necropower that aims to *civilize* the Other to imitate the empire.

Also, spaces of exception operate in secrecy and contradiction. Personnel were told to maintain top-level secrecy about the operations at Guantanamo Bay. Yee narrativises how General Miller warned them that they should never pass up an opportunity to keep their mouth shut which implies “what happens at Camp Delta stays at Camp Delta” (p. 57). The secrecy that enshrouds spaces of exception like Guantanamo fosters arbitrariness and

impunity. Equally, what transpired at the interrogation sessions were kept secret. Yee states that the details of the sessions were kept secret from the world and most of the military personnel (p. 77). He narrativises how the Joint Task Force at Guantanamo presented a contradictory image of the prison to visitors and the media, misrepresenting the conditions in the prison. It is also contradictory that American laws do not apply at Guantanamo Bay, an American space though in another space. The contradiction is to circumvent the American judicial system and international law.

In spaces of exception, where necropower is deployed by empire to subjugate its object, resistance becomes a currency between the postcolonial subjects and the empire as well as its agencies. This is the postcolonial posture adopted by detainees at Guantanamo. Their refusal to have a Quran in each detainee's cell is a resistance against the cultural war of the West's agency in Guantanamo. Another form of resistance deployed by the detainees is mass suicide. Although the guards maltreat the detainees, they do not want any of the detainees to die because of their objectification as sources of intelligence. Hence, when an "interrogator had thrown a detainee's Qur'an on the floor, stepped on it, and kicked it across the room" (p. 115), the news got round and the detainees decided to communicate their displeasure to the cultural war through mass suicide. Yee narrativises the chaotic scene of the mass suicide: "once every fifteen minutes, a prisoner tried to hang himself...the guards never stood still on the blocks...the prisoners would yell...hang their cage doors and the guards would rush up and down the corridor" (p. 115). The mass suicide is employed as resistant dialogue against the military police's abuse of the Qur'an which is against cultural norms.

Another form of resistance is hunger strike. Yee presents Shaker, one of the detainees, that "led a hunger strike meant to protest the policy of indefinite detention" (p. 62). However, the effort was futile and they abandoned it several weeks later. Also, the Guantanamo leadership countered by force-feeding the detainees through intravenous tubes. The theme of these forms of resistance is that postcolonial subjects will always find sites of resistance and utilise them to confront the empire and its violent agencies. Yee's autobiography is also a form of resistance that reveals the secrets of the empire and questions its brazen violence against the innocent detainees at Guantanamo. Its resistant writing against the colonial and necropolitical war on terror that targets only postcolonial subjects like Muslims or non-

Westerners generally prompts further writings like Zaeef's *My Life with the Taliban* and Mohamedou Ould Slahl's *Guantanamo Diary*. These autobiographies inscribe the corpus of writing back to the empire about its colonial war on terror.

Significantly, certain organisations/movements have been employed as sites of resistance against the colonial present of America's war on terror and internal state terrorism. Yee represents this in the activities of the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) and other groups like Justice for New America and Chinese for Affirmative Actions which advocated his release (p. 190) and campaigned against the illegality of America's state terrorism against its Other. Yee depicts the centrality of these organisations in resisting the various, contemporary guises of violence against the Other, especially in America.

Therefore, Yee's representation of Guantanamo Bay valorises it as a space of exception where necropower is deployed against the detainees who are postcolonial subjects and non-Westerners. However, the postcolonial subjects did not accept the banal use of power on them, they resisted in various forms that pronounce the weakness of the empire. This means empire's deployment of brute and militarised power against its Other in the guise of war on terror will perpetually be resisted in various forms.

#### **5.3.5.3. Stereotyping the hybridised postcolonial subject, the deconstruction and the trope in *For God and Country***

Yee represents the war on terror as based on stereotyping the postcolonial subjects, including the hybridised or hyphenated postcolonial subject. To the West, all Muslims are terrorists and this gaze drives the war on terror. This section examines how Yee, a Muslim Chaplain, in the United States Army deployed to Guantanamo Bay suffered the same fate as the detainees because he is a Muslim and he employs his image to deconstruct the generalising gaze of all Muslims are terrorists. As Said (2003) states that the electronic and print media "have been awashed with demeaning stereotypes that lump together Islam and terrorism" (p. 347), the implication is that this stereotyping permeates the various sections of the West, especially its governmentality, and the corporeality affects postcolonial subjects like Yee. Despite being hyphenated to the West, Yee – a Chinese American – is still mistrusted and considered a spy and terrorist because he is a Muslim.

Yee's detention after leaving Guantanamo represents the corporeality of stereotyping the Other, in this case a hybridised postcolonial subject. Yee's defence of his job's ethics to treat the detainees humanely, respect their religious practice and follow standard operating procedures (SOPs) at Guantanamo earned him a detention in a solitary confinement for seventy-six days. His acts of defending the detainees' rights and religious practices make the empire's agency conceive him as seditious, therefore fictionalising him as an enemy because the West's subjectivity still considers him an Other because he is a Muslim. Other Muslim personnel that worked at Guantanamo like Ahmed Melhaba, a civilian linguist, and Ahmad al-Halabi, were also arrested and charged too with different offences including aiding the enemy (p. 165). Being Muslim is the common identity that makes the American state consider them terrorists. This means the hyphenated identity is still regarded as the Other by the West.

The media's representations of Yee accentuate the complicity of the media with power and how this demoralises and humiliates the Other. Powerful news outlets like Cable Network News (CNN), *New York Post*, *Los Angeles Times* published malicious articles about Yee without verifying the facts. Yee narrativises one Daniel Pipes, a contributor to the *New York Post*, stating that "it has been obvious for months that Islamists who despise America have penetrated U.S. prisons" (p. 166), using James Yee and Ahmad al-Halabi as case studies. The article recommended that all Muslims employed by the US government should be investigated which evinces the stereotyping of all Muslims as possible terrorists or terrorists. This stereotypical and generalised media portrayal of Muslims translates to the corporeality of illegal imprisonment of Muslims and subjects them to violence in the colonial present. The media's treatment of Huda, Yee's wife, equally evinces desperation to malign the Other as evil and guilty. The government, through anonymous sources, leaked false information to the media to malign Yee and other Muslim personnel as terrorists working with Al Qaeda. This media misrepresentation is based on stereotyping and has the implication of prompting violence against the Other. The stereotyping of all Muslims as terrorists also engenders labelling of the Muslim personnel by the other troopers. They were designated Hamas, extreme and anti-Jewish (p. 132).

However, Yee deploys his image as a Muslim Chaplain in the United States military to counter the hegemonic and stereotypical image of a Muslim as a terrorist. He portrays



himself as a dedicated Muslim Chaplain who went to the extent of studying Arabic in Syria to perform his duties optimally and a faithful adherent of Islam for the promotion of peace and devotion. Similarly, he projects himself as a loyal and faithful American who was in the Army to help propagate the American ideals. In the course of promoting the ideals of freedom, fairness and justice, he earned the hatred of the empire's agency and was wrongfully charged and humiliated by the same military that gave him letters of commendations and these actions epitomise the contradiction that characterise the empire's relationship with its Other. He declares that he is "a patriot, loyal American...not a terrorist, nor...spy" (p. 213). He also depicts himself as a faithful husband of Huda and father of Sarah. Yee appropriates these images to deconstruct the idea of all Muslims as terrorists and to resist the empire's denigration of the Other, especially the hybridised postcolonial subject. Albeit one may consider doubting the sanctimonious image projected by Yee, the image is justifiable because the military later dropped all the charges against him because the military made a "grave mistake" and was not ready to acknowledge it.

In narrativising the dehumanisation of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, Yee employs the trope of animalisation to portray the inhumane conditions that the detainees experience. The word "cage" is used repetitively to characterise the detainees' cells and to represent the animalistic conditions that the detainees are subjected to. To underscore this condition, Yee titles one of the chapters "Caged in Camp Delta" which emphasises the trope of animalisation. The detainees' incarceration is compared to that of animals that are kept in a cage. This trope accentuates the perception of the West about the Other that the non-Westerner can be treated as an animal, what Mbembe (2003) conceptualises as the *living dead* condition. Hence, the West's stereotyping of the Other as evil, extreme and terroristic translates to subjecting the Other to animalistic conditions or treating them like animals. Apart from the signification of their cells as cages, the perpetual use of shackles on the prisoners even in extreme conditions typifies their being regarded as animals by the empire. Other such conditions include not allowing them to shower in days, maintaining open cells that expose the detainees during defecation, leaving the buckets of feces for days in their cages, among others.

In conclusion, Yee employs his autobiography as a form of resistance and critique of America's war on terror, especially the activities at Guantanamo Bay. He represents war on

terror as a parallel with state terrorism and a war against Muslims, postcolonial subjects, and presents the various forms of resistance to this colonial present by the detainees in Guantanamo Bay and other groups within America. This evinces that resistance will always emerge against new forms of colonial violence perpetrated by the West against its Other. He depicts the stereotypical imaginary that underlies America's war on terror and employs his image as a deconstruction of the popular notion in the West that Islam is equal to terrorism and that all Muslims are terrorists. He also employs the trope of animalisation to depict the brazen violence that the empire inflicts on its Other in the guise of war on terror and the imaginary of the Other as animals that underlies the war on terror. Yee's autobiography thematises resistance writing as an essential form of postcolonialism that reveals the excesses of the empire, especially America, in the war on terror.

#### **5.4. Comparative analysis: concatenation of the representations of terrorism in the selected prose works**

In most of the prose works, Islam is a rallying point for representing terrorism, while Chacour's *Blood Brothers* represents Zionist extremism, with Judeo-Christianity roots, at the heart of Israeli state terrorism and Waldman's *The Submission* depicts Judeo-Christianity as a form of extremism promoting ultranationalism that maligns Islam. Most representations of Islam in narratives about terrorism are based on generalisations, stereotyping and media misrepresentations. Ample illustrations are in DeLillo's *Falling Man*, Updike's *Terrorist*, Khadra's *Wolf Dreams*, among others, while novels like Waldman's *The Submission* and John's *Born on a Tuesday* depict the heretogeneity of Islam based on sectarian ideologies.

