Toxic White Masculinity: Literary and Cinematic Representations of Terrorism and Antagonistic Masculinities in Colonial Algeria and 9/11 United States

by

Miriam Mabrouk

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English

Department of English and Film Studies
University of Alberta

© Miriam Mabrouk, 2017

Abstract

My thesis explores the ways in which the re-enactment of an aggressive white masculinity that is heteronormative, militarist, and aggressive, one that is also race- and class-specific, is the cornerstone of the neo-liberal world order in Western Europe and in the U.S. My project turns to literature and film in order to examine how white masculinity is constructed against the terrorist Other, within a colonial context, in French Algeria, as well as during the chaotic neo-imperial aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States. My project expounds on how white hegemonic masculinity is maintained and challenged in *Ce Que le Jour Doit à la Nuit* (2012) and *The Battle of Algiers* (1966), as well as Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*. My thesis asks the following central questions: How do cultural representations of masculinity influence and determine our understanding of terrorism? What does the representation of gender indicate about the interactions between colonizer and colonized, and between the US and its enemies?

The first half of the thesis examines the dynamics of masculinity, as mediated in two cinematic representations of the French colonisation of Algeria. Chapter one traces the unequal power dynamics between Algeria and France through the juxtaposition of the main male French and Algerian characters in *Ce Que Le Jour Doit a la Nuit*. Macroscopically the hierarchical structures and the conflicts that arise between these characters reflect the relationship and power discrepancies between the two nations and the way in which France employs its hegemony to feminize the land and establish a masculinist order that subjugates and exploits Algerians. Chapter two focuses on the infamous Battle of Algiers, a campaign of guerrilla warfare that lasted between 1956 and 1957. Pontecorvo's mediation of the historic *The Battle of Algiers* more

explicitly deals with the clash between French and Algerian powers. My analysis is focused on torture and its imperative role in constructing a vindictive and violent masculinity.

The second part of the thesis shifts into the post-9/11 context in order to examine the toxic construction of a masculinist milieu of white hegemonic identity formations. Chapter three elaborates on Mohsin Hamid's representation of a hyper masculine environment, which creates antagonistic masculinities. Hamid's novel reveals how white hegemonic masculinity unleashes a protest counter-hegemonic masculinity, as seen via the antagonistic relationship between the novel's Pakistani protagonist and his American interlocutor. The final chapter turns to Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* to analyze these competing masculinities within a U.S. national context. He foregrounds the rupture brought about by September 11 between various expressions and formations of masculinity resulting in identity crises. Keith's dysfunctional masculinity which is manifested through his fetishistic obsession with poker, stands testament to the emergence of a new masculinist order. The latter requires a different masculinity that is neither nostalgic nor vindictive and reactionary. These discourse analyses, relying on postcolonial gender theories, foreground the inextricable link between masculinity and colonialism and neo-imperialism. My investigation shows that masculinist milieus are imperative to the maintenance of gendered hierarchies and the dominance as well as violence of colonizers in imperial contexts.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Terri Tomsky who has supported me throughout my thesis with her patience and knowledge whilst allowing me the room to work in my own way. Dr. Tomsky has been supportive since the days I began working with her on my project. Her academic and emotional encouragement helped through the rough road to finish this thesis. I attribute the level of my Master's degree to her encouragement and effort and without her this thesis would not have been completed. One simply could not wish for a better or more supportive supervisor. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Lahoucine Ouzgane whose supervision in the earlier stages of my thesis assisted me in developing my ideas.

I gratefully acknowledge the funding received towards my MA from the Tunisian Government. Without this financial support, I would not have been able to undertake this project. Special thanks go to Prof. Julie Rak for her guidance and academic support throughout different stages of my project. Dr. Rak and Kim Brown's administrative help enabled me to finish my project and made it possible for me to defend it. I am similarly indebted to Dr. Corrinne Harol, and Dr. Gary Kelly who provided me with advice at times of critical need.

I owe gratitude to my Canadian family who offered me shelter and words of wisdom and encouragement, reminding me to take care of myself. Thank you, Brianne Peck, Brittany Mock, Orly Lael Netzer and Brenda Lee Germain and many others. I finish with Tunisia and Germany, where the most basic source of my life energy resides: my family. I have an amazing family, unique in many ways, and the stereotype of a perfect family in many others. Their support has been unconditional all these years; they have cherished with me every great moment and supported me whenever I needed it. Thank you Rawia Barrak and Mahdi Brahim who never gave

up on me. Last but not the least, I sought inspiration and I owe a great deal to my mother Sylvia Moser-Mabrouk, my father Sami Mabrouk and my sister Ines Mabrouk whose late-night phone calls provided me with the emotional support I needed to keep on track. Their sacrifices and work ethics inspired me to pursue my dreams and to never give up. It was my father's wish to see me with a Masters degree. I would prefer to pay homage by dedicating my thesis to my late father under whose care I have been able to enjoy my life.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Historical Context

At a first glance, the Algerian independence war (1954-1962) and the attacks on the United States, on September 11, 2001 seem to be unrelated, both temporally and spatially, with the former taking place in French Algeria and the latter impacting the psyche of a nation for decades after 2001. Yet, at a closer look, both events share two salient similarities: they were historically framed in the context of terrorism and depicted in a gendered manner. When France invaded Algeria in 1830 it set the foundation for a century-long domination, transforming the northern African country into a core political component of the French Republic. While the European settlers, the *pieds noirs*, enjoyed full rights there, Algerians lived under harsh and restrictive conditions, confined in overpopulated slums and denied political representation in government. Gradually growing resentful of these injustices, numerous pro-independence groups surfaced, such as the National Liberation Front (FLN), calling for the freedom of Algerians. Instigating a revolution, colonizer and colonized clashed on numerous occasions. The bloody conflicts culminated in the yearlong battle of Algiers, a pivotal moment in Algerian history, which led to the granting of Independence in 1962. The September 11, 2001 attacks are similarly decisive events in American history, as they constitute the first major assaults on American soil since Pearl Harbour. On that day, nineteen Al-Qaeda militants hijacked four planes and directed them into symbolic buildings: two collided into the World Trade Center, bringing both the North and

South towers to collapse, another one hit the Pentagon, and the fourth crashed on a field in Pennsylvania, ostensibly on its way to the White House. Over 3,000 thousand people died as a consequence prompting a series of harsh reactionary military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, and reshaping American global policies, the effects of which are still felt today.

My thesis takes up literary and cinematographic representations of the battle of Algiers, the period preceding it, as well as the September 11, 2001 attacks and their aftermath. Chapter 1 examines Yasmina Khadra's 2008 novel *Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit (What the Day Owes the Night*) and Alexandre Arcady's homonymous cinematic adaptation of 1966, focusing on the rising tensions between colonized and colonizers and the impact of colonialism on Algerian identity. Chapter 2 looks at Gillo Pontecorvo's iconic film *The Battle of Algiers* (1966) and the representation of colonial torture tactics on the FLN, as a way to undermine their efforts to overthrow the French regime. Chapter 3 shifts the focus to the American context after September 11, 2001 with an analysis of American and counter-hegemonic (terrorist) masculinity in Mohsin Hamid's 2007 novel *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Chapter 4 turns to Don DeLillo's bestseller, *Falling Man* (2007), in order to explore identity formation and the post-9/11 crisis of masculinity in the main protagonists. Through these analyses, my thesis asks the following: What connects the Battle of Algiers to the September 11, 2001 attacks? How do cultural representations of masculinity influence and determine our understanding of terrorism? To what extent does the binary imagining of these conflicts (i.e., good versus evil) provide insights into historically complex events? What is the significance of masculinity in these conflicts in terms of understanding (colonial) pasts and futures? What does the representation of gender indicate about the interactions between colonizer and colonized, and between the US and its enemies?

Literary Productions on the Algerian War

My thesis addresses the centrality of masculinity and terrorism in representations of the Algerian War, an event which was extensively portrayed in film and literature. Numerous cultural works have engaged with this colonial history, from the arrival of the French colons in 1830 to contemporary France and its reckoning with its multicultural present. Most prominent among them is the novel *The Centurions* (*Les Centurions*) (1960) by French journalist and former soldier Jean Lartéguy. The novel revolves around the heroic French protagonist who against all odds dismantles a terrorist cell during the Battle of Algiers. Sacrificing his moral superiority, Captain Julien Boisfeuras uses torture to extract information in order to maintain the French empire. Another French writer, Jean Brune, a *pied noir*, explores similar tropes in his 1961 bestseller *This Hatred which Resembles Love* (*Cette haine qui ressemble a l'amour*). With works such as Claude Bonjean's *Lucien Chez les Barbares* (1977), Gilbert Cesbron's *Entre Chiens et Loups* (1062), Pierre Leulliette's *Saint Michel et le Dragon: Souvenirs d'un Parachutiste* (1961), and others, readers gain a one-sided view into the Algerian war. These works, predominantly written by French, male, former soldiers turned writers, construct a binary imaginary of the war: Algerians are portrayed as barbaric terrorists; the war is represented in a favourable light for the French. These novels romanticize and glorify the French military presence in Algeria and perpetuate moral and strategic justifications for the use of excessive violence bombings, and torture. The cinematic representations during that period, such as *The Lost Command* (1966), *L'Honneur d'un Capitaine* (1982), *L'insoumis* (1964), and *Avoir 20 ans dans les Aurès* (1972), also contend with similar tropes.

