



جامعة المنصورة
كلية التربية



The Exacerbation of Resistance and Reverse Resistance in Ayad Akhtar's Disgraced (2013)

By

Eslam Abdel Fattah Abdo Ramadan Mohammed

A Demonstrator at Dept. of Foreign Languages

Under the Supervision of

Dr. Ragab Selim Ali

Professor in Drama

Dr. Basheer Eisawy

Professor in Criticism

Journal of The Faculty of Education- Mansoura University

No. 115 – July . 2021

The Exacerbation of Resistance and Reverse Resistance in Ayad Akhtar's *Disgraced* (2013)

Eslam Abdel Fattah Abdo Ramadan Mohammed

Abstract

Diasporic Muslims' social life has been completely altered in the West in the 21st century. Immigrants confront sheer prejudice, marginalization, ethnic profiling, and estrangement in the Western community. Perhaps Ayad Akhtar's *Disgraced* (2013) incorporates features of resistance and reverse resistance of Muslims in countries of residence in which Amir, the protagonist, experiences alienation from his wife, friends, and his colleagues at work and in which the Western society acutely discard and exclude Amir. The research concludes that resistance seems inevitable if both Westerners and Easterners are not ready to tolerate differences, mitigate cultural gaps, and adopt common grounds.

Keywords: Ayad Akhtar, *Disgraced* (2013), Muslims' Diaspora, Resistance, Alienation, Prejudice, Stereotyping, Otherness.

المستخلص

لقد تغيرت الحياة الاجتماعية لمسلمي الشتات في الغرب بشكل هائل وذلك في القرن الحادي والعشرين حيث قسمت أحداث الحادي عشر من سبتمبر المروعة المجتمع الغربي وتدهور التناسق الاجتماعي في ذلك المجتمع متعدد الثقافات. وعلي إثر ذلك، يواجه مسلمي الشتات حياة قاسية من التحيز والتهميش والتمييز العنصري والتغريب داخل المجتمع الغربي. وهنا تتجلي مسرحية المنبوذ (2013) للكاتب المسرحي أياد أختار نُجسد عنصري المقاومة والمقاومة المضادة حيث يواجه "أمير" ظاهرة الاغتراب من أقرب محبيه: الزوجة والأصدقاء وزملاء العمل، وفي المسرحية ينبذ ويستبعد المجتمع الغربي أمير تماماً. ويخلص البحث إلي حتمية المقاومة الأيدلوجية والثقافية مالم يُبد الغريبيون والشرقيون استعدادهما نحو تقبل الاختلافات وتقليص الفجوة الثقافية واتخاذ أرض مشتركة كي يتسني لأولئك المختلفين في الهوية والثقافة أن يتعايشوا مع بعضهم البعض في سلام وطمأنينة ووثام.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المنبوذ - أياد أختار - مُسلمي الشتات - المقاومة - التمييز العنصري - التغريب.

Introduction

The social aspects of Muslim and Arab immigrants' life have been accentuated in the aftermath of the ferocious attacks of 9/11 which have immensely shocked the entire world and dramatically altered the positioning of those immigrants in the multifaceted cosmopolitan West. Such attacks on the infamous towers have pinpointed the circumstances of Arabs and Muslims, posing them as a possible threat to the Western society. Consequently, the Western society have attributed some drastic perceptions to Muslims and Arabs such as Islamophobia, which renders Muslims as the enemy within. In other words, Muslims and Arabs have since become stereotyped, dehumanized, criminalized, and condemned. In so doing, Muslims confronted dilemmas of otherness, prejudice, suspicion, and inferiority. The media also have contributed to demonizing Muslims and Arabs which broadens such minority's agony and suffering. As a result, Muslims and Arabs have developed a great sense of alienation, dislocation, resistance, and estrangement which has led to the rise of a disparaging atmosphere in the society. Indeed, in such an atmosphere, Muslims and Arabs in the West are stereotyped in the 'other' zone with concomitant surveillance which chains their effective interaction and fosters an impinging attitude on the part of both sides.