Also, two dominant forms are identified in the prose works based on the perpetrators namely state and non-state terrorism. Non-state actors perpetrate non-state terrorism, while state terrorism is carried out by the state and its agencies. The general sub-forms include religious terrorism like Islamic (sectarian) terrorism in John's *Born on a Tuesday* and Zionist terrorism in Chacour's *Blood Brothers* and can extend to political terrorism like the Palestinian resistance of Israeli colonial occupation. Islamic terrorism remains the dominant form due to the 9/11 terrorist attacks which accentuated this form of terrorism, especially in 9/11 narratives. State terrorism is marked by America's colonial violence against its Other

as represented in some of the selected works. This colonial violence is cloaked in war on terror and this is emulated by governments in the postcolony which signifies neocolonial proclivities. Also, the Israeli occupation of Palestine as represented in Mallard's *Stillpoint* and Chacour's *Blood Brothers* evinces state terrorism against the Other. Some prose works like *Born on a Tuesday* and *Wolf Dreams* portray both state and non-state terrorism, while others focus on one like Yee's *For God and Country*'s focus on war on terrorism as state terrorism.

The imaginary of othering underlies the representations of terrorism in the selected prose works. Othering operates both nationally and transnationally. Nationally, othering can be on the basis of ethnicity, gender and religion like in *Born on a Tuesday*, while, transnationally, it is underpinned by race, religion or national ideologies like in the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts. Othering operates on the Self/Other ideology in which the Other is considered a threat to the Self which may be a country or religious sect. The texts represent the Other as an entity that the terrorists aim to eliminate or conceive as a threat like the Israelis perceive the Palestinians as a threat in *Blood Brothers* and the military personnel's attitude to the detainees and the Muslim military personnel at Guantanamo Bay in Zaef's *My Life with the Taliban* and Yee's *For God and Country*. The corollary is that the imaginary of othering is essential to the terrorists and their representations in cultural works.

#### **5.4.1. Comparative reflections on representing terrorism in African novels**

The four African texts analysed in this thesis represent and interrogate terrorism in different ways based on their variegated spatial locations. While generalisation should be avoided in adopting these texts as a holistic representations of African novels, however, the novels analysed are a microcosm of novels on terrorism from the regions they portray. Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* and Adaobi Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* are set in Nigeria, Yasmin Khadra's *Wolf Dreams* is in Algeria while Nurrudin Farah's *Crossbones* is set in Somalia. Considering the rife increase of terrorism in the Sahel of Africa, the geographical locations of these texts are essential for drawing links between the four countries, and, possibly, the four regions. The first two represent Nigeria in West Africa, a country with a history of terrorism, Algeria represents the Maghreb and Somalia the Horn

of Africa that connects the region to East Africa and the global jihad of Al-Qaeda. This comparative reflection examines the links and the disjuncture in the novels.

First, Islam as a religion connects all the novels and focalises the centrality of Islam to the representations of terrorism in African literature. Also, Islam has been employed as a site of resistance while some Islamic sectarian ideologies like Salafism and Wahhabism have been used to propagate terrorism in different forms. In *Born on a Tuesday*, the Islamic sectarian penchant and rivalry drive the mutation from dawah (preaching) to the extreme violence by Malam Abdul-Nur who revolts against his master to have access to economic and political power as well as demographic patronage. In *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, Nwaubani examines how Boko Haram couched its ideology in Salafism and has used it to terrorise the people. In *Wolf Dreams*, Khadra portrays how Islam overlaps with politics and how this can degenerate into terrorism if not guided, while in *Crossbones*, Farah represents how Islam overlaps with politics like in Algeria and how a section of it can terrorise the country with its violent ideology. The appropriation of some Islamic sectarian ideologies as resistance and terrorism can be attributed to the cultural differences and suspicion between Islam and the West which is inherited in different postcolony in addition to imperialism that bolsters global capitalism. The differences between the West and Islam that inspired Said to write *Orientalism* have extended beyond the realm of cultural forms to governmentality and the political systems bequeathed to the postcolony by colonialism. In the selected African novels, Islamic sectarian ideologies like Salafism have been used to interrogate some colonial legacies like the political systems that have made the majority of the population poor. These dominant forms of interrogation morph into violence and terrorism. These Islamic ideologies have the impulse of establishing an Islamic state or caliphate as an alternative to the Western political system that is still dictated by the West to engender a utopian alternative which is usually a mirage. This is the situation in Somalia, Algeria and Nigeria and this religious and political quest has dovetailed into terrorism in the postcolonial states represented. In the selected African fictional works, the atmosphere in the postcolony is haunted by these alternative Islamic sectarian ideologies. Significantly, most of the authors depict Islam as heterogeneous except Khadra and adopt the binary of liberal Muslims versus radical Muslims, thereby, supporting Said's (1997) contention that Islam is not homogeneous, that generalisation about it should be avoided.

Second, most of the selected African novels analysed in this chapter represent the impoverished economic conditions of postcolonial subjects as a major push factor to extreme violence, terrorism, and insurgency. This is appropriated as an alibi by various radical Islamic groups to perpetrate and propagate terrorism. Malam Abdul-Nur in *Born on a Tuesday* has access to the political and religious funding that Sheikh Jamal controls while youths in Nigeria and Somalia are recruited into terrorism mostly, but not primarily, due to poor economic conditions. The postcolonial nation-state is portrayed as being reckless and inept in fulfilling the dreams of its youths, thereby, making terrorist groups a veritable alternative for essentiality like Nafa Walid in *Wolf Dreams*.

Furthermore, all the African novels analysed in this chapter represent the male gender, solely, as the actors and leaders in terrorism while females like Amira, Zoubeida, Zaituun, inter alia, perform surrogate roles as mediating agents except Zainab in *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree* that is a suicide bomber. This representation enunciates the patriarchal proclivities underlying terrorism in Africa. Also, the gender of the author, most times, determines the gender that is represented as victims of terrorism while in, some cases, there is a mixture. In Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*, the male victims are killed immediately while Success and the other boys are left unattended to by the narrator except in snippets but the kidnapped girls form the crux of the narrative and it terminates with their release, leaving the reader(s) in a limbo about Success' fate. In John's *Born on a Tuesday*, it is a mixture: the male youths are depicted as victims of Islamic sectarian terrorism while women like Umma suffer the trauma of a natural disaster, Malam Abdul-Nur's wife endures the patriarchal terror of her husband. In Farah's *Crossbones*, those recruited to fight are mainly male characters like Taxliil while female characters suffer the terror of being under the Court and Al-Shabaab's rule. In essence, gender plays a prominent role in representing terrorism. However, only a few characters are represented as resistant to this terrorism perpetrated by Islamic sectarian patriarchal groups. Two of the selected authors, Farah and Khadra, portray feminist resistant undercurrent in their novels. Most of the women in Farah's novels fight the system because they are elite, while Khadra's Hanane is murdered by her erratic brother for defying the Islamic code of dressing and for protesting. Albeit there is no clear line on this argument, nevertheless, the gender of the author, to an extent, determines the gendering of the victims of terrorism based on other socio-cultural factors.

The authors' representations of the state's response to terrorism is uniform as highhanded and terroristic in itself. In John's *Born on a Tuesday*, the military adopts the imperial style of counterterrorism against the militants, operates a necrospace/space of exception where the law of reason is subverted and terrorises the people like the *mujahideen* do too. In Khadra's *Wolf Dreams*, the military and state police in Algeria act in similar ways like their counterparts in Nigeria, adopting a tit-for-tat system with the Islamist terrorists/insurgents. In Farah's *Crossbones*, the Transitional Federal Government backed by the Ethiopian army decimate civilians like Al-Shabaab too. The representations of deploying extreme and brazen force without considering the civilians or subjecting the terrorists to the legal system by the state is subtly denounced by the authors. This illustrates the sustained interrogation of postcolonial states and their neocolonial practices by African authors and the need to decolonise the government machinery of extreme force bequeathed to the postcolony.

#### **5.4.2. Comparative views on the representations of terrorism in selected Asian prose works**

The works analysed are Khaled Hosseini's (2004) *The Kite Runner*; Abdul Salam Zaef's (2010) *My Life with the Taliban* edited by Alex Strick van Linschoten and Felix Kuehn; Collin Mallard's (2012) *Stillpoint* and Elias Chacour with David Hazard's (2013) *Blood Brothers*. The events in the texts demonstrate that there are diverse guises of terrorism practised by both state and non-state actors. The aesthetic representation of these shades of terrorism shows that they are rooted in different forms of fundamentalism. In *Blood Brothers*, Chacour depicts Zionist terrorism as rooted in Christian/Biblical fundamentalism, what Axel Stahler (2007), generally, designates Jewish fundamentalism. The Zionist ultra-nationalist and religious fundamentalism is propagated through excessive militarism against Palestinians to seal the establishment of the state of Israel as an absolutist and monolithic entity that undermines pluralism or co-existence with the Other. This is comparable to Mallard's portrayal of Zionist terrorism in *Stillpoint*. Chacour and Mallard also depict the internationalisation of Zionist terrorism as a colonial condition that is bolstered by the United States and its allies in Europe. Similarly, the two authors represent how imperial violence/terrorism engenders reciprocal violence from the Other, therefore, underscoring terrorism as a medium of communication between the imperial Zionist Self and the

Palestinian Other whose homeland is being occupied. Equally, the two authors avoid generalisation by presenting the binary in both Israel and Palestine. Chacour presents the dyad of those that propose/support peace and those that favour terrorism on the side of both Israelis and Palestinians. Mallard depicts a parallel dyadic framework on both sides and questions the imperial roles of the United States in the Israeli-Palestinian crises.

