

# Terrorist Discourse in Naqvi's 'Home Boy': A Neo Orientalist Perspective

Atta ul Mustafa

Faculty of Sciences, Department of Humanities and Linguistics  
University of Agriculture Faisalabad Pakistan

## Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to study Naqvi's novel, *Home Boy* (2010) as a Neo Orientalist discourse of US officials about Pakistani Muslims. This paper will discuss how US officials including that of G. W. Bush perceive the Oriental world \_ by using the same strategy \_ as one distinguished by strangeness, Creepiness, and unusual practices; a world that is 'Other' than that of Anglo-American familiar to the American public. In short what terrorist discourse of Neo Orientalists in the novel confirmed, was Said's thesis about the "subtle and persistent Eurocentric prejudice against Arabo-Islamic peoples and their culture" (*The Edward Said Reader 2000, 69*). The paper argues that the terrorist discourse in the novel is certainly a Neo Orientalist discourse enacted by the Center to demonize marginal Islam and its followers.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Origin of Terrorist Discourse

Many literary works produced by American writers especially those published in the wake of 9/11 tragic incident, have been written in context of the Orientalist ideology of how to deal with the Orient. There has been a rising sum of anti- Muslim sentiments in American 'Think Tanks' after 9/11. The Arabs and Muslims are depicted as barbaric, uncultured, backward, murderers and desert dwellers. We find this terrorist discourse in narratives as well. The writings show how once colonized people are still treated as others. Since the calamitous events of 9/11 and its design, the discourse of terrorism has become one of the key features of American writings.

### 1.2 Background

In his book *Orientalism*, Edward Said (1979) claims that all Western European and American literature, and cultural representation and stereotyping create and reinforce prejudice against non-Western cultures, putting them in the category of the Oriental/or the "Other" (*The Edward Said Reader 2000, 68*). This is evident especially after 11 September, 2001. In post-11 September, the perceptions and representations of Muslims as terrorists or potential terrorists are common in US literature. The attacks on the United States spurred a new wave of writings to study Islam and the Middle East Countries.

### 1.3 Objective

The objective of this paper is to argue how Neo Orientalism has been a constant ideological and technical cognitive phenomena working behind terrorist discourse enacted by US officials as is reflected in Naqvi's novel, *'Home Boy'* (2010). Although this terrorist discourse is now capturing attention of people not only in USA but also throughout the globe, very little has been settled evaluating it and its protuberant role in New Orientalist assumptions of Muslim world. The terrorist discourse as reflected in Naqvi's *'Home Boy'*, this paper argues, has been vital in remaking West's conceptions of Muslims and Islam. Throughout the novel, the dominant Neo Orientalist ideology about Islam never changes, and the mission behind this terrorist discourse is to inform Western and so-called liberal world that any political, historical, and scholarly version of Muslims must begin and end with this fact that Muslims are Muslims: violent, intolerant and life haters. They are believers of a religion, the holy book of which encourages; as Grizzly asked Chuck during inquiry, "terrorism" (Naqvi, 2010, p. 116), just as Updike once titled them in an interview, "suicidal bomber" encouraged by their religious teachings (2006a).

### 1.4 Core of Terrorist Discourse

The central claim of this terrorist discourse as reflected by Naqvi in his novel is a typical Neo Orientalist perspective: Islamists are responsible for 9/11, 2001 terrorist attacks, and for any expected perpetration as Bush declared that their enemy is a radical network of terrorists backed by some (Muslim) governments and that they are traitors to their own religion (Naqvi 2010, 97). Moreover US officials presented Pakistani Muslim characters, though fully absorbed in US society, as "Other", those who are neither Americans nor having any rights like Americans (Naqvi 2010 107). They are declared, through discourse, as terrorists, compatriots of terrorists, suicidal bombers, readers of Koran (a bomb making manual) and citizens of Bumfuckistan. Through portrayal of Chuck's character, of his friends AC and Jimbo, and of other Muslim characters like Mehmood, Aly, Shaman etc.

as reflected in Naqvi's novel *'Home Boy'*, American Neo Orientalist terrorist discourse depicts Muslims as stereotypes of bad and irresponsible human beings whose function is to perpetrate the world peace and terrorize free and self-leading Western world. The terrorist discourse and war on terror have gained widespread popularity.

## 2 September 11 and the outbreak of Neo Orientalist Terrorist Discourse

The quite patent thing is that Neo-Orientalist narratives and discourse are not based on any new changing acuity of Islam but typically a rebirth of the traditional Orientalism intended to validate American imperialism and its hostile acts toward Muslim countries like Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. Not like the traditional one, however, the Neo Orientalists thought Islam and its movements as the main end and regarded Islam as a global danger to western civilization. As Shahid Alam (2006) puts it: What forms this repackaged Orientalism new are its ends, its exponents, and the enemy it has embattled for pulling down .... Whatever the term, it holds all Islamic movements, no matter what their positions on political uses of violence. The Neo Orientalists say that many Muslims are Islamic fundamentalists who are "irreconcilable" with modern Western democratic values and culture. A famous Neo Orientalist puts it: "Fundamentalism as a whole is mismatched with the values of civil society and the Western vision of civilization, political order and society" (Bernard, 2003, p. 4). In America, the 'battle of ideas' opened on several borders after 9/11. President Bush, addressing a joint session of Congress on 20 September 2001, framed the foes as those who "hate our freedoms – our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other" (the ideas are cited by Naqvi when Bush says that they are traitors to their own faith (p. 97). This supports Dag Tuastad (2003) that the basic ideological assumptions of ...Neo Orientalism, are consistent with the tenets of new barbarism, where violence is seen as deeply rooted in local culture, which mean that political and economic situations and structures are irrelevant (595).