The blatant absence of Algerian voices and the reductive portrayal of FLN fighters as primitive savages provides a one-sided account of an intricate historical event, leading to the

easy categorization and labelling of Algerians as terrorists. Yet this Manichean discourse was challenged and countered by French intellectuals after the increasing exposure of the colonizers' atrocities. Albert Camus, Frantz Fanon, and Jean Paul Sartre were the front runners of the "intellectuals' last stand" who called for readers to actively engage with both literature and politics (Dine 2). This intellectual awakening and the resultant literary exploration of politics, in conjunction with the appearance of the cinematic New Wave marked the appearance of more balanced artistic imagining of the Algerian war. Phillippe Dine's 1994 survey *Images of the Algerian War: French fiction and film, 1954-1992* highlights the importance of the war in cultural production, since it "generat[ed] an enormous volume of histories, testimonies, polemics, memoirs, and, especially, works of fiction" with many authors who turned to "writing as a private substitute" due to the "absence of [..] a state sponsored ritual of mourning and a consensual history of the period" (6-7). Kateb Yacine's *Nedjma* (1956), and Mohammed Dib's three iconic novels *La Grande Maison* (1952), *L'Incendie* (1954), and *Le Métier à tisser* (1957), referred to collectively as the *Algérie* trilogy led the literary revolution. The novelistic responses to the war, as well as a small number of films written by and about men mainly contend with French colonisation and the effects of it on the Algerian psyche; these, however, neglect the gendered relationship that was integral to the maintenance of French dominance.

Published in 2008 in French, Yasmina Kahdra's *Ce que le Jour doit à la Nuit* deals with the traumatic consequences of French colonialism and the way in which it deeply disrupts the protagonist's journey of self discovery and identity formation within colonial Algeria. Like other works in this field, the story line is set in motion by a young boy, Younes, whose blue eyes and fair skin permit him to pass as French and befriend *pieds noirs*. While other works establish an unequivocal binary between colonizer and colonized, Khadra complicates this dualism by endowing some of his French characters with compassion for the Algerian cause. He thus

challenges previous fictional imaginings of the Algerian war, by indicating the struggles on both sides.

Similar attempts can be observed in Gillo Pontecorvo's *Battle of Algiers*, an earlier filmic response about French colonialism, which was produced in the years immediately after Algerian independence. Portraying the infamous *Bataille d'Alger*, the film contains graphic torture scenes that led to screening boycotts and drew harsh criticism. Pontecorvo's cinematographic work revolves around the male leaders of the FLN as well as the French paras. The film delineates their bombing and torture tactics as well as the ways in which they use their cultural knowledge to subvert and undermine prevalent racial and gendered assumptions. Unlike other movies of that period, Pontecorvo exposes harsh realties of the fight between the unequal parties, challenging the heroic myth of French military. While these works challenge previous binary representations of the Algerian war there is a striking masculinist understanding of the struggles that both Khadra's novel and Pontecorvo's film share.

Literary Productions on 9/11

As with my focus on French Algeria and masculinity, the second half of my thesis explores how masculinity is figured in literary representations of 9/11. The attacks of September 11, 2001 were pivotal, in that they ushered in a decade of artistic preoccupation with this traumatic event. Post 9/11 productions are diverse, ranging from collections of eye witness accounts such as Jim Dwyer and Kevin Flynn's *102 Minutes: The Untold Story of the Fight to Survive Inside the Twin Towers* (2005) to comic books such as *In the Shadow of No Towers* (2004) by Pulitzer-prize

winning artist, Art Spiegelman. There also exists a plethora of fictional father- son narratives among which one can find Jay McInerney's *The Good Life* (2006) and Jess Walter's *The Zero* (2006). With some exceptions, early literary responses to the attacks are marked by Manichean themes: good is positioned against evil; the west is juxtaposed against the rest. John Updike's novel *Terrorist* (2006) is a prime example of this binary. Other bestsellers such as Ian McEwan's *Saturday* (2005) exhibit reductionist penchants as well. Senior lecturer at the University of Sunderland Geoffrey Nash explores these tropes in *Writing Muslim Identity* (2012) and suggests that the writers often:

> operate within a horizon of discourse that does not have the semantic tools to penetrate the mysteries of Muslim identity. Whether this is constructed in terms of mental pathology, nihilism or cultural alienation, it bares the imprint of western neuroses rather than it does Arab or Muslim ones. (108)

By juxtaposing Muslim culture and identity against Western standard, writers fall trap to reductionist representations of the other, paving the way for the categorization of differences as violent anomalies. While Updike and his contemporaries claim to have conducted research before delving into the writing of these novels, there is little evidence that could substantiate their understanding of the intricate socio-political factors, in conjunction to U.S hegemonic neo-imperial foreign policies that play significant roles in the emergence of terrorism.

The regressive discourse, while still a prevalent theme in many texts, was eventually challenged by writers such as Amy Waldman with her 2011 novel *Submission*, which openly questions ideas of Muslim homogeneity and prejudice. Like Waldman, Mohsin Hamid's *The*

Reluctant Fundamentalist expands the focus on American national identity and subverts assumptions about the Muslim Other by including marginalized voices. These writers actively attempt to move away from reductionist imaginings of the attacks, yet they fail to address the predominant role of gender and masculinity. Although they do so in different ways, both Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* (2007) and Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) contend with the 9/11 attacks by giving voice to both Americans and minorities. They nevertheless share, along with many of their contemporaries, a masculinist imagining of September 11, 2001 and its aftermath, by focusing solely on how male protagonists cope with and respond to the trauma of the event.

Conceptual Framework

My discourse analysis of these literary and cinematographic representations of the Algerian war and the September 11, 2001 attacks rely on theories on feminism and gender. Consequently, I draw on postcolonial gender analysis and scholarship from a range of disciplines, including especially sociology and literary studies. The role of masculinity is particularly important to my explorations of the fictional representation of events. Raewyn Connell's theories are imperative to understand the concept of masculinity. The gender theorist defines masculinity as "configurations of practice structured by gender relations … They are inherently historical and their making and remaking is a political process" (Connell 44). A system of gender relations is quintessential for the construction of masculinity as it is "an object of knowledge [which] is always masculinity in relation" (44). Masculinity is hence not a coherent object but rather part of a structure that is subject to constant change. Masculinity is "simultaneously a place in gender

relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture" (71). Masculinity is further equated with the "exercise of power in its most naked forms" resulting in the emergence of different manifestations of gendered practices (42). It also intersects with race and class.

While both the Algerian war and 9/11 are historically and geographically distinct, there is a noticeable gender hierarchy and a clear sexualization of the terrorist in literary portrayals that reveals a particular discrimination towards the Other, a form of Orientalism that justifies colonial and neo-imperial violence. Similarly, my investigation of films and texts on Algeria and 9/11 highlights the appearance of what Connell call "hegemonic masculinities" as well as the "protest" identities that emerge to counteract it (77;109). These different types of masculinity emerge to the different power dynamics between men. While "hegemonic masculinity" is not a fixed character type "it is rather a masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position that is always contestable" (76). These sets of practices can be espoused by both men and women and create more types of masculinity such as "complicit" and "marginalized" masculinities. The male protagonists that I examine in the first half of the thesis have a masculinist demeanour in common with Jonas trying to adopt the French masculinity of his friends; Colonel Mathieu, in the *Battle of Algiers*, is similarly masculinist, imposing gendered tactics to feminize and hence undermine his Algerian enemies. DeLillo and Hamid, on the other hand, juxtapose the masculinities of their male protagonists against the terrorist other.

Raewyn Connell's *Masculinities* (1985) is integral to furthering my exploration of gender and masculinities in the aforementioned works. In her ground-breaking analysis, she clearly distinguishes between men and masculinities, with the latter concerning the position of men in

the gender order. Different patterns of practices by both men and women contribute directly and indirectly to the maintenance of this hierarchy, engendering the construction of different forms of masculinity, namely "protest masculinity" and "hegemonic masculinity" (Connell xviii;109). These forms of masculinity are reliant on repeated performance, requiring men to constantly prove and perform their manliness in respect to others, creating an environment of competition. Performativity not only creates tension between individuals but is also a source of escalating violence, which can be observed in the literary and cinematographic mediations of the two major historical events I investigate. French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's study on masculine domination in the Kabyle society is another theoretical text that I will draw on in my analyses. The gendered power dynamics established in this setting, Bourdieu finds, are characterized by a pervasive "symbolic violence," which he considers to be amongst the most powerful tools of gender construction (2). His focus on particular cases provide unique insights into "the cultural tradition that has been maintained there" and which constitutes "a paradigmatic realization of the Mediterranean tradition" shared with "the whole European cultural domain" (6). His study delineates how different cultural practices such as marriage define and solidify overtly gendered forms of domination.

Bourdieu and Connell as well as Edward Said's 1978 influential *Orientalism* will be imperative in chapters 1 and 2, as they offer insights into homosocial bonding, which is reliant on an environment of competition and performance. Annette Kolodny's findings in conjunction to Anne Mclintock's work will shed light on the power dynamics between the two nations and the way in which France employs its hegemony to feminize the land and establish a masculinist order that subjugates and exploits Algerians. This macroscopic juxtaposition is reflective of the relationship between the different French and Algerian protagonists in *Ce Que Le Jour Doit a la*

Nuit. Chapter 2 will draw on theories on gender and performativity by Ranjana Khanna and theories on the sexualization of torture by Marnia Lazreg in order to understand Pontecorvo's mediation of the historic battle of Algiers which deals more explicitly with the clash between French and Algerian powers. Khanna offers a helpful analysis of the performativity of race as well as the role of women who passed as French citizens in order to breach the harshly controlled districts. An investigation of torture, its sexualization and its imperative role in galvanizing a vindictive and violent masculinity is also included in Chapter 2, with Colonel Mathieu's character taking center stage.