Furthermore, Chacour and Mallard propose solutions to the protracted Israeli-Palestinian crises. Underscoring Chacour's suggestion is the necessity of unbundling the fundamentalism underpinning Zionism and the militarism of the Israeli state against Palestinians. Chacour recommends a state of equal coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians while Mallard proposes that the United States take a tougher position against Zionist terrorism against Palestinians as well as the excessive militarism of the Israeli government against Palestine/ians. Both authors represent how Zionists within the Israeli government deploy terrorism against the Palestinian Other through the state architecture and depict how some Palestinians, non-state actors, perpetrate terrorism against Israelis too.

Zaeef, on the other hand, represents the motivations of the Taliban and the Soviet's invasion of Afghanistan as the major drive for resistance in Afghanistan. While he deploys a contradictory image of the Taliban, Zaeef reveals how non-state actors mutate to state actors and deploy state infrastructure to propagate Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. Subtly, he draws a parallel between the United States' war on terrorism and colonial activities against the West's Other. While Zaeef presents a self-righteous image of the Taliban, he is silent on salient issues like the group's maltreatment of women, its extreme implementation of *shari'a*, the highhandedness of some members of the Taliban like Mullah Omar and the absolutist orientation of the group. However, the silences of Zaeef in his autobiography are accentuated in Hosseini's *The Kite Runner*. Hosseini represents how a state terrorises its citizens under the rubric of the Islamic judicial system and reifies the Taliban Government as a reign of terror in Afghanistan based on Islamic fundamentalism. Hosseini's fiction also raises questions about the comfortability of the homeland for its citizens like Sohrab.

#### **5.4.3. Comparative reflections on the representations of the postcolonial subjects and Islamic terrorism in the selected 9/11 American prose works**

Updike's *Terrorist* and DeLillo's *Falling Man* represent postcolonial subjects like Shaikh Rashid and Hammad as Islamic fundamentalists that promote Islamic terrorism, while Waldman's *The Submission* depicts another set of fundamentalism. Updike frames characters like Shaikh Rashid and Ahmad, his disciple, as Islamic fundamentalists that are bent on destroying America and DeLillo adopts the same portrayal of Muslims as terrorists without depicting exceptions. Updike and DeLillo represents Islam primarily as a violent religion and presents a narrow view of Islam, a religion of the Other. Conversely, Waldman portrays fundamentalism on the binary of positivity and negativity and how it affects the American culture and society, while Yee critiques America's war on terror as terror against the Other. Waldman represents Mo as a fundamentalist of his profession that does not succumb to any manipulative Western agency and represents Mo as a hybridised postcolonial subject that suffers the American Judeo-Christian fundamentalism as typified by Debbie Dawson. The nomenclature of Debbie's organisation "Save America from Islam" accentuates the Judeo-Christian/American exceptional fundamentalism underpinning her actions. Sean Gallagher is another illustration of the shade of fundamentalism that is most times overlooked in cultural representations. He exploits the terrorist attacks to popularise himself although he later changed. This contrasting representations of fundamentalism by the two authors signifies their imagination about the Other. DeLillo's *Falling Man* and Updike's *Terrorist* is a continuity of the stereotypical portrayal of the Other, while Waldman's *Submission* evinces deconstruction of the old prejudicial depiction of representing one form of fundamentalism but silencing the other. Waldman equally portrays Islam from a wider perspective of peace, from Asma's and Mo's parents' perspectives, and violence from the fundamentalist outlook of those who attacked Manhattan.

Also, Updike and DeLillo, on one side, and Waldman and Yee, on the other side, portray Islam differently. In Updike's *Terrorist* and DeLillo's *Falling Man*, stereotypical and generalist aesthetics of Islam are deployed, while Waldman and Yee depict a more deconstructive and varying perspective of Islam. Updike, through Shaikh Rashid and Ahmad, portrays Islam primarily as antagonistic to America and the West in general and DeLillo does the same through Hammad and Amir. According to Ahmad, "the American way is the way of infidels. It is headed for a terrible doom" (p.21). DeLillo, in *Falling Man*, represents Amir's definition of Islam as the "struggle against the enemy, near enemy and



far, Jews first, for all things unjust and hateful, and then the Americans” (p. 61). Equally, Updike and DeLillo portray Muslim characters as generally contesting American culture but they do not depict those that have assimilated it. Contrarily, Waldman deploys a balanced aesthetical representation of Islam by portraying Muslim characters on both sides of the divide and Yee portrays hybridised American Muslims that serve the country by projecting his image as a patriot. Asma in *The Submission*, for example, represents a Muslim character that believes Islam is a religion of peace. According to Asma

My husband was a man of peace because he was a Muslim. That is our tradition. That is what our Prophet, peace be upon him, taught... You have mixed up these bad Muslims, these bad people, and Islam. Millions of people all over the world have done good things because Islam tells them to. There are so many more Muslims who would never think of taking a life. You talk about paradise as a place for bad people. But that is not what we believe... The gardens of paradise are for men like my husband, who never hurt anyone. (*TS*, p. 230-231)

Waldman employs Asma’s character to deconstruct the stereotypical views of most Americans about Islam and to interrogate the concept of paradise for martyrs. Unlike the popular jihadi discourse that proposes paradise for supposed “martyrs”, Asma asseverates that “the gardens of paradise are for men...who never hurt anyone” (p. 231). This deconstructive depiction in Waldman’s *The Submission* is not available in Updike’s *Terrorist* nor in DeLillo’s *Falling Man*. Updike’s and DeLillo’s representations of Islam signify continuity of stereotyping and Orientalising the Other, while Waldman’s and Yee’s portrayal is a deconstructive framing of the Other. This study contends that there is fundamentalism in every religion, therefore, it is ethical of every writer to present a balanced view that Waldman aims at in *The Submission*.

Furthermore, Updike and DeLillo deploy derogatory description of the Other, while Waldman avoids this. Updike describes Ahmad’s father’s ancestors as those that “had been *baked* since the pharaohs in the *muddy* rice and overflowing Nile” (p. 7, **emphasis added**) and DeLillo relegates the Muslims in his novel to the ghetto of Marienstrasse. Updike’s description of Omar, Ahmad’s father, falls in the tradition of derogating the Other in cultural

expressions as preponderant in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. Also, Updike's description of the church in New Prospect where African Americans congregate is appalling and discriminatory. He states that

The church's decorous glory days of pious burghers in the hierarchically assigned pews also belong to the past. Now African American congregants bring their ***dishevelled, shouting religion. Their award-winning choir dissolving their brains*** in a rhythmical rapture as illusory as...the shuffling, mumbling trance of Brazilian *candomble*. (*Terrorist*, p. 8 **emphasis added**)

The emboldened part of the extract accentuates Updike's racial profiling embedded in his description of the church in New Prospect. To him, the glorious days of the church were when "pious burghers" worship at the church not now that African Americans use it. Similarly, his diction, like "disheveled", "shouting religion" and "dissolving their brains", signifies his derogation of the Other, in this case, African Americans. Conversely, Yee in *For God and Country* employs his image as a diligent soldier, chaplain, caring husband and father to deconstruct the image of the Other as indolent, evil and bad. His image against the overweening Western subjectivity contradicts that of DeLillo and Updike. The theme of these representational lens is that no subjectivity is homogenous and that adopting the homogenous gaze politicises representation and accentuates the silenced.

Conversely, Waldman's description of the other and its space is cautious and juxtaposes the good and the bad that co-exist in the space of the Other. In Waldman's description of Kabul's slum, the narrator follows Mo and narrativises that

He was in some kind of slum. The hills of Kabul had been left to the poor. Garbage clotted the gutters that ran alongside the unpaved pathways, which rain would churn to mud...The earthen houses, well-fortified rectangular structures with walls and high windows that made it impossible to see inside. (*TS*, p. 278)

This short extract contrasts Waldman's cautionary description of the Other with Updike's demeaning imagining of the Other. Even Waldman's description of the latrine toilet does not appropriate demeaning diction like Updike's. According to the narrator,

The foul smell grew stronger as they moved along the alley, then there was the small outhouse. Inside Mo shut the door and squatted over the hole, gagging before he remembered to hold his breath...His bowels emptied in furious stinking squirts...rocking to get his balance...he looked down into a sea with islands of shit. (*TS*, p. 279)

Albeit the scatological imagery presented by Waldman's narrator, the diction respects the Other. To evince the balance between the irritable and pleasant images that coexist in the space of the Other, Waldman depicts Mo's experience of a sterling garden that presumably informs his memorial design. The narrator describes the landscape as "marked by symmetry, order, geometry" (p. 279).

### **5.5. Summary of findings**

This thesis has traversed the literary works of three continents namely Africa, Asia, and North America. The selected works comprise fiction and autobiographies. This thesis examines the representations and tropologies of terrorism in the selected prose works. The concept of terrorism is a controversial one that is problematised by its connection to power, politics, and hegemony. This problem starts from establishing a conventional definition for terrorism to defining who a terrorist is. From the postcolonial perspective, it is observed that a significant part of the discourse on terrorism in literary studies has been based on the representations of postcolonial subjects as (supposed) terrorists in American novels with meagre concentration on the representations and aesthetics of terrorism in literatures of other nations and the disguised forms of terrorism in the empire. This evokes the questions of how writers represent terrorism within the postcolonial states/nations, what narrative aesthetics are deployed in representing terrorism within the nation-state – beyond the 9/11 attacks and narratives, how are terrorists represented, what type of terrorism is represented, are the representations of terrorism/terrorists a continuity or discontinuity in consonance with the inquiry of Frank and Guber (2012), what actions of the state are represented as terrorism, and what tropes are deployed by the writers to represent terrorism, among others. Hence, the representations and tropologies of terrorism in the selected novels span three periods: the pre-terrorism era that accounts for the conditions that stimulate terrorism, the terrorism epoch that records the time of an actual terrorist attack whether as ongoing or a past event and the post-terrorism era which accounts for the trauma of terrorism, the phobia

and the complicated war on terror by states that adopt state of exception. This does not mean the term “post-terrorism period” is not problematic on its own but it is deployed in this thesis to encompass a definite era of an event like post-9/11, post-Boko Haram, and the like, considering that there may not be an actual “post-” to terrorism in any society. Hence, in line with the first objective of this research, the representations of forms of state and non-state terrorism are identified in the prose works and the tropes deployed are interrogated.