### 2.1 Bush as a Neo Orientalist

Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient \_\_\_ and this applies whether the person is an anthropologist, sociologist, historian, or philologist \_\_\_ either in its specific or its general aspects, is an Orientalist, and what he or she does is Orientalism (*Orientalism 1979, 2*).

Bush championed the cause of US imperialist and capitalist designs. His administration reiterated and supported Neo-Orientalist views about Islam after 9/11 attacks. To him (2004), "Islamic fundamentalists are "ideological extremists who do not believe in free societies and who happen to use terror as a weapon to try to shake conscience of the free world" (Speech to UNITY). They are strange people having hostility towards light and civilization. They are trying to hijack Islam (Naqvi, 2010, p.97). He spreads phobia among Americans and creates a division among Muslims through praising of Islam and rebuking radical Muslims as if they were not concurred with common Muslims (as reflected in Naqvi, 2010, p. 97). It has been an olden policy of the empire to 'divide and rule'. So did Bush, the Crusader of this age who advised his countrymen to gird up their loins for a lengthy campaign [Crusade]" (p. 97) and that in spite of his claim that this will be an age of liberty, here and across the world (p. 102). But the three Metrostanis are perhaps Neo-Orients and Bush is a Neo-Orientalist.

### 2.2 Regional (Area) Studies

Now the scholarly field of what used to be called Orientalism has been renamed 'Area Studies' or 'Regional Studies' in modern times. These politically true expressions have reinstated the word 'Orientalism' in erudite circles, since the later word is now polluted with a negative imperialist subtext, in large measure due to Orientalists themselves (Squires, 2011). The paper argues that like the past Western empires, the United States of America has some economic and strategic interests for which she can go to any extent.

### 2.3 Terrorism – Latest version of Neo Orientalism

Throughout the novel, the terrorist discourse of US officials presented Chuck's (and other Muslim characters) problem, the protagonist of the novel, to be because of his (their) Islamic religion. In MDC, America's own Abu Gharib (p. 105), frequently Chuck (others are) is described as "terrorist(s)", (Naqvi, 2010, p. 113) or indulged into "terrorize" (115), readers of Koran "a bomb making manual (108)" and Pakistani citizenship for Bumfuckistan (107) is the term used by them for Pakistan which "had figured in headlines" (42) and Pakistanis are all alike and are defined by certain contexts (73). According to Grizzly, if a person is Muslim, says his prayers, reads holy Koran, avoids liquor (113) or if they have Arabic literature (p. 73) to study, then it is impossible for him not to indulge in perpetration or terrorism.

Throughout the novel, the main ideology working behind the terrorist discourse enacted by US officials seems to be an changeable thinking about Islam, and the motto behind this discourse, as said by Deyab (2006), is to inform conservative sectors of the American reading public and viewers of electronic media that any political, historical and scholarly account of Pakistani Muslims must begin and end with the fact that they are violent, fundamentalists, suicidal bombers and terrorists (2006). What is expected from them is grooming of

more Taliban, oppression of women, blowing up statues of Buddha (Updike, 2006, p. 258). Actually the West/America takes Islamic world still caught up into a cobweb of “religion, primitivity, and backwardness: (Said, 1981, p. 10). All this image build up is the result of false reporting of journalists and media men who shoulder to report the Islamic world as a profession (p. 26). The already existing spiteful image of another people is being concretized by media which cannot cross the boundary line drawn by West (p. 50) and it is here we find accuracy in Said’s remarks that for Islam no linguistic knowledge seems to be necessary since what one is dealing with is considered to be a psychological deformation, not a “real” culture or religion” (*Covering Islam, 1997, xxxvi*). Therefore most of the discourse enacted by US officials as reflected in Naqvi’s novel is based on false perception about Islam and its followers. Every time they try to convince Muslim characters whether Koran sanctions terrorism? or why Muslims use it to justify terrorism? (Naqvi, 2010, p. 116). The officials have puffed up state of affairs by misreading of passages contained in sacred religious writings (of Koran) according to their own bent of mind (Armstrong, 2011, p. 10). It goes without saying that a wary effort is being done to subvert Koran and its actual message. As Ziauddin Sardar (2004) puts it : Translators also used omission, distortion and mistranslation to subvert the message and meaning of the Holy Book. These translations subvert the message to misguide the general public and have penetrated so deeply that officials use them as a trustworthy source of understanding Islam and its followers. So “It’s all a matter of interpretation, isn’t it?” says Chuck to Grizzly (p. 116).

### **3 Traces of Neo-Orientalist aspects in terrorist discourse as reflected in ‘Home Boy’**

There are a number of aspects easily identifiable in the general ideology of Neo Orientalism: propagating Islamophobia including the dread of Pakistani nuclear capability ; binary opposition between “We/Them, West/East;” and demonizing Islam and its followers to achieve political motive of Neo-Imperialism as reflected in the novel. Naqvi demonstrated all these aspects found in terrorist discourse of US officials (center).