The second part of the thesis shifts into the post-9/11 context in order to examine the toxic construction of a masculinist milieu of white hegemonic identity formations. Chapter 3 continues to draw on the scholarly insights of Bourdieu and Connell as well as Gwen Broude to discern how Hamid's representation of a hyper masculine environment creates antagonistic masculinities. The novel reveals how white hegemonic masculinity unleashes a protest counter-hegemonic masculinity, as seen via the antagonistic relationship between the novel's Pakistani protagonist and his American interlocutor. Connell's work helps shed light on Changez's "transnational business masculinity" which he substitutes with a reactionary "protest masculinity," creating a tense environment of competition (46; 78). The final chapter turns to
Don DeLillo's *Falling Man* to analyse these competing masculinities within a U.S. national context. DeLillo foregrounds the rupture brought about by September 11, with the national crisis extended (and personified in Keith) as a crisis in masculine identity. Keith's dysfunctional masculinity, which is manifested through his fetishistic obsession with poker, stands as a testament to the emergence of a new masculinist order. Bourdieu's theories on masculinity, particularly the significance of the familial context in defining manliness, are important here;

similarly, Anna Agathangelou's understanding of hyper masculinity is also integral to my understanding of Keith's attempt to restore a nostalgic masculinity. My chapter additionally analyses Hammad, the terrorist Other, in terms of his positioning within a homogenous and homosocial Islamic context. Here I draw on Afsaneh Najmabadi's study of Islam and her cultural history of the beard to further explore DeLillo's representation of Hammad's masculinity.

Comparative focus

Both the Algerian war and the September 11, 2001 attacks had extensive impacts globally and nationally. Yet when they are represented in literature and film, they are often shown in reductive and binary ways. The aforementioned texts, however, attempt to challenge these representations and offer more realistic insights into the suffering of the different parties involved, and consequently they shed light on the historical yet forgotten factors that led to these events. With the Algerian war, for instance, there is a common misconception that FLN militants are part of terrorist cell, as they are repeatedly labelled as such by historians and writers. Yet few mention the factors that pushed Algerians to form these groups and adopt radical tactics, i.e., after one hundred and thirty-years of colonial oppression and the denial of rights and liberties. A similar dehistoricist pattern can be observed in the imagining of 9/11, positioned as it is in American history as an unexpected and unwarranted event. While there is no justification for these atrocities, it is imperative to mention the geo-political factors that culminated in the attacks, particularly in regard to US hegemonic and interventionist neo-imperial policies that have been taking place for decades.

Khadra's *Ce Que le Jour Doit a la Nuit*, Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers*, Hamid's *Reluctant Fundamentalist*, and DeLillo's *Falling Man* directly and indirectly speak to these issues; my thesis, however, sidelines this history in order to prioritize an analysis of their predominantly masculinist imaginary. While both periods are connected in various ways (for example, the US has referenced *The Battle of Algiers* as a means to study Arab insurgency tactics in preparation for the Iraq War), all of these cultural works share a major theme: the portrayal of male protagonists struggling with their masculinist identities in reaction to new political, social and economic environments, which engender toxic and sometimes violent reactions. My thesis explores the production of toxic masculinities: whether it is the re-enactment of an aggressive white masculinity that is heteronormative, militarist, and aggressive, or one that is reactionary, race-, and class-specific. In these texts and films, the appearance of a violent masculinist identity is deeply significant as the cornerstone of the neo-liberal world order in Western Europe and in the U.S.

Chapter 1: Between Two Worlds: Masculinity and Colonialism in Alexandre Arcady's Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit

Introduction

When Yasmina Khadra's works first appeared in Algeria, literary critics were thrilled to be analyzing and reviewing novels by an Algerian female writer. Khadra's voice became emblematic of that of the "authentic Arab woman" (Mohammed Moulessehoul, the real 'Yasmina Khadra,' n.pag). Khadra gained international acclaim for a range of novels: *Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit* (2008), which traces the struggles of a young boy, Younes, in rural Algeria during the French occupation in Algeria; *The Attack* (2006), which tackles the Palestinian Israeli conflict; and *The Swallows of Kabul* (2005), which depicts the life of a Taliban jailer. The novels are not only thematically versatile, resonating with readers from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds; they also offer intriguing insights into the politics and conflicts from colonized Algeria to occupied Palestine.

In 2001, however, Khadra revealed her true identity to be in fact Mohammed Moulessehoul, an army officer with the Algerian government who fought against so-called radical Islamists and hence partook in the systemic oppression of civilians, according to the French media. This revelation problematizes all of Khadra's literary achievements. What was once hailed as offering significant insights into the world of an Arab woman was undermined by the author's "tainted" past. Readers found it hard to reconcile Khadra's persona as a soldier with

that of the provocative female author. In an interview, Moulessehoul, hereafter Khadra recounts the prejudice he encountered as a former solider:

> There were many misunderstandings because people found it hard to understand a writer who was a soldier [..] I had to really fight against those who did not appreciate my work because they pigeonholed me as some sort of brute who was responsible for military massacres. In the eight years I led the fight against terrorism, there were no massacres. Let me tell you, it was a hard battle - there is no honesty or integrity among the pseudo-intellectuals I had to take on. There's much more honesty and integrity among soldiers, trust me. ("Mohammed Moulessehoul" n.pag.)

Khadra further explains the predicament that led him to adopt Khadra, his wife's name, as his *nom de plume*. He narrates his experiences of censorship of his manuscripts by the Algerian military. While he wrote and published several books before 1988, his superiors insisted that future works were to be censored. Considering this an unbearable imposition, Khadra adopted his pen name. During the interview, he confesses:

> I wrote six books under my real name in Algeria. I was happy with that until 1988, when they imposed on me conditions that were abominable. Unacceptable. The army required henceforth that I submitted my manuscripts to a committee who could censor my work. I refused and so I risked having to stop writing, but what could I do? It was my wife who proposed to write under her first two names. ("Mohammed Moulessehoul," n.pag.)

Asked why he did not leave the Algerian army, he replies that he had neither "means or the courage" to quit ("Mohammed Moulessehoul," n.pag.). He joined the military academy at the age of nine to follow in the footsteps of his father, an officer in the Algerian Liberation Front, hence Khadra's fascination with this period of Algeria's history.

This interest in Algeria's colonial history is echoed in Khadra's more recent work *Ce Que le Jour Doit à la Nuit* (2008). This novel, set in in the 1930s, revolves around the story of Younes, a young Algerian boy who is the main character in the novel. After his father, Issa, loses his land due to the vile tactics of the French colons, Younes is forced to join his uncle and French aunt. His emergence into the world of French Algeria not only highlights the drastic differences between the two worlds but his enrolment in a French school also creates tensions with his French companions, Jean Christophe, Fabrice, Dede and Simon on numerous occasions. While he has to repeatedly prove his worth, and endure indirect and direct discriminatory attacks, he has to simultaneously try to win over his childhood friend Emilie, who is desired by all of his male friends. This thematic preoccupation with the Algerian War suggests the trauma that affected the lives of many Algerians for decades after the end of colonisation.

Alexandre Arcady's 2012 cinematic adaptation of Khadra's novel offers poignant references to the trauma of colonisation as well. In cooperation with Khadra, Arcady adapted the novel into a screen-play. His rationale behind this project was political as well as deeply personal. In an interview, Arcady reveals that he is indeed the son of *pieds noir* (descendant of French settlers in Algeria), and "happy and proud to be a child from the Casbah" who spent a considerable time in Algeria (Labarre, n.pag.). Having been forced to leave his home with his family after the country's independence, he reminisces on the bitter memories of entering

Frances's cold world. The adaptation project not only provided a way for him to revisit his past, but also helped him clear the misunderstanding that he thought existed between France and Algeria, which caused the latter to be portrayed in a disfigured manner. Unlike other French works that denigrated Algerians, *Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit* offers a new kind of relationship, which sought to bring closer French and Algerian citizens, and to convey a sense of unity and a shared love for Algeria. The novel's central love story, the impossible and tragic relationship between Younes and Emilie, reflects on the strained relationship between France and its former colony.

This chapter will investigate the gendered nature of the Algerian conflict in Arcady's filmic adaptation of *Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit,* in conjunction with references to Khadra's novel. While critics mostly focused their attention on the historical accuracy of Arcady's cinematic representation, this chapter will add to the discussion by examining the masculinist milieu that French colonization created through an analysis of the masculinities of the main characters, such as Younes and his French friends. My chapter also investigates the role of women, such as Emilie and her mother, Madame Cazenave who are representative of France and who both challenge yet uphold French masculine dominance. Through his interactions with these characters, Younes' microscopic identity struggles with his French friends symbolize the discrepant and gendered power dynamics between France and Algeria, as poignantly represented both by the discriminatory treatment of Arabs and by the forced conquest of the Algerian land.

The Algerian Land as Body

The French occupation of Algeria, which started in 1830, gradually turned in an ongoing project of colonization. Both the people and the land were abused and exploited, resources were stolen,

and Algerian citizens were pushed into poorer neighbourhoods, while the French settlers enjoyed a luxurious life. The French oppression of Algerians is depicted in detail in Alexandre Arcady's film adaptation of *Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit.* From the outset, the viewers witness the physical and metaphorical subjugation of Algerian land and its citizens, a process that is extremely gendered in nature, for it is characterized by a mostly male group violently dominating over another.