The selected African novels analysed in this thesis are from Nigeria, Somalia, and Algeria, three hotbeds of terrorism in Africa. The authors comprise Elnathan John and Adaobi Nwaubani from Nigeria and they represent the conditions that birth Boko Haram and the terror of Boko Haram terrorists on their victims respectively; Yasmin Khadra is from Algeria while Nuruddin Farah is from Somalia. Khadra and Farah depict terrorism as both national and transnational and critique war on terrorism as a parallel with terrorism. Although past literature like Spencer (2011), Boehmer 2010(b) identify war on terrorism as the newest form of terrorism, this study further the argument by appropriating Mbembe’s (2003) theorisation of necropolitics to connect war on terrorism to state terrorism, especially within the postcolony. Spencer (2011) connects war on terror to torture and imperialism but this study connects war on terror as rooted in torture to necropower, a synonym for state terrorism, which is rooted in the colonial terror that underlie governmentality in the postcolony. Also, this study identifies how writers in the postcolony appropriate the narrative strategies of their counterparts in the West by deploying identity differentiation based on ethnicity (John in *BOAT*) and religious exclusion to narrativise terrorism. Most writers also avoid using the term terrorist because of the controversy it generates but rather utilise “militant” to describe the terrorists represented. Also, this research extends beyond the findings of Senoussi and Serir Mortad (2019) by identifying the tropes deployed by the selected African authors in narrativising terrorism in line with the fourth objective of this study.

The Asian novels are Khaled Hosseini’s (2004) *The Kite Runner*; Abdul Salam Zaef’s (2010) *My Life with the Taliban* edited by Alex Strick van Linschoten and Felix Kuehn; Collin Mallard’s (2012) *Stillpoint* and Elias Chacour with David Hazard’s (2013) *Blood Brothers*. The four novels portray terrorism in different shades as perpetrated by both non-

state and state actors. Most research like Toine van Teeffelen (1994) and Deb (2015) have dwelt on the representations of the Western against the non-Western in Israeli/Palestinian crises, however, this study furthers the argument that the selected authors in representing the state and non-state terrorism that occur in Palestine/Israel propose non-violent humanist alternatives, that look beyond the present state of terrorism. Equally, in the Israeli and Palestinian literature, Shohat and Stam (2014) identify the trope of good and evil. This study complements this by identifying other tropes like that of olive trees, Palestinians as dirt and the trope of the roving voice. In the Afghanistan literature, autobiographical and fictional representations of the Taliban are compared. While Stuhr (2009) conceives Hosseini in *TKR* as representing the day-to-day lives of Afghans, this study argues that the latter part of the work depicts the Taliban's state terrorism in contrast to the sanctimonious image of the Taliban portrayed by Zaeef in *My Life*.

The last four are 9/11 American narratives. The three novels represent terrorism contrastingly especially in relation to the postcolonial subjects portrayed while Yee's *For God and Country*, an autobiography, critiques war on terror as terrorism against the West's Other and employs his image to deconstruct the stereotypical image of Muslims as terrorists which aligns with the argument of Boehmer and Morton 2010 and Said (2003) on imperial nature of America's war against terrorism. The narratives' differing representations signify the ongoing deconstruction of the stereotypical and racialised portrayal of postcolonial subjects, the West's Other, that is dominant in narratives about terrorism as in Updike's *Terrorist* and DeLillo's *Falling Man* as contended by Gamal (2012) and Blessington (2008). Hence, this research agrees that there is both continuity and discontinuity in the representation of the postcolonial subject as a terrorist in American novels. The continuity is in the works of DeLillo and Updike, while the discontinuity is in Walman's *The Submission*. Although Amy Waldman's *The Submission* does not capture an actual terrorist attack, however, it narrativises the outcome of 9/11 on America and its Others. Therefore, her novel typifies the essence of including post-terrorism period as part of representations of terrorism in this thesis.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **6.1. Summary of the study**

This research examines the representations and tropologies of terrorism in selected prose works. In Chapter One, the background of the study expounds the necessity of apprehending the history of terrorism in literature and terrorism. The background also reflects on the controversy that defining terrorism generates and conceptualises the definition of terrorism for this research and explains the nexus between terrorism and literature. The statement of the problem explains how concentration in literature and terrorism has commonly been on American novels and how analyses are usually isolated therefore creating the gap for extending textual exegesis to prose works from the postcolony and comparing them with their counterparts in other continents. The research questions and the aim and objectives are enumerated. The scope of this research spans twelve prose works from three continents namely Africa, Asia and North America. The significance and justifications of this research are explained and the chapter is concluded with the definition of terms.

In Chapter Two, the conceptual framework is premised on the essence of interdisciplinarity in literature and terrorism. The empirical review comprises the critical review of the Western hegemony that has profoundly influenced the meaning of terrorism, the major typologies of literature and terrorism as postulated by Kubiak (2004), the review of terrorism in other discourse and its influence on literary expressions, the critical review of representations and tropologies of terrorism in literary works and then the postcolonial theoretical underpinning of this study. The aspects of Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Achille Mbembe, among others are explained, while the war on terror is interrogated as a colonial present. The models of Ashcroft et al (2002) provide direction for this study in terms of national and comparative methodologies. Hence, Chapter Two concludes by stating there exists a thin borderline between resistance and terrorism, especially in postcolonialism.

The research methodology for this research is explained in Chapter Three. The study setting spans three continents and the research samples four prose works from each of the three continents and the sampling technique is purposive. Although this technique possesses its biases, however, for this research to achieve its research aim, prose works are purposively selected based on representations of terrorism and their availability in English. The research is qualitative and adopts an interpretive design. Data were sourced from secondary sources. Postcolonial theory underpins the textual exegesis in this study. Chapter Four basically entails the analysis of four African prose fiction: two from Nigeria, one from Algeria and one from Somalia. The limitation of finding prose works in English and representing terrorism determined the choice. All the texts represent both non-state terrorism, especially religious and political terrorism, and state terrorism which focalises necropower, an aspect of postcolonialism postulated by Mbembe (2003). Previous critical attention usually focuses on the representations of terrorism, its alibi or motivation and the othering that underlie the representations of terrorist identities, however, the analysis in this chapter identifies necropower as underlying the war against terrorism in the postcolony.

In chapter Five, prose works from Asia and North America are analysed. Similar to the textual exegesis in Chapter Four. Different patterns of terrorism and the othering that underpins the representations of terrorist identities are identified. The critical discussion of texts from Afghanistan demonstrates Talibanism between 1996 to 2001 as state terrorism and the contradiction between autobiographical representations by a Taliban member and a fictional representation of the group is reified. America's war against terror is also interrogated as a continuation of a colonial present. The texts on Palestine/Israel depict resistance as terrorism, colonial occupation and the alternatives to terrorism. The American prose works swing between stereotypical representations of non-Westerners and the shift to the deconstruction of the image as well as the portrayal of America's war against terror as revenge against non-Westerners and the continuation of colonialism. The comparative reflections demonstrate that religious ideologies promote terrorism and that most forms of war against terrorism are premised on necropower and colonial imaginary. The summary encapsulates all these findings. This research is concluded in Chapter Six. The summary of this study is presented, recommendations are proposed and contributions to knowledge explained. Lastly, suggestions for further studies are proposed.

## 6.2. Conclusion

In this thesis, two forms of terrorism, non-state and state, are identified, with religious ideologies playing prominent roles. Non-state terrorism, especially Islamic terrorism, spans Africa, Asia and North America, while state terrorism is more pronounced in Africa and Asia. In most of the selected prose works, variations of Islam play essential roles in interrogating politics, resisting dominant order, and stimulating terrorism. Zionism and dominant Christian ideologies promote the terrorism in Israel/Palestine. However, this thesis contends that Islam as a religion does not generally signify violence and terrorism but some sectarian modifications and ideologies. Equally, the representations of terrorism in cultural expressions should be more deconstructive rather than a continuity of stereotypical aesthetics like in Updike's *Terrorist* and DeLillo's *Falling Man*. The postcolonial interrogation of representations of terrorism in African novels also focalises the postcolony's postcolonial condition that drives terrorism and the postcolonial state as a site of violence that parallels terrorism. John portrays this in *Born on a Tuesday* as well as Khadra in *Wolf Dreams*. War on terrorism should be within the instruments of law and not necropolitics.

Also, the representations of Zionist fundamentalism/terrorism and Palestinian resistance/terrorism by Mallard and Chacour valorises the role of the colonial present in promoting terrorism and validates Fanon's argument that colonial terror stimulates anti-colonial terror. Similarly, Zionist terrorism accentuates the argument that every religion has its variant of extremism which means Islamic terrorism has received much attention because of 9/11, whereas Zionist terrorism has attracted lesser interrogation because of the role of the United States in supporting the colonial order in Israel. Consequently, the two authors propose non-violent humanist alternatives that the two sides (the Israelis and the Palestinians) can learn from cultural expressions. This makes cultural expressions an embodiment of themes for social development and not just a mirror of a society's ills. Thus, it is expedient to shift from the dominant discourse of 9/11 terrorism in American/western novels to the terrorism in postcolonial states as represented in different, emerging cultural expressions. Also, it is essential to pay close attention to the textual representations of the present colonial violence against the Western Other that the empire, as spearheaded by the United States of America, engenders and promotes in the cloak of war on terrorism.