#### **A-Islamophobia**

This historical but contemporarily relevant ideology, though became trendy in Western circles with the publication of “*Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*” published by Runnymede Trust, came into practice after the 9/11 attacks in USA (Casciani, June 2, 2004).

McGowan writes (1991, p. 268) that the term first used in an unnamed U.S. journal in 1991, was ascribed to the idea of fear or dread of Islam seen to be hostile to Christianity ever since religion was presented inevitably in these terms (Ed, Karla, 2009, p.295)}. Same idea was promoted by neo Orientalist writer, Bernard Lewis (1994) who, in his book *Islam and the West*, refers to Muslims as intolerant to other religions. The terrorists involved in 9/11 attacks were “a radical network” supported by some enemy governments (Naqvi, 2010, p. 97), says Bush and spreads dread by saying that they “are traitors to their own faith who are trying to hijack Islam” (p. 97). The Runnymede Trust states Islam as a huge static bloc, quite indifferent to change, as an isolated and the “other”; having no cultural accord with other cultures, is neither affected by nor influenced them; is seen as inferior, barbaric, irrational, primitive, sexist, aggressive, violent, threatening, supportive of terrorism, and engaged in a clash of civilizations with West; is an ideology used for political or armed benefit (1997). It has spread in US society to root level and “FBI arrested them at public reporting from ‘Shaman’ Home” (p. 99) and investigated as if they were planning some acts of terrorism. The officer also told that their pal Aly was caught red handed and agency ‘found books, books in Arabic, and bomb-making manuals’ (p. 108) in his apartment. Calling Pakistan as “Bumfuckistan” (Naqvi, 2010, p. 107), and Quran as “bomb making manual” and a justification for terrorism (p. 116) by Grizzly shows that not only religion of Islam is a problem but the fear of Pakistan’s nuclear capability urge them to degrade Pakistani Muslims at such a vast scale. Through Islamophobia, their greedy eyes are trying to find an opportunity to snatch away the nuclear capability of Pakistan which is an ‘Islamic Bomb’ for them.

This Neo Orientalist (terrorist) discourse of Islamophobia, as reflected in this novel, has been shaped and reshaped by the current climate of fear that is inflamed and aggravated by the American television news, and the political speeches by Neo Conservatives of Bush’s administration. What novel reflected in the form of discourse is just a comeback of the American media’s talk about the “crazy bunch of Saudis bastards” (p. 115) who hijacked planes to demolish Twin Towers’ and are working to destroy America. Because “those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah” (p. 97) and are “trying to hijack Islam” (p. 97). And this singular calamity have induced the death of thousands of innocents ‘in the most cruel way’ and “We need to seek the terrorists in our midst, and if they happen to be Muslims Arabs, or South Asian, so be it! Security is our inviolable right!” (p. 136).

The current wave of Islamophobia in US official circles is aimed at attaining a dual purpose: to present Islam and its followers as threat and to muster up courage enough to cope with its civilization which they think challenger one after the fall of communism. The Neo-Orientalists call for a thorough reforms, among them, regime changes, wars, and the imposition of 'democracy' on Islamic societies (We will pursue nations that

provide aid or safe heaven to terrorists and that dramatic strikes and covert operations, secret even in success will be conducted, says Bush as reflected in Naqvi, p. 97) failing which the West will have to pay cost in the form of Islamists' authorization which will destroy the West (The Express Tribune, August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2011: 2).

### **B- Binary Oppositions between “We/Them, West/East:”**

Everyone who writes about the Orient must locate himself vis-à-vis the Orient; translated into his text, this location includes the kind of narrative voice he adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kind of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text ---- all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader, containing the Orient, and finally, representing it or speaking in its behalf (Orientalism, 1979, p. 22). This is what binary is. In this connection, it is curious to explore US officials' "strategic location" (1979, p. 20), their position towards Muslims, Arabs and Pakistanis and the uses they make of this knowledge. The terrorist attacks on United States of America spurred a wave of writings based on an ideology of seeing Muslims as terrorists (Islam phobia). This wave that brought an absolute change in world scenario after 9/11, may be titled as neo- Orientalism. As Said says that the center has shifted from Europe to USA, so there emerges a new peripheral too. The Muslims particularly those of Pakistan are the neo- Orient. New binaries have been established- this time between the U.S. (rather than West) and the Muslim world (rather than East). Now Muslims are portrayed as stereotypes with negative racial traits (Asseri, 2009, p.78) and are the victim of social bigotry. Being 'others', they are under vigilance of FBI and other agencies as reflected in Naqvi's novel 'Home Boy'. *Secondly*, they are ranked as terrorists. Like Neo Orientalists, US officials including that of Bush reduce the Arabs, Muslims and Pakistanis to mere types of binary oppositions. As Keshavarz (2007) puts it: the Neo Orientalist account "reduces contemporary Muslim Middle East to an uncomplicated black and white world villains (Muslims) and victims (sympathizers with West)". These types of binary oppositions have been created by Bush's announcement of "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with terrorists" (Naqvi, 2010, p.98). It has been olden policy of the empire to 'Divide and Rule', so did Bush who advised his countrymen to gird up their loins for Crusades" (p. 97).