During one of the first scenes in Arcady's film, the audience is introduced to Issa and his family, who live on a farm in a rural area in Algeria. The aesthetics of the golden wheat fields are set in scene; the opening frames of the movie emphasize the vibrant colours of the fields with the camera's extensive focus lingering on the aesthetic quality and material value of the land. Not only does Issa, the owner of the fields, invite his son Younes to look at the beautiful land, but the representative of French authority, the Caid, comes to inspect it as well, telling him that his land is "really nice to look at" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* When the farmer refuses to sell his much-coveted property, the Caid's horsemen burn everything down, sealing the family's future, for Issa is "emasculated" i.e., he has "lost his face" because he has "nothing" and is no longer capable of providing for his family (Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit). Forcing the spectator to adopt the perspective of the male gaze, and so becoming complicit with France's materialistic perception of Algeria, the film draws attention to the French authorities' attempt to dominate over and possess the land. This controlling attitude is further exhibited by another French settler, Rucillio, who confesses to Younes after altercations between the FLN and the French that "[he] would rather see the land burn, than see it in the hands of Algerians" *(Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). The desire to be in charge and to have the upper hand is inherent to French masculine

colonizers. French masculinity sits on the apex of the hierarchical order, in contrast to the feminized land, which like the native women is passed from one male to another.

Gendering the land as feminine and perpetuating fantasies of rich and virgin territories is, in fact, not a novel phenomenon. Annette Kolodny, for instance, in the *Lay of the Land* (1984), traces it back to the sixteenth century when these metaphors were deliberately used to attract more colonizers. What is more, she claims that among the reasons that led to such a "fantasy," i.e., perceiving land as female, is to eliminate the threat that nature poses with its unpredictability, inquiring:

> Was there perhaps a need to experience the land as a nurturing, giving maternal breast because of the threatening, alien, and potentially emasculating terror of the unknown? [..] In a sense, to make the new continent Woman was already to civilize it a bit, casting the stamp of human relations upon what was otherwise unknown and untamed. (9)

While this fantasy facilitates colonization by reducing the threats of an unknown territory, it also paves the way to the subjugation of both resources and people.

Anne McClintock also expounds on the trope of feminizing the land, stating that "Africa and the Americas had become what can be called a porno-tropics for the European imagination," and that the latter "had a long tradition" (34). The main reason behind the creation of this metaphor, according to both McClintock and Kolodny, is to reduce the threat of the unknown, by forcing the land into a gender hierarchy, with the male on top as the dominant force. McClintock

maintains that “the feminizing of the land represents a ritualistic moment in imperial discourse, as male intruders ward off fears of narcissistic disorder by reinscribing, as natural, an excess of gender hierarchy” (36). This can be seen in France’s domination and placing itself as the superior power, at the top of the gender hierarchy.

While Kolodny mainly focuses on the American continent and how the metaphor of the virgin land and *terra nullius* were used as justifications for colonization, McClintock adds to that, focusing on Africa and the stereotypes that were associated to its inhabitants. Not only does she show that it was common to perceive the “dark continent” as one characterized by sexual perversion, but she also uses citations from *Universal History* (1747-1768), which depicts Africans as inherently “proud, lazy, treacherous, thievish, hot and addicted to all kinds of lusts" to make her point (McClintock 22). Their “abnormalities and sexual aberrations” were so unnatural and excessive “as to border to the bestial” (22). This negative portrayal and the stereotypes that stem from such lore resonate with the insults and accusations Younes has to endure from an early age, widening the gap between who he is and who he wants to be; a tension that will eventually result into him taking irreversible decisions.

Younes’s Struggle: The Construction of Masculinity in French Algeria

The gendered struggle between the French colonizers and Algerians comes to the fore through an examination of Younes and the ways in which he struggles to assimilate and construct his masculinity. His identity crisis gradually manifests itself after having been taken in by his uncle who instigates a number of changes. In fact, Younes’ transformation can be observed on both the physical and the psychological level. When he arrives, his name, a major identity marker, is

changed, as Younes becomes Jonas. Madeleine, his uncle Mahi's wife, addresses him as the latter and upon being corrected by the boy, tells him that Younes is "no longer his name" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Setting up the psychological shift, the physical one quickly ensues when Younes is literally stripped from his identity by Mahi who undresses him. His clothes, representative of the rustic and earthy Algerian lifestyle, are discarded in the garbage bin and later on replaced by modern French garments. After being taken away from his family, stripping, here, furthers the physical stage of rupture from his old life and the entry into a new one, which is replete with alien values and habits. A cleansing ritual finalizes the process. The purifying power of water and the biblical connotation of rebirth that entails it are executed by the uncle who washes away and further distances the boy from his past. Each cleansing stroke forcibly removes a layer of his identity, destroying his connection to the land. Younes is reborn into Jonas.

The transformation is further accentuated when Younes is placed in front of the mirror to contemplate his appearance and the result of his metamorphosis. When we see him, we see his imago, an altered reflection of him, in his blue sailor suit. The Algerian boy disappears and is replaced by the French "emancipated" version, marking his passing, which is similar to that of his father who "entered a mirror as well" when he arrived in Oran (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). This scene, albeit short, is reminiscent of the Lacanian mirror phase through which children go during their development. Jaques Lacan argues that by seeing one's reflection, children obtain a "sense of subjectivity," enabling them to discover a sense of self identity (503). In this case, however, the mirror represents a tool for colonization through which Younes gets a false sense of identity, inadvertently creating an alternate or double self or a "double

consciousness" as W.E.B Du Bois calls it, in his 1903 *The Souls of Black Folk* (3). Younes sees the idealized, French version of himself. DuBois adds:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in an amused contempt and pity. (4)

The constant recourse to the past, which in this case is brought about by his uncle Mahi who, ironically says, while the camera focalizes on the image, that "even in this suit, never forget where you come from," further exacerbates Younes' dilemma (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).*

In *Decolonising the Mind* (1986), Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o notes that it is not really through guns, violence, and physical control that a people is colonised, but through language and education. In the case of Algeria, the French language became the language of education and thus the language of the educated, the advanced, and the elite. French language and culture was held up as superior to that of the native Algerians, and in teaching this to the Algerian children, the colonisation of the mind occurred. This is what happens to Younes when he is slowly introduced to French culture. At school, for instance, Younes willingly identifies himself as Jonas and no longer has the desire to use his true name. In the film, we can hear him say that "with Madeleine, he came to know another world; France" and that her tenderness facilitated his inclusion (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* Yet this did not inhibit him from still feeling the hurt of his Algerian background. When boys in school say that Arabs are lazy, he asks his uncle, who explains that it is the difference between the French and the Algerians that make them appear

lazy to the French: "For them time is money. For us, freedom is priceless" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Younes' uncle tells him about his ancestors and his history. Lella Fatna and her revolutionary actions take center stage in his narrative. He reminds him that his father "has the same character as her, and that he is strong" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).*

While the tension results from the constant oscillations between the two cultures, Younes' inner conflict transcends the psyche to affect his body as well, when he and his foster family move to Rio Salado. In class, when his name is read out loud by the teacher, the other students discover Younes' true identity and immediately reject him for being "a dirty Arab" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). During recess, his classmates confront him and the situation soon escalates, as Isabelle Rucilio yells across the yard that she "can't marry him" because he is "an Arab" and Jean Christophe accuses him of being "a liar" and asks him to "lower his eyes," or else he'll beat him (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* Only after he subjects himself and his body to the physical punishment of the French teacher to protect them and then complies to the diving test twice because they thought he cheated the first time is Younes tolerated in their circle. The naked bodies on the beach, with the Arab one directly juxtaposed to that of the French, not only suggests the vulnerability of the boy but also brings to the fore the inequalities between them, for Younes is outnumbered. Although he is as physically strong as if not stronger than his French friends, it's only when the latter resort to French stereotypes of Algerians (lazy, cheats, etc.) that they manage to put him down and exclude him from their midst. The treatment of the young boy is similar to what Mahi had to undergo, for he was in fact forced to leave Oran after being publicly humiliated by the French police, who left him with "nothing in Oran" *(Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Issa, as well, was a victim of French hegemony, chased away from his lands to find misery and despair in Oran. Now Younes is placed in the same vicious circle, for he is

repeatedly forced to mimic his friends' French masculinity and performances to remain in their circle.

This translates itself into the macroscopic picture of Algeria under colonization. The Algerian body suffered a great deal under French rule and Arabs were blatantly discriminated against and treated as worthless animals, a treatment that several characters in the movie, namely Djelloul and Younes, have to endure.

Women and Arabs as Animals

While the French colonizers established a gendered hierarchy positioning themselves at the top, women and Arabs were on the opposite end of the spectrum, which is brought to the fore in the second major beach scene of the film and which is dominated by masculinist interactions between Younes and his friends. Only this time the friends are adults and a new character, Djelloul, Younes is humiliated and abused in place of Younes by the French settlers. When we first encounter him, we can see him struggling to set up a picnic tent on a hot day at the beach. Forcing him to work under inhumane conditions marks the first instance that we witness of Dede's utter disrespect for his servant, which only shows the extent to which he disregards Algerians and views them as inferior. The situation is only exacerbated when Dedes arrives and immediately lashes out at him, calling him "an idiot and moron" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Although the other *pieds noirs* interject, trying to half-heartedly defend Djelloul, Dede retorts with the excuse that "Arabs are like octopuses, they need to be beaten to become tender" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* In other words, Arabs need to be softened up, they need to be broken, in order to subjugate them to the white man's will. In "Abu Zubaydah and the

Caterpillar" (2011), Neel Ahuja contends with the issue of torture and the very specific technique that was deployed to break Abu Zubaydah who is portrayed as "a mentally and physically strong man whose resilience allows him to withstand normal interrogation techniques" (128). This threat of violence not only scares the Other into submission but similarly establishes the powerful and dominant position of the colonizer.