### **6.3. Recommendations**

General recommendations include maintaining equal criteria and standards in designating an organisation terrorist or an act terrorism. The West and its allies should interrogate Israel's roles in Palestine and take an objective position that will resolve the perennial conflicts between the two sides. To resolve crisis and terrorism in contemporary societies, nonviolent alternatives should be promoted and propagated as humanist precepts that can conserve humanity and its civilisation and this should be given more critical attention. Equally, while the war against terrorism is inevitable, it should be executed within the purview of inter/national laws that guide reason and civilisation.

### **6.4. Contributions to knowledge**

This research has demonstrated that the word terrorism is a politicised term and that there is a thin line between resistance and terrorism, especially in the postcolony. Also, it has revealed that authors generally use one form of othering or the other to represent terrorists and they utilise different tropes as narrative strategies to represent the terrorist identity as negative. This study reveals America's war on terror as a continuity of colonising the Western Other and draws attention to new forms of colonialism. It added that not all Western authors disparage the image of the Western Other. While previous critical attention interrogates representations of non-state terrorism in prose works, this research extends the discourse by examining representations of state terrorism and its nuances in prose works. Lastly, some of the authors propose humanist non-violent alternatives to terrorism which should also attract more critical attention.

### **6.5. Suggestions for further studies**

Further studies should be considered in the areas of representations of alternatives to terrorism in literary works and resistance or terrorism as a conceptual conundrum in postcolonialism. Also, the representations and tropes of terrorism can be examined in other genres of literature.

## REFERENCES

- Abdu Al-Moghales, M., Adel, A. M. and Ahmad, S. 2018. Saudi novelists' response to terrorism through fiction: a study in comparison to world literature. *Trames*. 22. 4:365-388.
- Abdullahi "Ingiris", M. H. 2019. Al-Shabaab youth recruitment project. *War and peace in Somalia: national grievances, local conflict and Al-Shabaab*. Keating, M. and Waldman, M. Eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 339-348.
- Abrams, M. H. 1999. *A glossary of literary terms: seventh edition*. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle.
- Abu-manneh, B. 2016. *The Palestinian novel: from 1949 to the present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adekoya, A. 2018a. Gani Adams: how Aare-Ona-Kakanfo came to be. Retrieved Jan. 3, 2020, from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2018/01/gani-adams-aare-ona-kakanfo-title-came/>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018b. Afonja: the Kakanfo and fall of the Oyo empire. Retrieved Jan. 3, 2020, from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2018/01/afonja-kakanfo-fall-oyo-empire/>.
- Adeleke, I. O. 2016. *Theorising the Abiku/Ogbanje motif in Sefi Atta's Everything good will come, Wale Okediran's Tenants of the house and Helon Habila's Oil on water*. MA Project. Department of English. University of Ibadan. 78pp.
- Agamben, G. and Attell, K. Trans. 2005. *State of exception*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Agustina, H. N. 2015. *The kite runner: my passion of literature*. *International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities*.
- Ahmadi, W. 2008. *Modern Persian literature in Afghanistan: anomalous visions of history and form*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Akande, L. 2021. Postcolonial anarchy and minority discourse in Elnathan's *Born on a Tuesday*, Sule's *Sterile Sky*, and Yakusak's *After they Left*. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing and World Literatures*. 2. 2: 27-42.
- Allen, B. 1992. Terrorism tales: gender and the fictions of Italian national identity. *Italica*. 69. 2:161-176.
- Anntonowicz, A. 2002. Zamaira being executed by Taliban. Retrieved Jan. 3, 2020, from <http://www.rawa.org/zarmeena2.htm>
- Anonymous. Al Jazeera News: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/07/germany-jails-neo-nazi-cell-member-life-racist-killings-180711081629129.html>.
- Anugwom, E. E. 2019. *The Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria: perspectives from within*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Anyaduba, C. A. 2019. Genocide and hubristic masculinity in Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun*. *Research in African Literatures*. 50. 2:86-104.
- Anzur, M. Z. with Loewen, A. 2011. The modern Pashto short story in Afghanistan. *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 186-202.

- Appelbaum, R. 2015. Shakespeare and terrorism. *Criticism*. 57. 1:23-45.
- Ashcroft, A. et al. 2002. *The empire writes back: theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashour, R. 2010. Heikkinen, K. trans. 2014. *The woman from Tantoura*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Asuelime, L. E. and David, O. J. 2015. *Boko Haram: the socio-economic drivers*. New York: Springer Cham Heidelberg.
- Bachi, S. and Rice, A. 2011. The place of Islam in literature: geography, memory and exile. *Religion & Literature*. 43. 1:162-166.
- Baelo-Allu, S. 2012. 9/11 and the psychic trauma novel: Dond DeLillo's Falling man/ El 11 de septiembre y la novela de trauma psicologico: "Falling Man", de Don DeLillo. *Atlantis*. 34. 1:63-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. From the traumatic to the political: cultural trauma, 9/11 and Amy Waldman's "The submission". *Atlantis, Junio* 38. 1:165-183.
- Baudrillard, J. and Turner, C. Trans. 2003. *The spirit of terrorism*. London: Verso.
- Beer, D. 2007. The morality of terror: contemporary responses to political violence in Boris Savinkov's The pale horse (1909) and What never happened (1912). *The Slavonic and East European Review*. 85.1:25-46.
- Benjamin, W. 1978. Critique of violence. *reflections: essays, aphorisms, autobiographical writings*. New York: Schocken Books. 277-300.
- Benson, T. C. 1982. Five arguments against interdisciplinary studies. *Issues in Integrative Studies*. 1: 38-48.
- Bernard, A. 2013. *Rhetorics of belonging: nation, narration and Israel/Palestine*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Bernholz, P. 2017. *Totalitarianism, terrorism and supreme values: history and theory*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Bhabha, H. and Mark, C. L. Trans. 1986. Remembering Fanon: self, psyche and the colonial condition. Fanon, F. and Mark, C. L. *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press. vii-xxv.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bharat, M. 2013. The English novel and terrorism. *India International Centre Quarterly*. 40. 2:79-90.
- Blessington, F. Politics and the terrorist novel. *The Swansea Review*. 116. 1:116 -124.
- Boehmer, E. 2007. Postcolonial writing and terror. *Wasafari*. 22. 2:4-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Postcolonial writing and terror. *Terror and the Postcolonial*. In Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. 141-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Morton, S. 2010. 2010. Introduction: terror and the postcolonial. *Terror and the Postcolonial*. In Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. 1-24.
- Bosch-Vilarrubias, M. 2016. Post-9/11 representations of Arab men by American women writers: affirmation and resistance. New York: Peter Lang.
- Braunsperger, G. 2012. Sergey Nechaev and Dostoevsky's *Devils*: the literary answer to terrorism in nineteenth-century Russia. *Literature and terrorism: comparative perspectives*. In Frank, M. C. and Grubber, E. Eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 27-39.
- Brinson, M. and Stohl, M. 2009. From 7/7 to 8/10: Media framing of terrorist incidents in the United States and United Kingdom. *The faces of terrorism: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. In David Canter. Ed. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

- Brunner, C. 2007. Occidentalism meets the female suicide bomber: a critical on recent terrorism. *War and Terror I: Race-Gendered Logics and Effects in Conflict Zones*. 32. 4:957-971.
- Burleigh, M. 2009. *Blood and rage*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Bush, G. W. 2001. Detention, treatment and trial of certain non-citizens in the war against terrorism. Retrieved Sep. 14, 2020, from <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/mo-111301.htm>
- Byron, L. Ourika.
- Calvert, J. 2015. The roots of Islamism and Islamist violence. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 258–269.
- Campbell, G. 2007. “To the shore of Tripoli”: Milton, Islam, and the attacks on America and Spain. *Fundamentalism and literature*. Pessó-Miquel, C. and Stierstorfer, K. Eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 7-20.
- Canter, D. 2009. The multi-faceted nature of terrorism: an introduction. *The faces of terrorism: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. In David Canter. Ed. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Chacour, E. and Hazard, D. 1984. *Blood brothers: The dramatic story of a Palestinian Christian working for peace in Israel*. United Kingdom: Chosen Books.
- Chaliand, G. and Blin, A. 2007. Lenin, Stalin and state terrorism. *The history of terrorism from antiquity to Al-Qaeda*. In Chaliand, G. and Blin, A. Eds. Sneider, E. et al. Trans. Berkeley: University of California Press. 197–207.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2007. Zealots and Assassins. *The history of terrorism from antiquity to Al-Qaeda*. In Chaliand, G. and Blin, A. Eds. Sneider, E. et al. Trans. Berkeley: University of California Press. 55–78.
- Cheng, J. E. 2015. Islamophobia, Muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse and Society* 26. 5:562-568.
- Chouin, G., Reinert, M. and Apard, E. 2014. Body count and religion in the Boko Haram crisis: evidence from the Nigeria Watch database. *Boko Haram: Islamism, politics, security and the state in Nigeria*. In Perouse de Montelos, M. Eds. Leiden: African Studies Centre. 213-236.
- Conrad, J. 2005. *Heart of darkness*. United States: Icon Classics.
- Conte, J. N. 2011. Don DeLillo’s “*Falling man*” and the age of terror. *Modern Fiction Studies* 57. 3:559-583.
- Cook, D. 2015. Islamist terrorism from the Muslim Brotherhood to Hamas. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 270–283.
- Cope, K. L. 2007. Never better than late: the *Left behind* series and the incongruities of fundamentalist idealisms. *Fundamentalism and literature*. Pessó-Miquel, C. and Stierstorfer, K. Eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 181-204.
- Corbin, C. M. 2017. Terrorists are always Muslim but never white: at the intersection of critical race theory and propaganda. *Fordham Law Review* 86. 2:455-485.
- Coundouriotis, E. 2016. Improbable figures: realist fictions of insecurity in contemporary African fiction. *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. 49. 2: 236-261.
- Dasylyva, A. 2017. *Culture matters: African literary traditions, organic ontologies and epistemological roots*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