Another thing worth notable is that the war on terror has altered 'Orientalism', from a European-based image of modernity that could be used to tame others into a program that establishes limit between Civilization and new Barbarism as Bush says," Some speak of an age of terror. I know there are struggles ahead, and dangers to face. But this country will define our times, not be defined by them. As long as the United States of America is determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror; this will be an age of liberty, here and across the world" (P. 102).

This war started by West is a struggle for civilization. It means the others are enemies of freedom and civilization. They think themselves the holders of values, democracy, freedom while the opposites are lacking in these traits (Crooke, Bitterlemons, 2006). The main player of this game (so-called war on terror) is America where long settled Arab and Muslim communities are facing the most horrible hate. The situation is not much different for them in other western world. Every discourse, official or public, now seems to be filled with hate and fury for Muslims who are under strict vigilance of intelligence agencies like FBI and CIA. "The current U.S. discourse of 'war on terror' has been so successful that it has become rooted in institutions of law enforcement, national security, legal system, legislative and executive processes" (Jackson, 2005). We find how frequently Pakistanis are detained, investigated and even imprisoned in detention centers by agencies (Naqvi, pp. 99, 113, 115). And as Abdul Karim says to Chuck that FBI came into his house and asked him what his relationship to the Shehzad boy? "You are knowing he is a terrorist?" (p. 184). Even people from elite class seem to be obsessed with this discourse as novel reflects it happened in a gathering at Mini Aunti's home. "We've suffered a singular calamity. Thousands of innocents have died in the most cruel and most spectacular way. Now, we need to take the fight to them. We have to secure the borders and our way of life... 'We need to seek the terrorists in our midst' and if they happen to be Muslims, Arabs, or South Asian, so be it! Security is our inviolable right!" (Naqvi, 2010, p.136).

Bush also tries to create a binary (as reflected in the novel) within this binary saying, "I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. We respect your faith. It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans, and by millions more in countries that America counts as friends. Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah, blaspheme the name of Allah. The terrorists (Muslims) are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them" (p. 97).

The US view of Muslims and Arabs as potential terrorists has deepened the binaries by putting a major assertion on history, politics and socio-cultural variations. Muslims are labeled as terrorists due to their faith in jihad as Abdul Karim says, (cited in Naqvi, p. 184) "You go do Jihad some other place else", telling him how FBI raided his home and called Shehzad a terrorist. Jihad, means a struggle but its image has been injured by the West. The so-called Jihadis, too, have their hand in creating a fallacy about it.

A deliberate battle against them is being waged by the Western media and politicians through the publication of profane stuff and misreading ("everyone is busy in parceling myths and prejudice as analysis and



reportage” as is cited in Naqvi, p. 90) of the words of Islamic scripture; an effort to provoke them for a Militant - reactionary retort (Asseri, p. 79). Islam is thought to be a religion of terror and Quran is called as a Bomb making manual (Naqvi, 2010, p.108).Pakistan, too, is declared as Bumbfuckistan (p.107). The past understanding of Islam is in vogue all over the West. Islamic society is taken in terms of the Oriental history; not in milieu of the follower of a religion that shares much both with Judaism and Christianity. Awareness of this ‘Orientalism’ is an important first step (Said, 1995, p. 349).

Actually, until 9/11, the ‘war on terror’ was actually a war against a formless enemy for it had yet to be explored from which nations the terrorists came. “It (war) was no more between liberal capitalism and socialism, nor was it between liberalism and Islam” (Michaels, 2003, p. 106). However the situation became worst, when terror was linked to religion and political ideology and reductive myths that kept turning away from history and sense (cited in Said, 2001, p. 1). This happened as we see a conflict between the West and Islam which is a clash of civilizations though the motive behind it is a desire to gain economic benefits. The doubt tempts to remake Orientalist identities in confirming image of the Orient as other. This is one of the major rambling functions of terrorist discourse, after all. “[B]y setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of substitute and even secretive self,” Said notes, “European culture gained in strength and identity” (2003, p. 4). 9/11 terrorism gave it a new facet, and now the degree of otherness has reached its climax as is echoed in post- 9/11 fiction. 9/11 proved a line of demarcation when “Muslim cabbies had borne American flags” (Naqvi, 2010, p.74). These attacks changed the world scenario and they proved to be a ‘Defining Moment’ in the records of terrorism. It also proved a justification and a means with which liberties were suppressed in various countries in the best interests of elite class. The new millennium brought two massively harsh crimes against morality and modesty: the 9/11 terrorist attacks and an equal tendency. First the world felt shocked but “a slow acuity of this event involved an usual unemotional analysis of a fairly, just historical causes responsible for occurrence of the event” (Smith, 2004, p. 194). 9/11 proved a marked distinction in pre and post American policies towards the Muslims. America reverted to erect binaries between East and West, them and us, uncultured and cultured. We can say as the center changed (from Europe to USA- Edward Said), the peripheral changed too; this time the Muslims are a target alone as ‘Orient’.