As Graham E. Fuller in his infamous book *A World Without Islam* (2012) states that today's diverse world entails dissimilar mindsets:

Those who seek exclusivity, who seek to draw boundaries between themselves and others, who wish to see their own beliefs as unique, quite distinct from what others believe, views in which they themselves are right and the others wrong (43).

In other words, the world is perhaps torn between two ferocious processes: resistance and reverse resistance. On the one hand, the Western culture and identity cling to drawing borders, embracing an exclusionary attitude so as to shield their heritage under menace. On the other hand, Muslim and Arab immigrants seek to erase the heresy of them being threatening elements in the society, without losing their indigenous culture and identity.

Theoretical Framework:

The concept of resistance means any indications of refusal from immigrants or diasporic people. In other words, once immigrants reach host land, rejection takes place due to the spacious gap in communication, language, culture, space of freedom, religion, school teachings, and identity

in addition to the violent history of disputes, most notably in the Palestine issue and wars in the Middle East. It is not only their background which forces them to stick to a specific dogma but also the reflection of such practices which makes them question their own identity and culture leading them to embrace another inner resistance. They feel trapped between their own heritage and waves of the West's different civilization identity and culture.

Resistance incorporates a double-faced coin since it does not only belong to immigrants but people in the host land also resist with their utmost, and they have their own reasons. They believe that the land is sacred for them and no one else should inhabit it by any means. Moreover, they believe that if there must be some *strangers or outsiders* of some kind, they must act according to certain codes. The most crucial point here is some host lands have witnessed some vicious attacks. Therefore, immigrants must be under the scope all the time. They are seen as potential threat or people of interest due to the various awful experiences in the past such as the events of 9/11 that have formulated a totally different phase in the relationship between the East and the West. Such events have transformed the friendly contact between the West and Arab immigrants into a sort of suspicious-built communication. Such events widen the gap between the two cultures, leading to draw new borders.

The basis of Muslims' interpretations as intimidating has been relied mainly on chronicles and biographies of the centuries prior to 1100 AD, as Jerome's *Vita Malchi*, The Venerable Bede's, *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (AD 731) , chronicles that narrate stories about the triumph of Christianity over the modest Saracens, Arabs and Ishmaelites (Beckett 229). The "cryptic manner", as Edward Said phrases it, by which the image of Islam is conveyed to the generations prior to the age of Enlightenment, of the 18th century, could later outline the Western perception of Islam preceding this date (120). Later, when secularization grew on the learning level of the Bible and the Church, the Western trend developed to stir a "western appraisal of how to perceive the world" resulting in the phenomenon of *Orientalism*:

The expansion of the Orient further east geographically and further back temporally loosened, even dissolved, the Biblical framework considerably, reference points were no longer Christianity and Judaism, with their fairly modest calendars and maps... race, color, origin... overwhelmed the distinction between Christians and everyone else. (120)

The social tendency of the late 20th century and early 21st century has been a powerful ally of the propaganda run by the United States, as the triumph of the media has counted a great deal on the people's deficiency of cultural knowledge and access to the local language to comprehend such issues as the 'Shia's penchant for martyrdom' (Laboni 83) that was created to segment the Lebanese resistance against the Israeli's attacks on the Muslim territory and people in Palestine and Lebanon and the Iranian resistance to Iraq's invasion in the 1980s, confusing the public view to the Muslim Middle East as being never prone for democratic and diplomatic resolutions in favor of ferocity and conflicts.