Dede also uses terms such as "rat" and "donkey" to further dehumanize Djelloul, rendering him an easy target for more abuse (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* Animalizing the enemy hence serves the purpose of not only inducing fear and therefore emasculation, but also regulating and defeating them. The spectacle that Dede showcases, most of the time, happens in front of his male friends, suggesting that he is trying to assert his masculinity and authority through means of blatant discrimination and by forcing Djelloul into submission and passivity. Dede's masculinity is constructed and performed and does only exist when he directly juxtaposes it to the imposed and violently enforced femininity of his Algerian servant. In fact, the construct of masculinity heavily depends on repeated enactment and exhibition of one's manliness. Michael Kimmel, in "Masculinity as Homophobia" (2000), claims that "other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval. It is other men who evaluate the performance" (214). Such is the case for Dede, who actively performs his manhood, leading Djelloul to join the FLN, to fight for the country's independence.

Kimmel is also relevant when Dede downgrades Simon's Jewish masculinity, inviting him to perform a homoerotic act "why don't you kiss him on the lips" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*) not only implying that Simon is less of a man but also putting Arabs and Jews in the same box, i.e., both inferior to Dede's French masculinity. The homophobic accusation becomes a

potent tool to silence and demean other men. Kimmel notes that it "is a central organizing principle of [the] cultural definition of manhood … it is a label of ultimate contempt for anyone who seems sissy, untough, uncool" (214). This fear of appearing less masculine than the others explains Simon's vehement reply: "the Jews can screw you," which subverts the homophobia and directs it against Dede. Frantz Fanon in *Black Skin, White Mask* (1952), elaborates on the differences between Jewish and Negro masculinities, emphasizing the fact that colonizers are characterized by a strong desire to emasculate colonized males. He says:

> No anti-semite, for example, would ever conceive of the idea of castrating a Jew. He is killed or sterilized. But the Negro is castrated. The penis, the symbol of manhood is annihilated, which is to say that it is denied. (162)

Dede's attempt to defend himself against Jean Christophe's macho talk indirectly elevates him above the others and further reinforces the hierarchy, with Arabs at the bottom.

Jean Christophe is also rebuffed and debased when Dede reminds him of his social standing; after all, he does not know "how it is to have servants" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Masculinity, therefore, is relational and its existence fully dependent on the presence of a homosocial environment of competition. Bourdieu maintains that "manliness … is an eminently relational notion, constructed in front of and for other men and against femininity, in a kind of fear of the female, firstly in oneself" (53). Hence, the repeated boasting about their sexual adventures and feats.

During the entire exchange, at the beach, Younes remains completely silent and even turns away, becoming a mere bystander. Although he looks pained by the insults, he only ends up walking away. Fear of being humiliated like his Arab friend and exposed as unmanly might be the reasons that silence Younes, for he has been continuously trying to emulate their French masculinity, so why risk it now to lose it all? Kimmel, indeed, blames masculinity for this behaviour and insists that the latter is responsible for the "maintenance and sustenance of the patriarchal system" (214). Sara Ahmed also elaborates on the idea of shame and how it is used to "recogni[ze] injustices committed by others" (102). Younes realizes that what has happened to Djelloul is wrong yet his desire to fit in and assimilate into that masculinist milieu is dominant.

While Dede tries to make up for his fragile masculinity through verbal and psychological abuse, the situation escalates into a physical yet one sided altercation when he sets Djelloul up to fail yet again before he opens up his new bar. Only this time he feels entitled to use violence on top of calling him "a donkey" to force him into submission and maintain a hierarchical order (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Kimmel, in this respect, asserts:

> Violence is often the single most evident marker of manhood. Rather it is the willingness to fight, the desire to fight. The origin of our expression that one "has a chip on one's shoulder" lies in the practice of an adolescent boy … who would literally walk around with a chip of wood on his shoulder- a signal of his readiness to fight with anyone. (215)

Both incidents may also be traced back to and explained by Pierre Bourdieu's theory in *Masculine Domination* (1989). He argues that masculine domination is achieved through what he calls "symbolic violence" effecting submission and eventually becoming naturalized and historicised (4). Raewyn Connell considers "violence [as] part of a system of domination," claiming that a "thoroughly legitimate hierarchy would have less need to intimidate" (84). The forced and often violent maintenance of this gendered system underlines the frailty of masculinity and its inability to form organically. It is thoroughly performative.

Putting down women is crucial to maintaining this dominance, for if they represent the opposite of what masculinity entails, i.e. domesticity, abstinence and passivity, there will be no threat of emasculation. Women in *Ce que le Jour Doit à la Nuit* are indeed compliant to these criteria and the male characters make sure the situation remains as such by animalizing and objectifying them. In the beach scene, for instance, Dede's very arrival with the new car and the women highlights the beginning of women's subjugation. Not only do the female characters have absolutely no line and remain quiet and uninvolved, but they also are placed in a way to signal their belonging to other males. Isabelle Rucillio is lasciviously lounging in the sun and later protectively embraced by Jean Christophe. Dede's female acquaintances are either in the car or next to it during the altercation and hence become material trophies that underline Dede's masculinity. Kimmel sees this "exaggerated masculinity" as proof that men strive to appear as masculine as possible in front of others and use all means to do so, including "putting women down" (216). He furthers this idea as follows:

> Women and gay men become the "other" against which heterosexual men project their identities, against whom they stack the decks so as to compete in a situation

> in which they will always win, so that by supressing them, men can stake a claim for their own manhood. (216)

The spectacle that Dede stages is further reinforced by what follows, for we witness their discussions on their sexual encounters they have had during their time in Oran. Jean Christophe and Dede boast about picking up prostitutes. What both incidents have in common is the fact that the young men resort to animal metaphors to refer to Arabs and these women. Simon, in particular, uses the term "elephant of a man" to diminish the threat a sexually active woman might pose to his sexuality (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* This is further reinforced when he says that she "was crawling all over him" *(Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* It is typically men who are free to express their sexuality and conquests openly, but Simon's assertion clearly suggests that it was the woman who conquered him, so in order to portray himself as the virile man as he wants to be and thereby avoid humiliation by his friends, he resorts to animalizing her. In fact, virility and being sexually active are among the key pillars that Bourdieu establishes in his analysis of masculinity. He defines "manliness, virility, in its ethical aspect, i.e. as the essence of the vir, virtus, the point of honour (nif), the principle of the conservation and increase of honour, remains indissociable, tacitly at least, from physical virility, in particular through the attestations of sexual potency - deflowering of the bride, abundant male offspring, etc. - which are expected of a 'real' man" (12). Younes has to similarly keep up with his friends and boast about his sexual adventures.

Objectification and animalistic metaphors serve to define French and Arab masculinities in the film, reducing Algerian masculinity to its instinctual and debased form, and depicting French masculinity (embodied in Dede) as dominant, aggressive heteronormative—separating

the two forms on the basis of race and class. They not only drive Djelloul into joining the FLN but also push Younes into Madame Cazenave's arms.

Madame Cazenave's Masculinity

While a masculinist milieu is established in Arcady's work through the animalization of the Other and objectification of women, there is another integral character who subverts these gender dynamics without challenging France's hegemony: Madame Cazenave. The wealthy *pieds noir* and mother of Emilie rearranges the gender order and positions herself above Arabs, while at the same time taking advantage of Younes. Immediately after the violent confrontation between Dede and Djelloul, we see Younes strolling around at the beach and stumbling across Madame Cazenave. Their encounter and ensuing exchange, although brief, is not only indicative of the pernicious nature of the wealthy seductress but ominous of an event that will change the course of Younes' life. What we first see in this scene is an inequality on the level of conversation. Madame Cazenave asks him about who he is and where he is from, but does not offer any insights concerning herself. This borders on an interrogation and underlines the unjust footing on which this relationship begins. She is in power and makes sure to convey that authority to her interlocutor.

The power dynamic is further subverted, for Younes is not only psychologically vulnerable after his so-called friend's attack on his identity as an Arab, but he is also exposed bodily; he is in his swimwear and almost naked, his body exposed to French culture, embodied by her. This is further substantiated by her seductive looks that she repeatedly directs at him, giving the impression of being a predator, waiting for the perfect opportunity to catch her prey.

Younes' friends force him out of his enchantment, jokingly informing him that "he will get a sunstroke" because she is fiery, and later add that she is "scorching hot in bed," suggesting the pernicious nature of Madame Cazenave (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit).* It was indeed scorching hot that day and the trap that she laid out did burn Younes' future.

The pattern that Madame Cazenave exhibits is similar to that of the Caid and hence the French authorities. Like him, Madame Cazenave praises Younes' appearance, telling him that "he is so beautiful"; she also enforces her dominance, informing him that women "are the ones who get to pick" (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). In reality, however, she means that the hegemons and powerful get to choose who they manipulate, use and humiliate. Younes hence becomes land that is conquered and consumed and then disposed of. Her predatory behaviour can be put on an equal footing with the French authorities which gradually infiltrated the country, occupied it, exhausted its resources and finally left it to burn. By relating this back to McClintock's *Imperial Leather* (1995), which establishes the gendered relation between land and colonizer, in conjunction with her sexual prowess and her authoritarian initiatives, Madame Cazenave's adopted masculinity comes to the fore. Through masculinity, Madame Cazenave establishes her position in the gender order, i.e., above Arab men.