### **C- American New Colonialism: Imperialism**

In context of current situation in the Middle East and 9/11 terrorist attacks on the U.S., Said's theory is particularly revealing, informative and helpful. The worldly atmosphere is fully charged with a kind of so-called threat from Muslims to peace process. The American official discourse aims at subduing the Muslim world through neo- colonialism by spreading social, political and economic hegemony through captivating slogans of bringing peace, calm and serenity in the world. While she is resolute to do so, she has declared Muslims as terrorists. The recent demonization of Arabs and Muslims by US politicians and others is racist and Islamophobic (very much evident in Naqvi). It has risen public sentiments, and employed in support of an unjust war (Kumar, 2006). The U.S. attention on the Middle East, Afghanistan and Pakistani northern areas and the perception of the mainstream appear as if Muslims there were ‘other’ people, people not like us, people having strange values and beliefs. And it goes without saying that the society of strange people is inferior. The literary works published in wake of 9/11 tragic event, are aimed at colonialist ideology of dealing with the subalterns, as Said remarks, “by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, setting it, ruling over it,...dominating, restructuring, having authority over the Orient” (Bayoumi ,2000, p. 69). The terrorist attacks on the US have prompted a discourse both in writing and speaking based on Orientalist ideology to publicize the deteriorated Muslim image and to misrepresent them as terrorists or potential terrorists. Media has served the same purpose for US imperialism as did novel for the past imperialism.

### **C I Imperialist Designs**

The renowned novelist James Carroll says the quarrel between the Muslims and Westerners "has its origins more in `the West` than in the House of Islam". It can be traced to "the poison flower of Crusades, with their scorns of remote cultures" and other Western injustices (Boston Globe, June 7, 2005). Bush states Islam as intolerable, violent and backward and its followers a threat to USA. He shows his determination saying that their “grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution and either they bring their enemies to justice, or bring justice to their enemies, justice will be done”(Naqvi, 2010, p. 94). He also thanks ‘the world for its rise in support’ through which it displayed solidarity with America and the discourse shows that it was a time when every tract of the earth shared grief of the Empire (p. 97). Bush addressed the whole world and his saying “this country (USA) will define our time” (Naqvi, 2010, p. 102) is enough to prove that America is having imperialist designs.

### **C II American Official Motives**

It is irony of the fate that some influential “US officials have puffed up the state of affairs to shape the features of imperialist war rooted in ideological basis against Third World which is already suppressed due to worst dictatorial regimes” (Said, 1979, p. xv). All this is the result of alleged American attitude. As Conrad says, it will be decided by ‘us’ whether who are good or bad natives because all natives are defined by us. “We created them, we taught them to speak and think; when they rebel they simply confirm our views of them as silly

children, duped by some of their Western masters” (Said, 1994, p. 20). No doubt Conrad’s words apply most aptly to the USA of today which undertakes to lead and stand for freedom and order and so on . . .” (1994). One can easily discover arrogance, impetuosity and stubbornness in American attitude which is sufficient to prove that “they think themselves the imperialists” in current age (Hamid, 2007, p. 101). To keep a control over world is their old dream as Nicolas, the geo-politician (representing American policy) puts it: “Who controls the Rimland [the peripheral areas of the Eurasia] rules Eurasia; who rules Eurasia controls destinies of the world” (cited in Spanier, 1961, p. v). The communism fell down but they still felt that they could not fulfill imperialist and capitalistic designs. The West in general and America in particular started thinking Islam and Muslims as their rival particularly with two motives: First “to exploit the oil rich Muslim countries economically and we know the erection of state of Israel is an outcome of Oil, Oil and Oil” (Ali, 2002, p. 88); Secondly to suppress the Muslim world politically. A wave of Islamophobia is a fashion of the day throughout the Western world. Hence a war was declared in the name of eradicating terrorism from the world.

According to History of American False Flag Operations (9/11 review) published by unknown source, America tried its level best to authorize and legitimize its actions and wars in Islamic countries behind which are its imperialistic designs and economic interests.

### **I Cultural Superiority**

Colonialism was always thought not as a system of ‘Conquest and Rule’, the term is useful to such systems where captors were Europeans or at least white races (Howe, 2002, p. 27). The terrorist discourse shows how cultural superiority on the part of America is an obstacle between two sides. “The central problem in relations . . . is, consequently, the discordance between West chiefly America’s—efforts to promote a universal Western culture and its declining ability to do so” (Huntington, 1997, p. 183). The paper traces the record of U.S. barbarity. The behavior of Pakistanis is defined by certain contexts (Naqvi, 2010, p. 73) and it was impossible for them to drive across America (which, said Bush, is defender of freedom, p. 94) due to their brown skin color (P. 69). Being not American, they have no rights (p. 107) and in case if they do not oblige, they might be deported to Bumfuckistan, says the officer (p. 107). All this shows the arrogance which is a result of their cultural superiority complex. The official discourse aims at making Pakistanis ‘realize U.S. Cultural superiority failing which the problem is inevitable’ (Huntington, 1993, p. 183).

### **II Political Motives**

It is evident from news media that Orientalism is still alive, only the center has moved from Europe to USA. “. . . . both the electronic and print media have been awash with demeaning stereotypes that lump together Islam and terrorism, or the Arabs and violence, or the Orient and tyranny.” (Said, 1995, p. 347).