The fear of contact between the West and the East nourished the West to enforce strict laws on immigrants which later transformed into a concept of criminalization of migrants. In turn, it has coined an asymmetrical incorporation of criminal justice norms into legal proceedings and traditionally build upon civil regulation (Legomsky 53). To illustrate, many migration laws and regulations have become criminal offences in the sense that such laws encompass harsh and inflexible tendencies towards immigrants. Stumpf coined a concept of 'crimmigration crisis' to capture that especially in the United States "immigration violations previously handled as civil matters are increasingly addressed as criminal offences" (56). Kubal argues that criminalizing migration does not seem a mere matter of a politically charged set of decisions that leads to a complex set of individual laws by which the state seeks to govern its subjects or the enforcement of these laws, but also how these interact with the broader features of the socio-legal environment, empirically noticeable at the level of social tissue, discourse, and everyday life experiences (96). In other words, the ultimate purpose of imposing such discriminating laws is not applying order and security but, rather, diminishing power of immigrants. Subjecting the individual might have been the aim behind such laws and regulations, which leads to deepen the wound between the West and East. Some European laws are Asylum and Immigration Act 2004 in the UK, and an immigration offence as inscribed in Dutch Aliens 2000 (Art 108), Norwegian Immigration Act 2008 (Section 108), Portuguese Immigration Law 2007 (Art 181). Such laws give authority to officers to check and enter immigrants houses without the consent of the occupant, their places of dwelling if there might be any indication of a reasonable suspicions or any reasonable grounds that may occur (Kubal 98).

Comparatively, imposing such laws has immediately received a wide rejection from immigrants since they believe that they are discarded from

the Western realm. Immigrants become completely dissatisfied and frustrated by the compelling application of those discriminatory laws. Diasporic people become defenseless and helpless, and they cannot dare to challenge these laws. The subversive status immigrants live in would formulate a hating tone or atmosphere towards the West leading them further to resist every overwhelming act the West is to do.

Ironically, this has been misinterpreted by the West and thus led to the rise of one of the most widespread concepts related to Muslims that is 'fundamentalism', which takes the West by a storm. Marty and Appleby have defined *fundamentalism* as,

A tendency, a habit of mind found within religious communities and paradigmatically embodied in certain representative individuals and movements, which manifests itself as a strategy, or set of strategies, by which beleaguered believers attempt to preserve their distinctive identity as people or group. Feeling this identity to be at risk in the contemporary era, they fortify it by a selective retrieval of doctrines, beliefs and practices from a sacred past. These retrieved 'fundamentals' are refined, modified and sanctioned in a spirit of shrewd pragmatism: they are to serve as a bulwark against the encroachment of outsiders who threaten to draw the believers into a syncretistic, a religious, or irreligious cultural milieu. (22)

Ruthven perceives that the term fundamentalism is abusive and used as a prejudice against Muslims asserting that the so-called Islamic fundamentalism is a matter of ethnocentrism that resonates in the East as a sort of *Orientalism*. Like Marty and Appleby, Harriot strictly follows and maintains the definition of fundamentalism concluding its features as follows:

Thus, the central feature of fundamentalisms, their struggle against secularism, underpins the application of SID [social identity theory] in the attempt to understand them from a psychological perspective. For it is the starkness of the distinction between the in-group and the out-group which results in extreme social identities. These include prototypes of the fundamentalist groups and stereotypes of their enemies which are the reverse image of each other. Fundamentalisms depend totally on the existence of their enemy. The enemy may be almost entirely a construction of their own imagination: the stereotype may be derived directly from the prototype. Hence the power of the fundamentalist leaders to determine prototypes and their associated stereotypes is crucial, for without an enemy the movement has no reason to exist, and they lose power. (qtd in Marranci 43)

Muslims, affected by certain practices, have been trapped in such a corner. They are stereotyped as fundamentalists leading to discarding them by the Western society in the time the Western community seeks to ‘Westernize’ the whole world. Thus, such different aims whether to ‘Westernize’, ‘Easternize’ or even ‘Americanize’ have to collide with one another in a trial to impose and show the supremacy of one over all. In the clash of civilizations, each part seeks to dominate the other. However, the dominance of land in the Western communities makes them much more powerful than Muslims as a minority especially after the aftermath of 9/11 events. Muslims’ culture has faded away little by little. Then, there has been no sympathy for Muslims being a marginal community. Hence, their impact on the society has become less influential and more fragile than ever.