Sexual Rivalry over Emilie

While sexual conquests are integral to the maintenance of masculinity, winning over Emilie transcends the need to prove one's virility. She is the ultimate prize as Younes and his friends desire to marry her and start a family. The intent of procreation establishes a striking parallelism between the Algerian land and the young French settler. When Emilie first arrives in Rio Salado, she is the much-coveted love interest of the five friends. All eyes are on her and soon the first

exclamations of "she is so beautiful" ensue and that "if she is not for one she is for all," marking the beginning of the competition and hence the rivalry between them (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). This behaviour is closely linked and indeed resultant of the men's masculine behaviour.

As aforementioned, men compete with others to prove their manhood. Virility, as was discussed in the above sections, is a main component of it; consequently, erotic rivalry and sexuality become means to prove their masculinity as well. Emilie, however, by being desired by the other men, transforms into a prize, a trophy that will be awarded to the manliest man. This objectification is reminiscent of how Algeria the land has been treated and passed around from one dominant force to the next.

A strong parallelism can be established between both that would corroborate this instance. In fact, as can be seen in Issa's fight for his land and its riches, Emilie is as well fought for. In addition, her strong desire to settle down with Simon, after waiting for Younes in vain, telling him that she is "25 and can no longer wait," underlines that idea as well (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit*). Like land, she believes that she needs to produce and offer something to society. Younes, burned by the touch of French hegemony, i.e., Madame Cazeanve, is not able to offer her that and has to sacrifice his happiness, indicating that there is no happy ending for an Arab in an occupied country.

Like his uncle who is married to a French woman, Younes is denied a life of inbetweeness, for he grew up in a period during which it is impossible to lead a happy life. He has to choose one side and can no longer exist in that liminal space. That explains why, towards the end of the movie, he sides more and more with his Algerian heritage, rebuking Rucillio who insists that Algeria was "nothing" and "piece of rock" before the arrival of the French, and helping Djelloul and the FLN rebels to overthrow the French regime (*Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la*

Nuit). Khadra's idealistic union that he envisages between France and Algeria is hence overthrown by the concrete and justified fight for one's country and, in Younes' case, an Algeria that is not oppressed by French hegemony.

Conclusion

Alexandre Arcady's adaptation of Khadra's *Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit* portrays a gendered struggle between colonizer and colonized. The antagonism can be observed through the different interactions between French and Algerian characters. While Younes initially struggles to fit into French Algeria and repeatedly tries to emulate his friends' French masculinities, other characters such as Djalloul are actively feminized and emasculated during clashes with pieds noirs. Both Emilie and Madame Cazenave similarly subvert and maintain the gender hierarchy and contribute indirectly to the sustenance of a masculinist milieu.

Chapter 2: Torture, Terrorism and the Construction of Masculinity in Gillo Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers*

Introduction

Released in 1966, only four short years after Algeria gained its independence with the aftermath of war still palpable, *The Battle of Algiers* has repeatedly caused controversy. The film was directed by Gillo Pontecorvo and Franco Solinas, in cooperation with the former FLN member Saadi Yacef. While the Italian-Algerian production was licensed to be screened in theaters it has been censored by numerous cinemas in France and its screening was also threatened with bomb attacks, delaying its premiere in Paris. At the Venice Film Festival in 1966, the French delegation stormed out of the awards in protest at the "lack of sensitivity in the selection of such a film" (Caillé 374). While reporters and journalists redressed this "diplomatic faux pas" by attacking the aesthetic and stylistic quality of the film as inferior compared to other films nominated at the same time, such as *Farenheit 451* (1966) and *Au Hazard Blathazar* (1966), Patricia Caillé claims that rather than the aesthetics, it was "the effect of the film on the image of the French" that initiated the rebuff (374). Journalists further criticized the film for not conforming to "any categories of the new French film culture," dismissing it as "anti-French" propaganda (374). Caillé's study "The Illegitimate Legitimacy of the Battle of Algiers in French Film Culture" (2007) examines "the processes by which Pontecorvo's film was … evaluated and eventually marginalized at the intersection of discourses on its status as a film in French film culture and discourses on the representation of the Algerian War of Independence" (373-74). The vigorous scrutiny and resultant dismissal of the film's stylistic assets is partly due to the hegemonic nature of French film culture which I will explore further in this chapter.

While the significance of the film primarily lies in its depiction of a revolutionary struggle between colonizer and colonized, its influence stretches far beyond that aspect, for it morphed into an interpretive tool used by various governments as a blueprint to counter armed resistance and so to suppress their people. In fact, the debate surrounding *The Battle of Algiers* resurfaced when it was screened on 27 August 2003 at the Pentagon as part of the preparation of "officers for the Iraq invasion" in light of the Iraq insurgency (O'Leary 250). This special screening, held for the Pentagon's office for Direction for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflicts, highlights what Thomas Riegler describes as "a renewed interest [in the film] on part of the American military" (55). Riegler continues that "operation Iraqi Freedom, which officially began March 20, 2003, started at the movies" (55). In fact, in 2004, numerous articles appeared claiming that Algeria was transformed into an "allegory" that offered insights into how to approach the war in Iraq (Austin 23). Guy Austin, for instance, maintains that the Pentagon screening is "an attempt to learn from history, but the connection is also evident in Le Monde's torture dossier of the same year, and in numerous press articles on that topic" (23). Torture is the very reason the film was banned in Argentina and Brazil, for the two governments used the film as a blueprint in an effort to both repress subversives and to avoid the risk of victims learning tactics from the film.

While this chapter does not explore the film's instrumentalization in the War on Terror, it is important to note how the film was utilized to shore up a particular model of military masculinity in different locales. This chapter investigates the role of Colonel Mathieu, the French paratrooper commander and one of the central characters in the *Battle of Algiers,* as a figure that represents the masculine forces of French hegemony, a model for anti-terrorism strategy that would also prove significant for the Department of Defence in post 9/11 US. Postcolonial gender

analysis offers a useful lens not only to consider how, in the film, Algeria is feminized as France is masculinized, but also to suggest that this gendering likewise applies to the reception of Pontecorvo's film itself. My chapter begins by examining censorship of the *Battle of Algie*rs and how outrage against the film and its subsequent marginalization functioned to shore up French (national) hegemony, thereby restaging French masculinist power against a feminized, colonized Other. Next, my chapter turns to representations of gender within the film itself. I argue that scenes of torture in particular stage the masculinity of the French colonizers and seek to sexualize, and so emasculate, the Algerian paramilitaries. Colonel Mathieu is pivotal in these scenes as he symbolizes France's hegemonic power and uses it to subdue his Algerians prisoners while at the same time trying to romanticise his tactics by framing them as heroic duties. Finally, my chapter elaborates on the significant role women played in *the Battle of Algiers*, as they carried out bomb attacks. While their involvement and representation is striking and suggests a step towards gender equality, it also brings to the fore how these women were used and instrumentalized in a masculinist battle between colonizer and colonized, problematizing their involvement.

Censorship and Othering: The Hegemonic Masculinity of a Nation

France maintained its dominance over Algeria for decades, yet its influence did not cease after the end of colonisation. In fact, France's power permeated the film scene, as it used its masculinist power to censor Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers.* The film's extensive focus on details of torture were critical issues that arose when trying to censor the film in France. After all, the nation had a reputation to keep: being portrayed as a hegemonic imperial power that resorted to illicit means, such as torture, to maintain its very authority served to undermine

France's national image. The aesthetic choice of merging documentary style with Italian neorealism was meant by Pontecorvo and Solinas to underline and support their claim of a truthful depiction of the conflict, which in turn would bolster credibility to the cinematographic work and so pose a greater threat of tainting the national image of France. The discussion of the idea of truth should not be taken in its essential understanding but rather as an engagement in the mediation of a historically contested event.

The director's claim of historical accuracy to a well-known episode during the Algerian War of Independence (1954–1962) manifested itself in the establishment of a "dictatorship of truth" which started with the refusal of Yacef's initial script which they deemed too biased (Siratsava and Young 108). In an interview Pontecorvo admits:

> Yacef Saadi who was the head of Casbah [Films], but was also a commander of the resistance fighters, came to Italy to propose a story about their liberation struggle … I read the thing and it was so hagiographic, so full of self-praise, that I said, 'Look, I wouldn't dream of making this film, but if you give us a free hand, if you give us the green light, Solinas and I [will do it], even at our own risk, without being paid. (Srivastava and Young 108)

Adapting Yacef's version of the events, trying to make it balanced and accurate, turned out to be a successful endeavour, for it attracted acclaim and praise by numerous critics.