The changed scenario has changed strategy of neo-colonialism; colonies are not physically occupied but “captured through monetary policies and a loyal comprador class” (Howe, 2002, p. 25). After cold war, the Muslim regimes made America realize her inevitable presence in Muslim-disturbed areas like Afghanistan lest fundamentalists should take hold the scene. This alarmed US not only because it was a threat to her imperial designs but also it provided her a base to propagate an image of Muslims being as terrorists and extremists. So the comprador class not only prolongs its regime but induces disaster on Muslims as well. This is easy for America to do an underhand deal with a small group rather than real representatives of any country. The same is true for comprador class to sustain as rulers of their country with the support of America rather than through a legitimate and fair play of election as “Musharraf joined the coalition against Afghanistan at a considerable personal and national risk” (P. 134). America had to take initiative of meddling with different nations of the world howsoever at a far distance from US did they locate geographically. That is why Americans commit crimes in the name of national security. They threw thousands of Japanese into camps who had posed a security threat. And now the same treatment is being faced by Muslims for nothing. This is unfair way to achieve security i.e. through an ill-treatment with human beings (p. 136).

### **III Economic Motives**

The economic interests are very much present in these political, cultural and religious clashes. The world’s main energy assets are situated in Muslim regions, exactly around the Gulf, so “it has always been of extreme interest to the U.S. as it was to Britain. If the oil wasn’t there, they wouldn’t care if they were animists. That is the main problem. That’s why the US supports radical Islamist tyrannies like Saudi Arabia. That’s why the U.S. sought the most radical Islamist killers it could find anywhere in the world and brought them to Afghanistan, ending up with al-Qaeda on their hands” (Chomsky, Islamica Magazine, 2007). The recent American adventures in Iraq and Afghanistan have proved the fact.

It is now an open secret that America invaded Iraq to gain economic benefits and not to search for chemical weapons as was claimed by her. “. . . critics of US policy in general, routinely described threats and incursions against the Arab state as imperialist, with some alleging that the real motivation was to maintain American-owned multicultural companies’ control over the oil reserves of the region” (Howe, 2002, p. 2). America, its allies, transnational companies, financial and media institutes, or most broadly the forces of ‘globalization’, compose a new imperial system (Naqvi, 2010, p. 158). In Cold War era, US foreign policy has

been a new imperialism for communists. The essential features of this policy has many connections with that of formal colonialism of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It shares the same essential, exploitative aims. However it now functions mostly in a different way. Particularly its strategy is operative “mostly not through direct colonial rule, so much as through local client regimes, and through less formalized, less obvious economic, diplomatic, cultural, and other means of control” (Howe, p. 25).

On asking about the circumstances of Pakistan, Chuck told the director of a firm that the war in Pakistan’s neighboring country, the flood of drugs and arms, emigration of refugees and fighters have worsened the situation. The Afghan borders are insecure due to monopoly of warring fiefdoms that had blocked the writ of the land government, Iran’s fundamental element on the other hand, is posing threat and on the third, we are in neighborhood of an aggressive enemy in the form of India; (Naqvi, 2010, p.158) all these things have been misused by America after 9/11 and this is neo Orientalism and shows American capitalist and neo Colonialist designs for even national companies show their international interests of core capital over the colonies.

#### **IV Islam as the problem from the U.S. perspective**

Certainly some people on each side want a clash of civilizations – like Osama bin Laden and George Bush – who are chiefly allies, cooperating indirectly as is commonly said. Islamophobia has been spread widely. Calling Pakistan as “Bumfuckistan” (Naqvi, 2010, p. 107), and Quran as “bomb making manual” and a justification for terrorism (p. 116) by Grizzly shows that not only religion of Islam is a problem but the fear of Pakistan’s nuclear capability urge them to degrade Pakistani Muslims at such a vast scale. Through Islamophobia, their greedy eyes are trying to find an opportunity to snatch away the nuclear capability of Pakistan which is an Islamic Bomb for them.

#### **Suppressed Muslim Identity**

The issue of identity has always been troubling since the origin of humanity. The very belief of the trio that they have overlooked traditional identities and are “self-made and self-invented”, is crushed after 9/11. Soon they realize that things are changing. “Suddenly everybody’s become an expert on varieties of turbans in the world” (p. 90). Their unexpected detention in MDC, ‘America’s own Abu Ghraib’ showed them the way to realize fragility of their “*metrostani*” identity. They feel themselves the part of a new age. The once exciting life at New York overflowing with hue and cry as if overloaded with a vigorous aroma of Karachi kitchens and streets; that very tone in which home boys utter ‘Oay’ as if calling a rickshaw in Karachi traffic, is no more availed of by them. Their fate is a special manifestation on Americana and so-called notions of collective identity. The jaywalker Metrostanis have might to say publicly the place as their own (Naqvi, pp. 11, 15). They have understanding of living in two worlds; modern USA and the traditional Pakistan. Suddenly they become uncertain about the use of their lives because in a changed, charged America (p. 124), they feel themselves rootless.

The city where genesis is valued less than faculty for self-invention, a wary mood prevails after that momentous September 11, morning which changed their “boulevardiers, raconteur, renaissance men” identity into “Japs, Jews, Niggers” (p. 1). Upon his release, Chuck — failed to go anywhere — is forced to reassess his life in the US and falsify new relationships. The question of Muslim identity arises. The weak but soothing declaration by a Pakistani cabbie in the epilogue, “*you will find who you are*” is the understood renounce as they find themselves the other people, people not of the kind as Americans are. The warm issues of *hijab* and *jihad* pointed to specific identity as well. Chuck, for example, finds that he is “*not on the same page*” as Amo, the girl he likes, due to her hijab. Hijab, he says “*weird me out*” (p. 54). And when Old Man Khan says “gardening his jihad, Chuck wonders what his jihad should be”. In spite of raptness in society, doing everything like a New Yorker, the circumstances compel them to think on ‘other’ lines, the real others.