Resistance and Reverse Resistance in Ayad Akhtar’s *Disgraced* (2013)

Disgraced (2013) opens in late 2011 and early 2012 at a luxurious apartment in Manhattan with Amir, the protagonist, an ambitious corporate lawyer in a famous firm, dresses himself without paints before his Caucasian wife Emily who draws him as an old painting by Spanish artist Diego Velázquez painted his servant slave Juan de Pareja, a man of Moorish descent. Amir Kapoor is outraged by portraying himself as a slave recurring the word to his wife. It is not all about portraying as a person but the idea itself concerning the image of a minority. In other words, this is the exact image Europeans perceive immigrants as slaves. Emily may not have done it deliberately. Yet, it happens this way even though she tries to clarify her point as she tells her husband it is not a slave but an assistant (7). Rodini Chaki in his thesis *Desis in the House: South Asian American Theatre and the Politics of Belonging* (2016) has made a remark based on the words of an 18th century art critic, Antonio Palomio, concerning the original Velázquez piece of art:

There is a quiet resistance to the Eurocentric fetishization of racial others and/or inferiors in Juan’s steady gaze and his head held high. It is perhaps noteworthy that Velázquez allowed Juan this power in capturing it on canvas, though it has historically not been the prerogative of the powerful in colonial and racial discourse to represent the minorities in such light. (p. 184)

Chaki compares Velázquez’s painting with Emily’s one asserting that Emily insists on labelling it ‘assistant’ although it is originally labelled ‘slave’. Chaki links this to the power of Western subjects to allocate labels such as “terrorist” to a Muslim subject like Amir (185).

The power dynamics between Emily and Amir are exposed in this painting. It is a representation within the discourse produced by historical course, as “there is no power relation without a correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute, at the same time, power relations” (Foucault as cited by Hall p. 76). In this context, the compatible double opposition of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1979) theory is tangible with Emily having the upper hand on the way Amir’s identity is articulated within the representation of him by assigning the label of “muse”, objectifying him as an exotic artistic inspiration, and connecting his image to Juan de Pareja, the slave assistant. Whilst, Amir, who confirms his protest to his wife’s painting as her own personal Moor and perceives it as someone who is being located, becomes the submissive as he comes to be her model.

It is highly notable that not only Emily, willy-nilly, has made her Amir furious but Amir has been badly offended the night before by a waiter who radically mistreated Amir concerning his (Amir’s) identity (8). Thus, it can be concluded that it is not a subject point of view of Eastern people as underrated or discriminated. Yet, it is more concerned about masses either being a relative or not, or being of high position or not, immigrants will confront discrimination. There are two decisive points in these two situations. First, most of the Western community do resist immigrants in many forms. Second, immigrants do feel such resistance as it is apparent in Amir’s words “it’s not the first time” (8). Besides, Emily’s obvious words about her husband when she tells him “You made him see this gap. Between what he was assuming about you and what you really are” (8). Emily can clearly feel and distinguish the presence of anxiety and exclusion her Arab husband feels. Amir senses that there is a kind of violent reaction against his existence at home with his wife when she portrays him as a Moor, at the restaurant with the waiter when the later mistreats him or looks down upon him, and at his office when readers know that Amir will be dismissed owing to his origins. In such an atrocious atmosphere, Amir is surrounded by many annoyances and stressors that would push him to resist back.

There are several reasons that unswervingly lead immigrants to resist or collide with other communities. The first and foremost factor that shapes rejection is the notion of the roots. Amir attributes and blames his background as a Muslim that leads him to discriminate other people especially the Jews and wishes that they are wiped into the ocean (39). He seems overjoyed by the attacks upon them and agrees with what happened in the Holocaust. He is further somehow satisfied with the cruel events of

9/11 regarding them as a prodigious victory as well as a natural reaction to what happens in the Middle East. Amir does remember that the only piece of knowledge his mother tells him about Jews is that they had *stolen land* from the Palestinians and something about God *hated* them more than other people (13).

The irony with Amir stems the fact that he is rejecting his own heritage. In fact, Amir seems to hate his own upbringing. He denies his mother's joy being proud of him when Emily reminds him saying "your mother would be proud" (13). Amir senses that he is raised to resist not to co-exist. One of the most glowing points in resisting his own self is changing his name from Abdullah Kapoor into Amir Kapoor as he could not live with his name as Abdullah. He rejects his identity being Abdullah which embodies his Muslim identity and that eventually pushes foreign people to discard and devalue him.