The directors themselves admired the truthfulness of their work, an aspect that has become a central feature in the production process. Pontecorvo recounts in an interview that "he [Yacef] liked what we had done, because it was done with honesty, with this obsession for truth

that characterizes the work of Franco Solinas and myself" (Srivastava and Young 111). It is no wonder then to discover that Pontecorvo and Solinas' research period extended over 8 months, largely consisting of field work and engaging hands on with former FLN fighters and Algerian citizens who lived through the war. The producer explains:

> [We took] seven or eight months to gather information, because we have a passion for historical truth. The BBC, speaking of my films, said it was a sort of 'dictatorship of truth'. One can see what they mean, no? Everything, even the effects that worked well on film, if they moved away from this scent of truth, were immediately discarded, first in the script-writing and then during shooting. (111)

Not only did the film makers strive to report accurately the events of the battle on the level of content, but they tried to create such effect by evoking truthfulness through the documentary style and neorealism, two factors that have been overshadowed and underexplored in favour of the political content. Nancy Virtue, in this respect, claims that the "neorealist stylistic conventions in *The Battle of Algiers* are married to an unequivocal ideological challenge to colonialism" (318). What Virtue is referring to here is Third Cinema, a notion first put forth in the late 1960s by the filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, defined in terms of its transformative and subversive potential:

> Real alternatives differing from those offered by the System are only possible if one of two requirements is fulfilled: making films that the System cannot

> assimilate and which are foreign to its needs, or making films that directly and explicitly set out to fight the System. Neither of these requirements fits within the alternatives that are still offered by the second cinema, but they can be found in the revolutionary opening towards a cinema outside and against the System, in a cinema of liberation: the third cinema. (120)

The political statement conveyed through this cinematic work, in conjunction the neorealist approach of using non-professional actors, portrayed Pontecorvo and Solinas as being "on the right side" of history (Srivastava and Young 111). This nevertheless did not stop them from trying to be unbiased and severely affected the way France was perceived, internationally, as a nation.

The effect of the film on France's national image and the country's attempt to censor it underscore the power structures that permeate the French film scene and highlight that gendered nature of these very structures. Raewyn Connell argues that "social institutions are substantively gendered," with the state being a "masculine institution" (73). Besides exerting its powers on the gendered Algerian land, dominating and exploiting it, we can see how France uses its hegemonic masculinity to stop the release of a film that challenges the legitimacy of its involvement in Algeria by exposing the very abuse of its power. With French power permeating film culture, it subdues Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers*, by focusing on the propagandist assertions against it, justifying that claim with the fact that it is partly an Algerian production. Even though the French government never officially called for the censorship of the movie, for it "was granted a certificate for its release in France," it is rather the link between film culture and national culture which is crucial to the banning of *The Battle of Algiers* in French theatres (Caillé 373). The film

heavily suffered under the hegemonic discourse that some journals and magazines perpetuated, contributing to its "cultural marginalization" (387). Caillé, who in her case study establishes the link between film culture and national culture asserts in this respect that "the film has always been apprehended, and in a sense submerged, within larger concerns about France's international image in the wake of the loss of the empire in the mid-1960s; about censorship and postcolonial national identity in the early 1970s; and about the global 'war on terrorism' that made the film look suspicious in 2004" (387). While France's national image was at stake thanks to Pontecorvo's film, there were other salient factors that contributed to this censorship.

What Caillé fails to see, in this respect, is the fact that this cultural sabotage stems from the prevalent Huntingtonian paradigm of west vs rest. Algerians, or Arabs for that matter, are considered inferior to the "civilized" western countries, so anything that the "Other" produces should not be given the credit it deserves and instead discarded (Huntington 39). This goes to show the power that France still holds over Algeria, power that permeates into literary and media spheres, contributing to the deliberate marginalization of *The Battle of Algiers*. Whereas the hegemonic masculinity and consequent alienation is foregrounded on the macroscopic level of film culture, the film itself contends extensively with another more violent and physical exhibition of masculine domination, embodied by Colonel Mathieu and his illicit tactics of information gathering.

Torture, Terrorism and the Quest for Masculine Domination

While France extended their masculinist hegemony into the film world trying to censor works that expose their colonial past, Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers* overtly juxtaposes two different masculinities embodied in Colonel Mathieu and the FLN. The former uses torture to

maintain his dominance over Algerians, portrayed in the opening scenes of the film. This scene does not explicitly show the act per se but the viewers witness the aftermath of it. A shaking, weak and naked man, lumped on a chair, surrounded by laughing, even mocking soldiers, takes center stage. Around him are several devices, a barrel filled with water and iron handles that were clearly used for the forceful extraction of information. The power dynamics in this scene are blatantly unequal, for the Algerian prisoner is outnumbered by the soldiers, who unlike him are clothed and not vulnerable to any outside attacks. Stripping here works on two levels: the physical and the mental. On the one hand, it is meant to eliminate any equality, putting the prisoner in the right mindset by showing him that he might be subject to harm at any time, and that nothing will protect him from possible burns or electrocutions. On the other hand, it also foreshadows the mental stripping, bringing to the fore the link between the infliction of physical pain that will eventually affect the mind and force the tortured to reveal the desired confession and/or piece of information. Stripping also entails a cultural dimension, especially in the Algerian cultural context, for the torturers make use of the stereotypes surrounding Arab men and their prudishness. In *Torture and the Twilight of Empire* (2008), Marnia Lazreg deploys the phrase "sexying torture" to establish the link between torture and sex and how the latter is used as a means of humiliation. The "séance," which almost always starts with the victim being stripped, refers to the "psychoanaly[tical] technique that leads a patient to talk about his life" (123). The researcher adds:

> Stripping is sexually laden … sex is always present in the torture chamber whether the victim is a man or a woman ... the sexing of torture is also charged with the traditional conception of gender that inferiorizes women. (123)

Sexying torture is meant to break the prisoner by undermining his sexuality, by what Lazreg calls "playing with his sexuality" (125). This comes to the fore in the scene when Colonel Mathieu patronizingly and almost lovingly addresses the Algerian prisoner, ensuring him that "nothing would happen to him now" (*The Battle of Algiers*). Like a father he gives the illusion of protecting him and offering him his help, but this paternal behaviour only reinforces his superior power position and signals to the prisoner that he is under his mercy. He hence emasculates him. This sexual humiliation extends through the scene when the officers force the Algerian prisoner to put on French military garments, joking about "his integration," so he can lead them to the headquarters of FLN cells (*The Battle of Algiers*). When the latter refuses, they resort to violence once again and threaten him with torture. Lazreg comments that his "whole sexed being was not only on display ... his identity as a male was violated" (125). This further extends the torturer's power.

The soldiers, in this opening scene, are also seen washing and cleaning the prisoner, as well as offering him coffee to warm him up. One would think this behaviour to be at odds with what preceded that cleaning ritual: torture. Yet cleaning the prisoner is meant to make him presentable to the Colonel who enters the room shortly after. Not only does it remove all proof of wrongdoing, but it also helps Colonel Mathieu to remain detached. Lazreg also analyses this aspect, saying that "a job well done must be clean. A man about to be asked questions must be presentable so as not to offend the dignity of the interrogating officer" (117). The dignity of the officer is prioritized over that of another human being, giving the officer in charge, Colonel Mathieu, the possibility of denying any involvement and hiding behind cryptic assertions. The latter comes around half way through the film when Mathieu answers journalists' questions at a

press conference, when he claims that “We are soldiers. Our duty is to win ... Is France to remain in Algeria? If your answer is still yes, you must accept all the necessary consequences” *The Battle of Algiers*. He later adds:

> The word "torture" doesn't appear in our orders. We've always spoken of interrogation as the only valid method in a police operation directed against unknown enemies. As for the NLF, they request that their members, in the event of capture, should maintain silence for twenty-four hours, and then they may talk. So, the organization has already had the time it needs to render any information useless. What type of interrogation should we choose, the one the courts use for a murder case, that drags on for months? … the FLN wants to chase us from Algeria. But we want to stay … by all means possible.” (45:48)

Here Colonel Mathieu uses a specific vocabulary to code his message, using euphemisms and other forms of linguistic manipulation. Lazreg considers this coding to be another form to create detachment between perpetrator and victim. This makes it easier for the colonel to never explicitly admit to using torture, for he was never seen in the film to be explicitly involved in a torture scene, yet he indirectly hints at the fact that they are doing everything to keep Algeria under French governance. Lazreg, in the chapter “On Torture,” explains:

> This special vocabulary helped, among other things, to create a psychological distance between practitioners of terror and their practices. Two different tongues were spoken, one by officials, the other by the practitioners of torture. Officials

> developed a grammar of torture that connoted the existence of a state of terror. (112)

The idea that Algeria is an extension of France and the consequent linguistic struggle around identity only reinforced this power struggle. On the one hand, Algeria was the official extension of French territory and therefore under French rule, yet Algerians were never considered to be French citizens and most certainly not given the same rights as the *pieds noirs*. Steven Loyal, in his analysis of Bourdieu, colonialism and migration in France and Algeria outlines the legal status Algeria had at the time:

> Algeria was colonized by France in 1830. By 1848, it was legally an extension of French Territory and therefore theoretically entitled to be ruled under its humanistic and enlightenment principles based on the rights of man. The reality of colonial rule differed starkly. (Loyal 407)

Insurgent forces were hence considered threats to French sovereignty in Algeria, rather than a fight for freedoms and rights.

Colonel Mathieu adamantly denies the fact that the paras were resorting to illegal tactics, trying to reassure the press that their only task is to ensure France's integrity in Algeria, but Pontecorvo and Solinas made sure to contradict and undermine that claim stylistically and cinematographically by adding a scene with a sequence of torture frames that include waterboarding, electrocution, and branding. Torture was, indeed, a common tactic during the Algerian War of Independence and used repeatedly alongside other cruelties. Guy Austin notes

that "the [war] cost between one million and one and a half million lives, and saw widespread atrocities, above all the use of torture by the French army—as reported by several sources" (18). These include Henri Alleg's *La Question* (1958), which delineates in detail the different torture techniques deployed by the French army. French officials attempted to deny the fact, claiming that "the French had gained accurate intelligence through public cooperation and informants, not torture" (Rejali 546). In an interview, Yacef Saadi, former FLN member and co-producer of *The Battle of Algiers* contradicts these claims and exposes the tactics of General Paul Aussaressess, former soldier and author of *The Battle of the Casbah* (2001), who defended the use of torture. Saadi asserts:

> He would go around to all of the various barracks where people had been tortured. He would collect these half-dead people who could not be released because to release them would be proof that people were being tortured … they were then dropped from helicopters into the sea. Some of his victims were sealed up in walls. (Crowdus 35)

French officials denied these claims of torture for an extended period, yet the disappearance of several Algerians during the war and the numerous biographical texts gradually exposed the Army's methods and challenged the heroic and romanticized French accounts of the struggle.