- Dauda, S. 2016. Ending religious extremism in Northern Nigeria: a study of Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday*. *Nile Journal of English Studies*. 3: 16-20.
- Davis, R. 2016. 12 Horrific crimes committed by the KKK between 1921 and 2016. Retrieved Jan. 5, 2019, from: <https://www.essence.com/culture/horrific-kkk-crimes/>.
- Deb, B. 2015. *Transnational feminist perspectives on terror in literature and culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Defoe, D. 2007. *Robinson Crusoe*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Delillo, D. 2007. *Falling man*. New York: Scribner.
- Dillinger, J. 2015. Tyrannicide from ancient Greece and Rome to the crisis of the seventh century. *The Routledge History of Terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 15–27.
- Diop, B. B. Mc Laughlin, F. Trans. 2016. *Murambi: the book of bones*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Ditrych, O. 2014. *Tracing the discourses of terrorism: identity, genealogy and state*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1996. *The souls of the black folk*. New York: Modern Library.
- Dutton, M., Gandhi, L. MacDonald, A. and Seth, S. 2004. Commitment, relevance and postcolonial terror. *Postcolonial Studies*. 7. 1: 5-10.
- Duvall, J. N. and Marzec, R. P. 2011. Narrating 9/11. *Modern Fiction Studies* 57. 3:381-400.
- Eaglestone, R. 2010. “The age of reason is over...an age of fury was dawning”: contemporary fiction and terror. *Terror and the Postcolonial*. Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. 361-369.
- Easthope, A. 1998. Homi Bhabha, hybridity and identity, or Derrida versus Lacan. *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 4. 1/2:145-151.
- Eichstaedt, P. 2010. *Pirate state: inside Somalia's terrorism at sea*. Illinois: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Eikonsalo, S. 2017. “Sometimes America needs to be pushed”: Amy Waldman's *The submission* and the early American 9/11 novels. *Brno Studies in English* 43. 2:79-94.
- El Fadl, K. M. A. 2005. *The great theft: wresting Islam from the extremists*. New York: Perfectbound, HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Elad-Bouskila, A. 2013. *Modern Palestinian literature and culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Emmanuel-Olowonubi, O. and Ogbonna, C. 2020. Religious extremism in Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday*. *Lokoja Journal of English and Literature*. 1. 2: 150-162.
- Estevez-Saa, M and Pereira-Ares, N. 2016. Trauma and transculturalism in contemporary fictional memories of 9/11. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 57. 3:268-278.
- Falola, T. 2003. *The power of African cultures*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Fanon, F. and Farrington, C. Trans. 1963. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Farinacci, E. 2013. *Cultural identity and the peacemaking process. The case of Christians in Israel and the Palestinian Territories*. Retrieved Sep. 14, 2020, from <http://amsacta.unibo.it/3751/1/FARINACCI.pdf>.
- Foucault, M. 2016. Murphy, J. and Khalfa, J. Trans. *History of madness*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Frank, M. C. 2012. Plots on London: terrorism in turn-of-the-century British fiction. *Literature and terrorism: comparative perspectives*. In Frank, M. C. and Grubber, E. Eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 41-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Grubber, E. 2012. Literature and terrorism: introduction. *Literature and terrorism: comparative perspectives*. Frank, M. C. and Grubber, E. Eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 1–23.
- Gabriel, M. A. 2015. *Islam and terrorism: the truth about ISIS, the Middle East, and Islamic jihad*. Florida: FrontLine.
- Gamal, A. 2012. “Encounters with strangeness’ in the post-9/11 novel. *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*. 14. 1:95-116.
- Gartenstein-Ross, D. 2015. The genesis, rise, and uncertain future of al-Qaeda. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 333–350.
- Garuba, H. 2017. Teacherly texts: imagining futures in Nuruddin Farah’s past imperfect trilogy. *Boundary*. 2. 44: 15-30.
- George, D. 1988. Distinguishing classical tyrannicide from modern terrorism. *The review of politics*. 50, 3: 390–419.
- Gerges, F. A. 2016. *A history of ISIS*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Gilpin, R. B. 2015. American racial terrorism from Brown to Booth to Birmingham. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 143–156.
- Gotanda, N. 2011. The racialization of Islam in American law. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 637:184-195.
- Gray, R. 2009. Open doors, closed minds: American prose writing at a time. *American Literary History*. 21. 1:128-151.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *After the fall: American literature since 9/11*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Green, N. 2014. Modern Persian literature in Afghanistan: anomalous visions of history and form. *Iranian Studies*. 47, 3:487-489.
- Gregory, D. 2006. The black flag: Guantanamo Bay and the space of exception. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*. 88, 4:405-427.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *The colonial present*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Griffin, R. 2015. Modernity and terrorism. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 369-382.
- Grisard, D. 2014. History of knowledge, terrorism and gender. *Historical Social research, Special Issue: Terrorism, Gender, and History*. 39. 3:82-99.
- Grob-Fitzgibbon, B. 2015. Britain’s small war: the challenge to empire, 1881 – 1951. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 177–189.
- Habila, H. 2019. The future of African literature. In *Journal of the African Literature Association*. 13, 1: 153 – 162.
- Hagenloh, P. M. 2015. State terrorism in early twentieth-century Europe. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 159–176.
- Hansen, S. J. 2013. *Al-Shabaab in Somalia: the history and ideology of a militant group, 2005–2012*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hardack, R. 2004. Two's a crowd: "Mao II", Coke II, and the politics of terrorism in Don DeLillo. *Studies in the Novel: Terrorism and the Postmodern Novel*. 36. 3:374-392.
- Harnischfeger, J. 2014. Boko Haram and its Muslim critics: observations from Yobe State. *Boko Haram: Islamism, politics, security and the state in Nigeria*. In Perouse de Montelos, M. Eds. Leiden: African Studies Centre. 33-62.
- Hartnell, L. and Hartnell, A. 2011. Violence and the faithful in post-9/11 America: Updike's "Terrorist", Islam and the specter of exceptionalism. *Modern Fiction Studies* 57. 3:477-502.
- Hashimi, F. 2016. 'How can they write about anything but pain?' The writing life in Afghanistan. Retrieved Sep. 14, 2020, from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/the-writing-life-around-the-world-by-electric-literature/2016/mar/02/how-can-they-write-about-anything-but-pain-the-writing-life-in-afghanistan>.
- Herman, P. C. 2015. Terrorism and the critique of American culture: John Updike's Terrorist. *Modern Philology* 112. 4:691-712.
- Hoffman, B. 2006. *Inside terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hosseini, K. 2004. *The kite runner*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Hossessini, A. S. and Zohdi, E. 2016. *The kite runner* and the problem of racism and ethnicity. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*. 74: 33-40.
- Houen, A. 2002. *Terrorism and modern literature: from Joseph Conrad to Ciaran Carson*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. Novel spaces and taking places in the wake of September 11. *Studies in the Novel: Terrorism and the Postmodern Novel*. 36. 3:419-437.
- Hubac-Occhipinti, O. 2007. Anarchist terrorists of the nineteenth century. *The history of terrorism from antiquity to Al-Qaeda*. In Chaliand, G. and Blin, A. Eds. Sneider, E. et al. Trans. Berkeley: University of California Press. 113-131.
- Huggan, G. 2008. *Interdisciplinary measures: literature and the postcolonial studies*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Hughes, G. 2015. International terrorism. *The Routledge History of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 456-469.
- Hundeyin, D. 2021. Cornflakes for jihad: the Boko Haram origin story. Retrieved Oct. 21, 2021, from <https://westafricaweekly.substack.com/p/cornflakes-for-jihad-the-boko-haram>.
- Ibrahim, A. A. 2015. *Season of crimson blossoms*. Lagos: Parresia Books.
- Irele, F. A. 2001. *The African imagination: literature in Africa and the Black diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Israel and Egypt. 1979. Framework for peace in the Middle East agreed at Camp David (with annex.) Retrieved July 5, 2019, from [https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/EG%20IL\\_780917\\_Framework%20for%20peace%20in%20the%20MiddleEast%20agreed%20at%20Camp%20David.pdf](https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/EG%20IL_780917_Framework%20for%20peace%20in%20the%20MiddleEast%20agreed%20at%20Camp%20David.pdf).
- Jefferess, D. 2009. To be good (again): *The kite runner* as allegory of global ethics. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. 45. 4: 389-400.
- Jenkins, P. 2003. *Images of terror: what we can know and can't know about terrorism*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