The essence of rejection for Amir stems from his mother when she has known that he likes his colleague, the Jewish schoolgirl Rivkah. She tells him, "If I ever hear that name in this house again, Amir, I'll break your bones. You will end up with a Jew over my dead body". Then, she spits in his face. In turn, Amir meets Rivkah the other day and spits in her face (13). Such sort of upbringing incorporates the hidden motives behind Amir's contradictory actions towards the West and towards himself. The tone of hatred and animistic atmosphere of enmity, towards the Other, paves the way before Amir not to tolerate or settle down the ethic and culture differences with the West.

The sentiment of feeling discarded seems running in Amir's bones and veins for what he believes he has no place in the company he has worked hard for a long time. As he does not receive the expected reward and promotion by the firm, he comes to judge himself saying, "We are the new Jews" to assert that he is alienated as Jews have been before. Just right after this statement, he says, "That firm will never be ours. It's theirs. And they're always going to remind us that we were just invited to the party" (26). The very late sentence lets no doubt that all what Amir is doing for the prosperity of the firm will go in vain. He senses that he has no place in the company in which he has spent his entire life toiling hard for its prosperity and welfare. In turn, it leads him to frustration and loss of faith. Amir seems haunted by the notion that he lives in a world of suspicion, a world that knows no other criminals but himself "the next terrorist attack is probably gonna come from some guy who more or less looks like me" (31). The

dominant feeling that lies in Amir's heart is he shoulders a full responsibility for all evil in the whole world and blames himself and people of the same origin to be the sole responsible for tribulations and agonies of the whole world. That is why he goes up right to the officers at airports and offers himself up, happy to be searched as Emily states (31). He believes the agents are looking for people like him and on top of people being more and more *afraid* of folks who look like him ending up beings *resented* too (31).

To assure the core of the inner conflict in Amir's psyche, the readers can effortlessly grasp what is spinning in Amir's head as they read Amir's words "It's not a secret. Em and I don't see eye to eye on Islam. I think it's ... a backward way of thinking. And being" (33). He asserts his view about his religion stating that there is a specific and rigid *Muslim psyche* believing that "Islam comes from the desert. From a group of tough-minded, tough-living people. Who saw life as something hard and relentless. Something to be suffered ..." (33). He then compares *Muslim psyche* with *Jewish psyche* stating that Muslims do not think about it. They are submissive and that is what 'Islam' means by submission (34). Amir bears a profound hatred to the Muslim community in the sense that he believes that the *Holy Quran* is like one very long hate-mail letter to humanity (34). He finally states frankly that he is not a Muslim but an *apostate*. In other words, he has renounced his faith, and he does no longer believe in Islam (35). The feelings of Arabs have changed greatly after the events of 9/11 as Ali writes:

as an Arab / Muslim American, one wasn't quite sure in those first few months after 9/11 as an Arab/Muslim American one wasn't quite sure where one stood. What laws were still in place to protect one from government inquisitiveness or from a government, rightly or wrongly, deciding to throw aside civil liberty concerns in the need to protect the country from an amorphous enemy whose potential for another strike was very real. In this climate [...] I personally, on a visceral level, found myself fearing a knock on the door. For no logical reason, I should add. (87)

perceiving Islam as "a backward way of thinking. And being" (33) shocks the readers as such comment is said by Amir, the supposedly-raised Muslim. Basu states that Amir "ridicules Islam's strictures against painting human figures, its aversion for dogs, and its other outmoded rules. On a more serious note, he points to passages in *Quran* that sanction wife-beating and other forms of misogyny. He also decries Islam's collapsing of institutions of religion and state" (72).

The profound loss of self and identity renders Amir a disbeliever in Islam and the *Holy Quran* reshaping a new identity for himself. His problem with his background is his ultimate refusal of teachings of Islam. He cannot see tolerance of Islam. Instead, he believes that the aim of Islam is going back to the Stone Age. In other words, the mission of Islam, in his standpoint, is all about stoning adulterers, cutting off thieves' hands, and murdering the unbelievers. Then, a true Muslim, in his point of view again, should have pride in such matters. It could be the following lines summarizing Amir's full-of-ideas head. He says, "It's tribal, Jor. It is in the bones. You have no idea how I was brought up. You have to work hard to root that shit out" (39).