The discourse shows that the representation of Muslims as reflected in Naqvi’s Home Boy is a mere reflection of their representation in American culture and media, which “repeatedly depicted Arabs (Muslims) as lacking democracy, unity and modernity .... As having a common heritage of defeat, living in the past in the past, moving rapidly toward fundamentalism” (Hashem, 1995, p. 159). The image is the same in discourse of Bush and other officials like Grizzly and Brophy as is reflected in Navi’s novel. This is what can be called a suppressed Muslim identity in US society.

#### **Othoring with Pakistanis**

The ancient India being surrounded by water on three sides and covered with high mountains on its fourth (Northern) side has proved to be a hard land like its geography. The climate and geographical features featured the sort of insular nature of the people. As both entry to and exit of the land have remained difficult so religion, though Hindu a dominating one, in the form of Islam entered but the culture of the people remained the same. In other words sense of unity was reinforced by religion: sense of diversity helped a rich and varied culture (Kazimi, 2007, p. 5).

This riddling situation has frequently been used by invaders in favor of their own motives. More than any other, USA rather exploited it in a befitting manner to grind its own axe. When Russian communist regime invaded Afghan territory in later seventies, USA exploited the religiosity of local population to combat the

hostility of Russia, equipped them with weapons and assisted them financially. They were called as freedom fighters – Mujahideen. Even their leadership was invited to Washington. They were good guys including that of Osama (Naqvi, 2010, p.10) but after the fall of communism, when Taliban implemented their specific theology in the land, and America felt its grip losing on them, the same Mujahideen became a threat and so-called free, modern and liberal world took them as brutes, and villains of modern civilization (p.11). Now the same people are being divided by USA in the name of inhabitants' cultural affinities and even in the name of liberal and fundamentalist Islamists. Pakistan, the neighboring country was compelled to side either with modern world or with rigid Taliban regime (Naqvi 2010, p.98) who had suddenly become a threat to world peace. Addressing the world, Bush appreciates the teachings of Islam and tries to create division within Muslim world through reproving of radical Muslims including their supportive governments which have hijacked Islam and cursed the name of Allah (p.97), hence will be turned up against each other (p.98). Their writ and power will be challenged in order to boom liberty (p.102) since free will is the backbone of civilization. She has exploited the religiosity and cultural diversity in order to gain her motives; to defeat Russia, religiosity was misused in the past and now cultural disparity is another tool in her hand to have an eye on rival forces and to misuse the resources of Balochistan and Northern Areas. Moreover Balochistan is a strategic bridge, and its hold can make America capable of possessing the wealth of oil, gas and thus get the West enriched with the same (Waris, February 26, 2012). All these motivate America to maltreat Pakistanis. How can we ignore her covert economic interests inflamed due to de-stable economy within. So Chuck is sacked from job and is disappointed where he came to get another job.

### References

- Abbas, Tahir. (2009). *"Multiculturalism, Islamophobia and the City"*. In Karla, Virinder, S. Eds. (2009). *"Pakistani Diasporas Culture, Conflict, and Change"*; Ameena Saiyyid, Oxford University Press No. 38, Sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, PO Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Alam, Shahid. (2006). *"Israel, US and the New Orientalism."* IslamiCity.com.URL: <<http://www.islamicity.com/articles/Articles.asp?ref=IV0607-3043>>. Access 2011/07/12.
- Ali, Tariq. (2002). *"The Clash of Fundamentalisms"*, Verso, UK: 6 Meard Street, W1F OEG & USA: 180 Varick Street, New York NY 10014- 4606.
- Armstrong, Karen. (2011). *"A Letter to Pakistan"*, Ameena Saiyyid, Oxford University Press. No.38, sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, Po Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Asseri, Ali S. Awadh. (2009). *"Combating Terrorism: Saudi Arabian's Role in the War on Terror"*. Ameena Saiyyid, Oxford University Press. No.38, sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, Po Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Bayoumi, Moustafa and Andrew Rubin, Eds. (2000). *"The Edward Said Reader"*. Vintage Books, New York, USA.
- Bernard, Cheryl. (2003). *"Civil Democratic Islam, Partners, Resources, and Strategies"*. RAND Corporation, Cambridge, UK.
- Bush, George W. (2004). *"Speech to UNITY: Journalists of Colour Convention 2004"*. August, 2004 PRNewswire.URL: <<http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/tories.pl?ACCT=109&STORY=/www/story/08-06-2004/0002226945&EDATE=>>]. [Accessed 11 September, 2011].
- Carroll, James. (2005). *The War against Islam*. Boston Globe June 7, 2005, Available at: [http://www.boston.com/NEWS/Boston/Opinion/op\\_ed](http://www.boston.com/NEWS/Boston/Opinion/op_ed) [Accessed 11 January, 2012].
- Casciani, Dominic. *"Islamophobia pervades UK – report"*, BBC News. <[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/3768327.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/3768327.stm) (peak) June 2, 2004, 2009-11- 07 10:43, 2001-12- 18 23:17> [Accessed 2012/01/13].
- Crooke, Alastair. (2006). *"The New Orientalism."* August 31, 2006. Conflicts Forum. URL: <<http://conflictsforum.org/2006/the-new-orientalism/>>. [Accessed 24 September, 2011].
- Deyab, Mohammad Shaaban Ahmad. (2006). *"A Neo Orientalist Narrative in John Updike's Terrorist"*, Taibah University, Madinah Munwarah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- Hamid, M. (2007). *"The Reluctant Fundamentalist"*, Oxford University Press, No.38, sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, Po Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Hashem, Mehboub, 1995. *"Covering of Arabs in two leading U. S. News magazines: Times and Newsweek."* In Yahya R. Kamalipour (Ed.). *The US media and the Middle East*, London: Greenwood Press. (151-162). *"History of American False Flags: A Review from Unknown Source"*. URL: <[http://www.911review.com/articles/anon/false\\_flag\\_operations.html](http://www.911review.com/articles/anon/false_flag_operations.html)> [Accessed 3 February, 2012].
- Howe, Stephen. (2002). *"Empire: A Very Short Introduction"*. Ameena Saiyyid, Oxford University Press. No.38, sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, Po Box 8214 Karachi-74900, Pakistan.
- Huntington, Samuel, P. (1997). *"The Clash of Civilizations And The Remaking of World Order"*. Penguin Books,