- Jennings, M. 2015. Terrorism in America from the colonial period to John Brown. *The Routledge History of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 77–91.
- Jensen, R. B. 2015. Anarchist terrorism and counter-terrorism in Europe and the world, 1878 – 1934. *The Routledge History of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 111–129.
- John, E. 2015. *Born on a Tuesday*. Lagos: Cassava Republic Press.
- Johnson, S. 2016. Johnson, O. Eds. *The history of the Yorubas*. FB &c Ltd, [www.forgottenbooks.com](http://www.forgottenbooks.com).
- Johnson, T. H., DuPee, M. and Shaaker, W. 2017. *Taliban narratives: the use and power of stories in the Afghanistan conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, T. 2015. Anarchist terrorism in the United States. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 130-42.
- Josephus, F. Thackeray, J. Trans. 1961. *The Jewish war, books IV – VII*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: William Heinemann Ltd and Harvard University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Whiston, W. Trans. *The antiquities of the Jews*. Retrieved Jan. 4, 2019, from [http://www.ultimatebiblelibrary.com/Complete\\_Works\\_of\\_Josephus.pdf](http://www.ultimatebiblelibrary.com/Complete_Works_of_Josephus.pdf).
- Kabraji, R. 2010. Reviewed work: *My life with the Taliban* by Abdul Salam Zaeef, Alex Strick van Linschoten, Felix Kuehn. *International Affairs*. 86. 6: 1455-1457.
- Kashua, S. 2006. *Let it be morning*. Shlesinger, M. Trans. New York: Black Cat.
- Kehinde, M. A., Lamidi, M. T., Akinjobi, A. A., Osisanwo, A. A. and Adebisi-Adelabu, A. K. 2019. Theories and methodologies in English Studies. *Theories and methodologies in the humanities*. In Ekanola, A. B., Raji-Oyelade, A. and Olaniyi, R. O. Eds. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. 95-129.
- Khadra, Y. 2004. *The swallows of Kabul*. Cullen, J. Trans. New York: Anchor Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Wolf dreams*. Black, L. Trans. New York: Toby Press.
- Khalaf, F. 2015. *The girl who escaped ISIS: this is my story*. Hoffmann, A. C. Trans. Atria Books ebook.
- Khoudi, M. A. and Guendouzi, A. 2021. Yasmina Khadra's *The Attack*: a “redemptive narrative”. *Language Practices*. 12. 3: 236-256.
- Klein, J. T. 1999. *Mapping interdisciplinary studies: the academy in transition*. Washington: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *Humanities, culture and interdisciplinarity: the changing American academy*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Creating interdisciplinary campus cultures: a model for strength and sustainability*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Koehler, D. 2017. *Right-wing terrorism in the 21st century: the national socialist underground and the history of terror from the far-right in Germany*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Kolb, A. F. R. 2021. *Epidemic empire: colonialism, contagion, and terror, 1817-2020*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kubiak, A. 2004. Spelling it out: narrative typologies of terror. *Studies in the Novel: Terrorism and the Postmodern Novel*. 36. 3: 294-301.
- Laqueur, W. 1977. Interpretations of terrorism: fact, fiction and political science. *Journal of Contemporary History*. 12. 1:1-42.



- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *The new terrorism: Fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *A history of terrorism*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Law, R. D. 2009. *Terrorism: a history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. Introduction. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 1–11.
- Lazarus, N. 2005. Representation and terror in V. Y. Mudimbe. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*. 17. 1:81-101.
- Le Sueur, J. D. 2010. *Algeria since 1989: between terror and democracy*. London: Zed books.
- Lee, J. 2011. A guided tour of Afghanistan's history. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 36-60.
- Leede, S. 2014. Afghan women and the Taliban: an exploratory assessment. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism.
- Lewis. B. 1988. *The political language of Islam*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Loewen, A. 2011a. Stepping inside: culture through the windows of art and literature. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 21-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011b. A thousand years of Persian jewels: classical Persian poetry. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 61-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011c. Voices from behind windows and walls: an overview of Dari short stories. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 111-120.
- Lopez, A. J. 2001. *Posts and pasts: a theory of postcolonialism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lynch, L. 2006 Truth and lies at Guantanamo Bay: reviewed work(s): *Inside he wire: a military intelligence soldier's eyewitness account of life at Guantanamo* by Erik Saar: *For god and country: faith and patriotism under fire* by James Yee. *The Arab Studies Journal*. 13/14. 2/1: 213-218.
- Makhoul, E. 2017. *The role of Arab Christians in the Palestinian national movement*. United States: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Maley, W. 2002. *The Afghanistan wars*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mallard, C. 2013. *Stillpoint: A novel of war, peace, politics and Palestine*. Mumbai: Zen Publications.
- Marchal, R. 2019. Motivations and drivers of Al-Shabaab. *War and peace in Somalia: national grievances, local conflict and Al-Shabaab*. In Keating, M. and Waldman, M. Eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 309-318.
- Martin, E. 2012. 'I' for iconoclasm: graphic novels and the (r)epresentation of terrorism. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. 5.3:469-481.
- Martin-Salvan, P. 2017. Public art and communal space: the politics of commemoration in Amy Waldman's *The submission*. *Memory frictions in contemporary literature*. Maria Jesus Martinez-Alfaro and Silvia Pellicer-Ortin. Eds. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. 87-104.

- Maruf, H. and Joseph, D. 2018. *Inside Al-Shabaab: the secret history of Al-Qaeda's most powerful ally*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Matthews, G. and Goodman, S. 2013. Introduction: violence and the limits of representation. *Violence and the limit of representation*. In Matthews, G. and Goodman. Eds. United States and United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-11.
- Matusitz, J. 2015. *Symbolism in terrorism*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Mayer, R. 2007. Virus discourse: the rhetoric of threat and terrorism in the biothriller. *Cultural Critique*. 66. 1-20.
- Mazza, V. 2019. Afterword: the chosen generation. *Buried beneath the Baobab Tree*. Nwaubani, A. T. Lagos: Masobe.
- Mbagwu, D. J. and Oaikhena, A. O. 2019. Expressions of patriarchy in Adaobi Tricia Nwaubani's *Buried beneath the baobab tree* and Ama Ata Aidoo's *Changes: a love story*. *Preorc Journal of Gender and Sexuality Studies*. 1. 91-100.
- Mbembe, J. A. Meintjes, L. Trans. 2003. Necropolitics. *Public Culture*. 15. 1:11-40.
- McClintock, S. 2015. *Topologies of fear in contemporary fiction: The anxieties of post-nationalism and counter terrorism*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McDonald, J. 2016. DeLillo's *Falling man* and the trouble with sympathy in narratives of terrorism. *Comparative Literature and Culture* 18. 3:1-9.
- McGrattan, C. 2015. The northern Irish troubles. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 204-217.
- McKeon, M. 1994. The origins of interdisciplinary studies. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. 28. 1:17-28.
- McManus, A. 2013. Terror narratives: gendering violence, dividing sympathy. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*. 9. 2:80-107.
- Meservy, J. 2019. Travelling for an idea: the appeal of Al-Shabaab to diaspora in the west. *War and peace in Somalia: national grievances, local conflict and Al-Shabaab*. In Keating, M. and Waldman, M. Eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 425-436.
- Miles, W. F. S. 2000. Religious pluralisms in northern Nigeria. *The history of Islam in Africa*. In Levtzion, N. and Pouwels, R. L. Eds. Athens: Ohio University Press. 209-226.
- Miller, M. A. 2015. Entangled terrorism in late imperial Russia. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 92-110.
- Milletti, C. 2004. Violent acts, volatile words: Kathy Acker's terrorist aesthetic. *Studies in the Novels, Terrorism and the Postmodern Novel*. 36. 3:352-373.
- Mohammed, K. 2014. The message and method of Boko Haram. *Boko Haram: Islamism, politics, security and the state in Nigeria*. In Perouse de Montelos, M. Eds. Leiden: African Studies Centre. 9-32.
- Moolla, F. F. 2018. Postnational paradoxes: Nuruddin Farah's recent novels and two life narratives in counterpoint. *Research in African Literatures*. 49. 1: 63-83.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. 2005. Spivak and Bhabha. *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. In Schwarz, H. and Ray, S. Eds. USA: Blackwell Publishing. 451-466.
- Morton, S. 2003. *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Naicker, K. 2017. Going to pieces: narrative disintegration in Nuruddin Farah's *Crossbones*. *Social Dynamics*. 43. 1:8-18.
- Nwaubani, A. T. 2019. *Buried beneath the Baobab tree*. Lagos: Masobe Books.

- O'Brien, S. 2018. Translating trauma in Khaled Hosseini's *The kite runner*. *Transnational Literature*. 10. 2: 1-5.
- Olaniyan, T. 2005. Africa: varied colonial legacies. *A companion to postcolonial studies*. Schwarz, H. and Ray, S. Eds. USA: Blackwell Publishing. 269-281.
- Omobowale, E. B. Literature and medicine: An appraisal of Latunde Odeku's *Twilight: out of the night*. *Deep South* 08.
- Opeyemi, A. 2018. And trauma became flesh: terrorism, violence and trauma in Elnathan John's *Born on a Tuesday* and Helon Habila's *The Chibok girls*. *Ibadan Journal of English Studies*. 14: 135-149.
- Osisanwo, A. 2016. Discursive representation of terrorism in selected Nigerian newspapers. *Discourse and Communication*. 1-22.
- Polyakov, E. O. 2018. Constructions of Christian identity and the idea of the Holy Land: a reciprocal relationship. *Israel Studies*. 23. 1: 177-195.
- Pontecorvo, G. 1966. *The Battle of Algiers*.
- Primorac, R. 2010. The poetics of state terror in twenty-first-century Zimbabwe. *Terror and the postcolonial*. In Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited.. 254-272.
- Prior, M. 2001. Holy places, unholy domination: the scramble for Jerusalem. *Islamic Studies*. 40. 3/4: 507-530.
- Qazi, F. 2011. The Mujahidaat: tracing the early female warriors of Islam. *Women, gender and terrorism*. In Sjoberg, L. and Gentry, C. E. Eds. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press. 29-56.
- Quayson, A. 2000. *Postcolonialism: theory, practice or process?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Postcolonialism and postmodernism. *A companion to postcolonial studies*. In Schwarz, H. and Ray, S. Eds. USA: Blackwell Publishing. 87-111.
- Ramsey-kurz, H. 2007. Literature as the "schismatic other of the sacred text" or itself sacred? The *Black album* by Hanif Kureishi. *Fundamentalism and literature*. Pessomiquel, C. and Stierstorfer, K. Eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 161-180.
- Rapport, M. 2015. The French revolution and the early European revolutionary terrorism. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 63-76.
- Rashid, A. 2000. *Taliban: militant Islam, oil and fundamentalism in Central Asia*. United States: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. The Taliban: transformation from Pashtun nationalism to religious nationalism. *Pakistan Horizon*. 67, 2:63-100.
- Reybrouck, D. V. and Garrett, S. Trans. 2014. *Congo: the epic history of a people*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Richards, D. 2010. Framing identities. *A concise companion to postcolonial literature*. In Chew, S. and Richards, D. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Riegler, T. 2010. Through the lenses of Hollywood depictions of terrorism in American movies. *Perspectives on Terrorism*. 4. 2:35-45.
- Rizzuto, N. 2017. Somali soundscapes. *Contemporary Literature*. 58. 2: 392-422.
- Rothband, M. N. 2010. The learned extremist: Juan de Mariana. Retrieved Sep. 14, 2020, from <https://mises.org/library/learned-extremist-juan-de-mariana>.
- Rowlandson, W. 2010. Understanding Guantanamo through its parallel with slavery. *International Journal of Cuban Studies*. 2. 3/4:217-230.