Disgraced (2013) is not only about Muslims' resistance to the West. It also sheds light on resistance from both the West on the wider scope and other minorities on specific lens. Although Emily, Amir's wife, and the representative of the West in the play, loves him to the bones, she draws him a picture as a disgraced as indicated when Amir urges her to put on his pants, she remarks that she only needs his upper part of the body. Emily, whether intentionally or not, seeks to depower her husband even from his clothes. In fact, Emily incorporates a power dimension in the play as she is able to assign labels to her husband such as "slave" along with her ability to elide such labels when she insists on the word "assistant" instead. As for Amir, he lacks the privilege of attributing labels along with his inability to be included in the Western realm. Eventually, he is the Moor in the play. When she encounters the waiter's mockery to her husband, she tells her husband that it is a matter of assumption as if she is attempting to address herself a highly intellectual position compared to her inferior husband who is made a fool even by a waiter.

In addition to the mocking of the waiter at the restaurant, the whole society keeps an eye on Muslims. One of the obvious remarks is holding Imam Fareed a suspect without even showing his guilt as if the only crime he has done is being a Muslim or having another identity and culture. When the firm, in which Amir works, knows that Amir has attended the court to defend the Imam, Amir is deprived of promotion at once although it is his right to get such a promotion. It also gives the opportunity to fetch back Amir's origins and once the firm knows that Amir has changed his name, they react negatively to this. They forget all Amir's career, judging him as unworthy. In other words, Basu argues that:

The denial of promotion signifies for Amir his failure to get total

acceptance in mainstream America in spite of all the deliberate efforts to attenuate all markers of ethnic and religious difference and trying so hard to fit in. he has broken all dietary taboos of Islam and is seen in the play to be drinking wine and eating pork. (73)

Reverse resistance is also apparent when Emily reads the newspaper in front of Amir. She reads: “The defendant, Imam Ali Fareed, surrounded by a gauntlet of attorneys, stuck a defiant tone ... Amir Kapoor of the New York Law firm Leibowiz, Bernstein, Harris supported the Imam” (16). *The Times* newspaper deliberately mentions the name of Amir to express and reflect the hysteria in the society. They cunningly attach and link Amir’s Muslim’s identity with a *Jewish* corporation which, in turn, evokes suspicion and awkwardness. The reason why Amir is furious is such a piece of news, supporting the Imam, would reflect negatively on him. In fact, this very piece of news has added more fuel to the already blazing fire. It is this quote that will forbid Amir’s promotion and will recall his origin. For Steven, Amir’s manager, is trying to ascertain if Amir has misrepresented himself to present himself from India while he is originally from Pakistan regardless of the fact that it has been all India. In addition, the firm knows Amir has changed his name (22). Such digging around or investigation has concluded that Amir does not deserve the promotion and Jory, a Jewish woman whom Amir has helped to have a job in the firm earlier, is the one to be promoted. The firm is not going to give more cases to Amir as they think that Amir is duplicitous (44). Besides, none of firm’s employees has been taking Amir’s calls anymore. Amir is being discarded by the community. The Western community does no longer want to establish communications with Amir since he has merely attended a hearing court with the Imam who has not been proven guilty yet. They cut their relationships with Amir as they suspect him.

The course of such a change would never be sheltered from the unjust ethnic and cultural prejudices of the hospital culture members frequently shaped to form the core generalizations as the collective’s representatives. Muktedir Khan designated the predicament of belonging and assimilation of Muslim Americans:

The demonization of Islam by the American media compels Muslims to indulge in identity politics. They concentrate on defending their faith from a perceived American assault rather than their role as American residents seeking liberty, equality, and prosperity. The negative image of America, a consequence of its foreign policy in the Middle East, inspires a

paradoxical response from Muslims. Its prosperity and freedom attacks them, but once they are here, its politics and attitudes towards Muslims and Islam alienates them. The result is the dilemma for American Muslims, they like living here but they love to hate America. (95)