- India P( )Ltd. 11 community Centre, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi-110017, India.
- Jackson, Richard. (2005). *Writing the War on Terror: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Kazimi, M. R. (2007). *Pakistan Studies*. Ameena Saiyid, Oxford University Press No. 38, Sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, PO Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Kazimi, M.R. (2009). *A Concise History of Pakistan*. Ameena Saiyid, Oxford University Press No. 38, Sector 15, Korangi Industrial Area, PO Box 8214 Karachi- 74900, Pakistan.
- Keshavarz, Fatemeh. 2007. An Interview with FoaadKhosmood, "Jasmine and Stars: New Orientalist Narratives." August 8, 2007. Middle East Studies in the News.  
URL: <http://www.campus-watch.org/article/id/3823>. Consulted 14 September 2013.
- Kumar, Deepa.(2006 Feb). *Fighting Islamophobia: A Response to Critics – MR. Zine, February 2006*". Available at: <http://www.Mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2010/kumar011010.html>. [Accessed 16 February, 2012].
- Lewis, Bernard. 1994. *Islam and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press. Macload, J. (2007). *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester University Press, UK.
- McGowan, Rima Berns. (1991). *Muslims in the Diaspora*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Michaels, Walter Benn. (2003). *Empires of the Senseless: (The Response to) Terror and (the End of) History*," *Radical History Review*", Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, United States.
- Naqvi, H. M. (2010). *Home Boy*", Harper Collins Publishers, India.
- Pasquier, Roger Du. (1992). *Unveiling Islam*", Islamic Text Society, Miller's House, Kings Lane, Great Shelford, Cambridge CB22 5EN.
- Runnymede Trust, 1997. *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All* November, 1997. *Commission on British Muslims*. URL: <http://www.Runnymedetrust.org/publications/17/74.html>. Accessed 11 September, 2011].
- Said, Edward. (1979) *Orientalism*", Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, New York.
- Said, Edward. (1994). *Culture & Imperialism*". Flikar Books Vintage.
- Said, Edward. (1986). *After the Last Sky*". Columbia University Press, New York.
- Said, Edward. (1981). *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*". Vintage: New York; 1745 Broadway Manhattan, New York.
- Said, Edward (2001). *Islam and the West are Inadequate Banners*". <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/sep/16/september11.terrorism3>>.
- Said, Edward (2003). *Orientalism*". London: Penguin.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. 2004. "Lost in Translation: Most English-Language Editions of the Qur'an Have Contained Numerous errors, Omissions and Distortions. Hardly Surprising, Writes Ziauddin Sardar, When One of Their Purposes Was to Denigrate Not Just the Holy Book, but the Entire Islamic Faith." *New Statesman* 9 Aug, 2004: 36+. Questia. URL: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d+5006805439>. Consulted 6 sept. 2013.
- Smith, Neil. (2004). *Chomsky: Ideas and Ideals*". Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Spanier, John W. (1961). *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*".
- Fraderick, A. Praeger, Inc., Publisher 64 University Place, New York 3, N.Y. Squires, Robert, Abd al-Rahman, Abu Imam. (2011). *Orientalism, Misinformation and Islam*". Available at: URL <http://www.ummah.com/.../shadowthread.php?...misinformation-and-Islam>. [Accessed 24 February, 2012].
- The Express Tribune, 2011, Available at: <http://www.Tribune.com.pk/2011/08/28/>>. Accessed 28 August, 2011].
- Tuastad, Dag. 2003. 'Neo-Orientalism and the New Barbarism Thesis: Aspects of Symbolic Violence in the Middle East Conflict(s). *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 24, No. 4, (591-599)
- Updike, J. (2006a). An Interview with Louise Witt, "Why Updike delved into suicide killers' psyches." July 18, MSNBC.com, consulted 13 September 2013
- Updike, J. (2006b). *Terrorist: A Review of Book*". Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/.../reviews/terrorist-by-john-updike-410798....>>
- Updike, John, (2006). *Terrorist*". ISIS Large Print Books, UK.
- Welty, Gordon. (1997). *A Review of Edward Said, Covering Islam*", Vintage Books, Weight State University, Dayton, OH 45435.