- Ruthven, M. 2007. *Fundamentalism: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saadawi, N. 2009. *Walking through fire: the later years of Nawal El Saadawi*. London & New York: Zed Books.
- Said, E. 1980. *The question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Group.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *The question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. *Covering Islam: how the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*. New York. Vintage Books.
- Sakhawarz, B. 2011. Rhyme and verse in politics: Persian poetry in Afghanistan since 1900. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 82-96.
- Sampson, R. 2011. Guns and roses: the two strands of love and war in Pashto poetry. In *Images of Afghanistan: exploring Afghan culture through art and literature*. Loewen, A. and McMichael, J. Eds. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Pp. 164-171.
- Sarangi, S. and Canter, D. 2009. The rhetorical foundation of militant jihad. *The faces of terrorism: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. In David Canter. Ed. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons ltd.
- Sarraj, E. 2001. Bombs and madness: understanding and terror. *Index on Censorship*. 30.4:7-13.
- Sass, L. 1994. *Madness and modernity: insanity in the light of modern art, literature, and thought*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Satre, J. P. and Farrington, C. Trans. 1963. Preface. In Fanon, F. and Farrington, C. Trans. 1963. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Scanlan, M. 1990. Language and the politics of despair in Doris Lessing's "The good terrorist". *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*. 23. 2:182-198.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. Writers among terrorists: Don DeLillo's "Mao II" and the Rushdie Affair. *Modern Fiction Studies*. 40.2:229-252.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. *Plotting terror: Novelists and terrorists in contemporary fiction*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Schraut, S. and Weinbauer, K. 2014. Terrorism, gender and history – Introduction. *Historical Social research, Special Issue: Terrorism, Gender, and History*. 39. 3:7-45.
- Schwarz, H. 2005. Mission impossible: introducing postcolonial studies in the US academy. *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. In Schwarz, H. and Ray, S. Eds. USA: Blackwell Publishing. 1-20.
- Senoussi, M, and Mortad, I. S. 2019. Plotting the unspeakable in Khadra's *wolf dreams*. *Critique Studies in Contemporary Fiction*. 60. 4:501-513.
- Sesay, I. 2019. *Beneath the Tamarind tree: a story of courage, family and the lost schoolgirls of Boko Haram*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Sethi, R. 2011. *The politics of postcolonialism: empire, nation and resistance*. London: Pluto Press.
- Shaheen, J. G. 1997. Arab and Muslim stereotyping in American popular culture. Retrieved Jan. 2, 2020, from

<http://facpub.stjohns.edu/~layachia/MENA/Documents/Arab%20and%20Muslim%20Stereotyping%20in%20American%20Popular%20Culture.htm>

- Shaw, T. 2015. *Cinematic terror: a global history of terrorism on film*. USA and UK: Bloomsbury Publishing Inc.
- Sheckels, T. F. 2010. Gendered terrorism: intertext, context, and Richard Flanagan's "The unknown terrorist". *Antipodes*. 24. 1:35-39.
- Shohat, E. 2010. *Israeli cinema: east/west and the politics of representation*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Stam, R. 2014. *Unthinking eurocentrism: multiculturalism and the media*. New York: Routledge.
- Silva, N. 2010. "Gendering" terror: representations of the female "freedom fighter" in contemporary Sri Lankan literature and cultural freedom. *Terror and the postcolonial*. In Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. 329-344.
- Simonetti, P. 2011. Historical fiction after 9/11: Thomas Pynchon's *Against the day*. *Modern Language Studies: Literature, Popular Culture and the Classroom*. 41. 1:26-41.
- Simpson, D. 2019. *States of terror: history, theory and literature*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sjoberg, L. and Gentry, C. E. 2011. Introduction: women, gender and terrorism. *Women, gender and terrorism*. In Sjoberg, L. and Gentry, C. E. Eds. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press. 1-25.
- Sloan, S. 2006. *Terrorism: The present threat in context*. New York: Berg.
- Solomon, H. 2015. *Terrorism and counter-terrorism in Africa: fighting insurgency from Al Shabaab, Ansar Dine and Boko Haram*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sontag, S. 2003. *Regarding the pain of others*. New York: Picador.
- Soyinka, W. 2010. *Climate of fear: the 2004 Reith lectures*. Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- Spahr, C. 2012. Prolonged suspension: Don DeLillo, Ian McEwan, and the literary imagination of 9/11. *A Forum on Fiction, the Contemporary Novel: Imagining the Twenty-First Century*. 45. 2:221-237.
- Spencer, R. 2011. *Cosmopolitan criticism and postcolonial literature*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stahler, A. 2007. The "aesthetics" of fundamentalism in recent Jewish fiction in English. In *Fundamentalism and literature*. Pessoa-Miquel, C. and Stierstofer, K. Eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp 43-77.
- Steel, J. 1998. Vampira. representations of the Irish female terrorist. *Irish Studies Review*. 6. 3:273-284.
- Stuhr, R. 2009. *Reading Khaled Hosseini*. California: Greenwood Press.
- Sullivan, D. P. 2007. Tinder, spark, oxygen and fuel: the mysterious rise of the Taliban. *Journal of Peace Research*. 44, 1: 93-108.
- Taha. I. 2002. *The Palestinian novel: a communication study*. London and New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Taoua, P. 2003. The postcolonial condition. *The Cambridge companion to the African novel*. Irele, F. A. Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarhbalouti, Y. 2019. From rebellion to cooperation: the evolution of the Izala movement in Nigeria. Retrieved Jan. 2, 2020, from

<https://afriquedecryptages.wordpress.com/2019/06/14/from-rebellion-to-cooperation-the-evolution-of-the-izala-movement-in-nigeria/>.

- Taylor, D. and Gautron, Y. 2015. Pre-modern terrorism: the cases of the Sicarii and the Assassins. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 28–45.
- Taylor, R. 2002. *The history of terrorism*. New York: Lucent Books.
- Teeffelen, T. V. 1994. Racism and metaphor: Palestinian – Israeli conflict in popular literature. *Discourse & Society*. 5. 3:381-405.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. (Ex)communicating Palestine: from best-selling terrorist fiction to real-life personal account. *Studies in Novel: Terrorism and the Postmodern Novel*. 36. 3:438-458.
- Third, A. 2014. Mediating the female terrorist: Patricia Hearst and the containment of the female terrorist threat in the United States in the 1970s. *Historical Social research, Special Issue: Terrorism, Gender, and History*. 39. 3:150-175.
- Thomas, M. C. 2015. Violence in the Algerian war of independence: terror, counter-terror, and compliance. *The Routledge history of terrorism*. In Law, R. D. Ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 218–238.
- Triaud, J. 2000. Islam in Africa under French rule. *The history of Islam in Africa*. In Levtzion, N. and Pouwels, R. L. Eds. Athens: Ohio University Press. 169-188.
- Unigwe, C. 2016. Born on a Tuesday by Elnathan John – a compelling debut set in northern Nigeria. Retrieved Jan. 2, 2020, from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/apr/28/born-on-tuesday-by-el-nathan-john-review>.
- Urdike, J. 2006. *Terrorist*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Valentini, M. 2018. The revolt of Islam: texts, subtexts, contexts. *The Keats-Shelley Review*. 32. 2: 96-101.
- Venn, C. 2006. *The postcolonial challenge: towards alternative worlds*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Volpi, F. 2003. *Islam and democracy: the failure of dialogue in Algeria*. London: Pluto Press.
- Waldman, A. 2011. *The submission*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Warrick, J. 2015. *Black flags: the rise of ISIS*. United States: Doubleday.
- Webb, J. 2011. Fiction and testimony in Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*. *Life Writing*. 8. 1:51-85.
- Widdowson, P. 1988. Terrorism and literary studies. *Textual Practice*. 2. 1:1-21.
- Wilson-Tagoe, N. 2017. The African novel and the feminist condition. *The Cambridge companion to the African novel*. Irele, F. A. Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 177-194.
- Wolff, M. 2012. Self, identity and terrorism in current American literature: *American pastoral and Terrorist*. *Literature and terrorism: comparative perspectives*. In Frank, M. C. and Grubber, E. Eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 103-122.
- Wright, L. 2016. *The terror years: from Al-Qaeda to the Islamic State*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Wright, R. 2005. *Native son*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Yee, J. 2005. *For God and country: faith and patriotism under fire*. Molloy, A. USA: PublicAffairs.
- Yerima, A. 1999. *Attahiru*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.

- Young, R. J. C. 2010. Terror effects. *Terror and the Postcolonial*. In Boehmer, E. and Morton, S. Eds. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Limited. 307-328.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. The postcolonial condition. *The Oxford Handbook of Postwar European History: History, European History, Contemporary History (post 1945), Colonialism and Imperialisms*. Stone, D. Ed. Retrieved Jan. 2, 2020, from <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199560981.001.001/oxfordhb-9780199560981-e-30?print=pdf>.
- Zaef, A. S. 2010. *My life with the Taliban*. Strick van Linschoten, A. and Kuehn, F. Eds. New York: Columbia University Press.