Regardless Emily being representative of the Western community, she is Amir's wife. Being a wife should have the most impact on their relationship, but it seems that Amir ignores his wife most frequently due to issues concerning Islam. Although he is Muslim, he does not see art in Islam. He does not want his wife to be related in one way or another to Islam. He always questions her about her works of art, insisting that she knows nothing about Islam. Amir's social relationship with his wife is not completely attractive as it should be as a normal husband would encourage and motivate his wife especially if she tries to understand him and his religion. Yet, Amir is totally away from this path. In other words, he does not only praise her works but he also condemns her and orders to stop her reflecting Islamic culture and convention in her portrayal (14). This is a typical dramatic irony, as a normal man would desire his wife to follow his footsteps and never lags. He never hinders her way but helps her to establish for her a more recognized position in the society.

In conclusion, resistance is perhaps the first phase facing immigrants in the host land. Resistance here means collision of thought and clash of civilization due to diverse culture and identity. Every group adheres to their fundamentalism as the sole reference. Amir, regardless of his actions, points out plainly and frankly that he wants Islam to win. He always wants this to occur. He is even overjoyed by the attacks of 9/11 considering this devilish crime as a heroic deed. Amir is not rejecting the natives only, but he also rejects other minorities as he deals with Isaac, the Jewish character in the play and the latter's wife Jory his colleague in the firm. The deeply-rooted upbringing of Amir makes his personality resist the new orientation. He mocks at Isaac declaring in the most intensive point in the play he hates the Jews, and he is furious that Jory gets the promotion instead of him. In the end, Amir has ruined his life on different levels. For he has broken his happy marriage with Emily through an act of violence, failed in his career in an attempt to shield it from racial profiling, and finally destroyed his remaining shelter. In other words, he belongs to nowhere in the meanwhile.

Works Cited

- Akhtar, Ayad. *Disgraced*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013. Print.
- Ali, Roaa. *In response to narratives of stereotypes: Arab American playwrights reclaim and fortify Arab American representation*. *Gramma: Journal of Theory and Criticism*, vol 24. Retrieved from <http://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/gramma/article/view/6119>. 2017. p. 87
- Basu, Lopamudra. *Ayad Akhtar, The American Nation, And its Other After 9/11: Homeland Insecurity*. Lexington Books, 2019.
- Beckett, Katherine. "ScarfeAnglo-Saxon: Perceptions of the Islamic World." Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*. 2003. P. 229
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.p.55
- Brah, Avtar. "Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities." Routledge, 1996. P 192-208
- Chaki, Rohini. *Desis in the House: South Asian American Theatre and the Politics of Belonging*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburg. 2016. pp.171-196.
- Fuller, Graham E. *A World without Islam*. Back Bay, 2012. P 43
- Hall, Stuart. "The Question of Cultural Identity, Modernity and Its Futures," Stuart Hall, David Held, and Anthony McGrew (eds.) Cambridge; Oxford: *Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers and the Open University Press*, 1992b. p 276
- Khan, Muktedir. *Muslims and identity politics in America*. In John L. Esposito and Yvonne Haddad (Eds.), *Muslims on the Americanization path* (p 95). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2000).
- Kubal, Agnieszka. "Struggles against Subjection. Implications of Criminalization of Migration for migrants' Everyday Lives in Europe." *Crime, Law and Social Change*, vol. 62, no. 2, 2014, pp. 91–111., doi:10.1007/s10611-014-9527-5.
- Labadi, Taher. "*The Palestinian Diaspora and the State-Building Process*." *Arab Reform Initiative*, 5 Dec. 2018, www.arab-reform.net/tag/palestine/.
- Legomsky, S. H. "The new path of immigration law: asymmetric incorporation of criminal justice norms." *Immigration and Nationality Law Review*. 2007.p 28, 679.

-
- Marty, M. E., & Appleby, R. S. *Fundamentalisms comprehended*. University of Chicago Press, 2004. P. 22
- Marranci, Gabriele. *Understanding Muslim Identity: Rethinking Fundamentalism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. P 43
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage. 1979. P. 120
- Stumpf, J. "The crimmigration crisis: Immigrants, crime and sovereign power." *American University Law Review*. 2006. P.56.