Torture was the focal point of yet another article on the Algerian War that encompassed accounts of several generals and officers who either wrote memoirs or gave interviews on the topic of their involvement in these events. Tzvetan Todorov, in "Torture in the Algerian War," recounts the experience of Captain Thomas, former Maquisard and FTP (Francs-Tireurs et

Partisans) member, who fought in Indochina. Todorov recounts that "in Algeria he [Thomas] performed acts of torture and participated in summary executions. One day, he was told to choose ten hostages to be executed by firing squad in retribution for an enemy attack and to deter such attacks in the future" (22). While this account is only one among many, Pontecorvo made use of these confessions during his extensive research to create the persona of Colonel Mathieu, "in fact a 'composite' character combining several key officers, one of them Colonel Yves Godard, who served as Chief of Staff during the battle" (Riegler 53). In an interview Saadi Yacef adds:

> Mathieu is not modelled on General Jaques Massu, the commander of the 10th Parachute Division sent to Algiers ... Mathieu is actually a composite of several of Massu's officers, including Col. Marcel Biegrad, head of the 3rd Para Regiment, assigned to do much of the dirty work assigned ... Col. Yves Godard, director of military intelligence, and Col. Roger Trinquier, who established a surveillance network of the Casbah. (Crowdus 30)

While this not only contributes to the quest for truthfulness that both Pontecorvo and Solinas strived for, it similarly foregrounds the maliciousness of the French practices in Algeria, personified by Colonel Mathieu.

Torture, as Lazreg defines it, transcends the destruction of the body that the military battle might achieve and instead "disturbs it, dismantles it, in order to reach the mind, open it and paves the way for its rearranging" (111). Neel Ahuja, on the other hand, argues that:

> Torture, then, is best understood within a broad spectrum of practices regulating life that constitute a biopolitical formation such as the war on terror. Biopolitical analysis attends not just to violence, but also to the utopianism, or imagined efficacy, of contemporary imperial governmentality — buttressed in this case by the very publicization of torture as a spectacle of state power. (Ahuja 128-9)

Torture is, therefore, not only an attack on the mind through the body but also a means to maintain France's authority and sovereignty in Algeria.

Mathieu, whose maliciousness is portrayed by Jean Martin, symbolizes the hegemonic masculinity that France deployed to win the battle and subdue the insurgency. For one, Mathieu undermines the FLN members' humanity not only by racially attacking them and considering them as inferior but also by animalizing them. In a briefing with the other paras, he likens the Algerian "clandestine organization" to "tapeworms" which "can grow to infinity. There are thousands of segments. You can destroy all of them; but as long as the head remains, it reproduces itself immediately. It is the same thing with the FLN ... Until we are able to eliminate them, we must always start from the beginning" (*The Battle of Algiers*). In the case of the film, the so-called beginning or the head consists of the main agents of the FLN, namely Ali la Pointe and Djafar. This animalization is further reinforced when we see the former with one of the female bombers, caged like animals in a small hideout, before being violently killed. What is more, Colonel Mathieu repeatedly refers to Algerian resistance fighters as "rats" (The Battle of Algiers). Ahuja calls this a "spectacle of animalization" that is meant to underline the deviant nature of the adversary's psyche but also to underscore French superiority and power over the animalized group, making animalization crucial to exercising dominance.

Algerians are not only sexualized and racialized, but also animalized. This gendered relationship between oppressor and oppressed enables the French in labelling FLN fighters as terrorists, because they plant bombs and kill police men. When the head of a police department, for instance, is seen planting a bomb in the Casbah, a form of retaliation, he is not labelled a terrorist or monster. The torture incidents shown are also legitimate means of interrogation and when questioned about them by journalists, emotional manipulation and an indirect suggestion of being unpatriotic for questioning these measures ensues. In "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," Jasbir Puar and Amit Rai establish a relationship between patriotism and heteronormativity, going as far as to claim that "patriotism has activated and transformed the historical memory of a militarist, racist, and class-specific masculinity" (125). This manifests itself in the scene in which Colonel Mathieu is asked by international journalists about the war in Algiers and the moment one reporter dared to question his tactics, he defends them by saying that "if [they] want to stay in Algeria, [they] have to accept the consequences" (*The Battle of Algiers*).

Puar and Rai also expound on the centrality of sexuality in "creating a certain knowledge on terrorism" (117). Through humiliation and making the enemy's sexuality appear abnormal the terrorist can be rendered a spectacle that is used by the state to exercise its power. As aforementioned, the French were using similar tactics, which comes to the fore in several scenes throughout *The Battle of Algiers*. Among the first measures the French officers implemented in Algiers were barriers around neighbourhoods to limit the mobility of Algerians. This incarceration is suggestive of the feminization of the Algerian people who have to conform to stereotypes surrounding women, i.e. they need to know their place and need to be controlled by male guardians. Random screenings were also part of the humiliation. During the war in Algeria

"the Muslim population of Algiers [was subjected] to an indiscriminate and complete 'screening' process in order to get the needed intelligence. In the process of 'fishing' through the cordoned off Casbah the French arrested between 30 and 40 per cent of the male population according to some estimates" (Riegler 53). In the film, this is portrayed as checkpoint guards examine what looks like an elderly Algerian merchant, who gets mocked and humiliated upon dropping his suitcase full of mice.

Mathieu justifies these random acts of knowledge acquisition as necessities that help combat terrorism, yet these tactics only bring to the fore the unequal power dynamics. In the film, this translates through the constant swarming of the paras. From the very outset, we can see a mob of paras flock into the narrow streets of the Casbah, looking for FLN terrorists. This image is a reoccurring one throughout the movie. The FLN members, on the other hand, are mostly seen attacking in groups of four or five. Only once we can see a large group marching towards the French quarters, yet even that was stopped by Djafar. Another scene that highlights this disparity consists in the powerful speech of Ben M'Hidi. Upon his "accidental capture," Mathieu organizes a conference, another exhibition of his power, during which journalists question the captive. When being asked about the FLN cowardice, Ben M'Hidi, a prominent leader of the French Algerian War, replies:

> Isn't it even more cowardly to attack defenseless [sic] villages with napalm bombs that kill many thousands of times [sic] more? Obviously, planes would make things easier for us. Give us your bombers, sir, and you can have our baskets. (The Battle of Algiers)

The FLN knows that baskets can't compete with such sophisticated French military machinery as bombers but they do not have any other tactics that could support their struggle against the foreign forces. Nancy Virtue comments on the prevalent power disparity, claiming that "tactics enable the weaker party to even the battlefield, not just through force but through the deft 'poaching' of power, to use de Certeau's term" (321). This tactic was in fact so successful because the FLN fighters used and subverted the French's prejudice surrounding women. "Because of Pontecorvo's goal of authentic representation through a distinct visual style and profound knowledge, the film still resonates across the years. Indeed, The *Battle of Algiers* not only reveals much of the tactics inherent in asymmetric war – such as random shootings, bombings of public places and even a 'suicide'-like mission – but also explores the rationality and effectiveness of 'terrorism' in the context of a confrontation between unequal opponents. In a memorable scene, the FLN dispatches European-looking Algerian women as bomb layers since they can pass through the roadblocks without being searched" (Riegler 49). This unorthodox recruitment of female FLN fighters and their representation brings to the fore their integral role to combat the dominant French presence.

Women and the Algerian War of Independence

While masculine domination is achieved through torture and restricted mobility, it is subverted and undermined by the deployment of female bombers who use France's limited and stereotypical understanding of the Algerian culture against them. The mirror scene, during which three Algerian women transform themselves into French settlers, is amongst the most striking and controversial scenes in the film. The instrumentalization of women and their unveiling take center stage in discussions by numerous scholarly analyses of this particular film. In this famous

scene, we see three women, representative of three different generations, standing in a room replete with mirrors changing and slowly undergoing a process of physical westernization. They cut and dye their hair to conform to French ideals of beauty and take off their cultural Algerian garments in exchange for skirts and blouses, all the while staring into mirrors. Through this metamorphosis, women are used as agents of insurgency against the French colonizers and the veil, as Fanon famously explain in his essay, is "removed and reassumed again and again" becoming "a technique of camouflage…a means of struggle" against the French (Fanon 163).

Pontecorvo adamantly denies having read "Algeria Unveiled" and rather in an interview claims that he "understood this not through the book, but by talking with the local women and men. It was a rather 'amusing' sign, quote unquote, of their position; it was a curious thing" (Srivastava and Young 108). Through his research, Pontecorvo understood the veil to be a sign of cultural difference and incorporated it in his.

The unveiling was also considered a representation for women's emancipation and a response to the masculinist patriarchal system in place. These female fighters were imperative agents in the asymmetric fight against French occupation, which enabled them to leave the domestic sphere and enter into a political one. Lucy Brisley, for instance, considers "Pontecorvo's film … paramount in foregrounding the relationship between the revolutionary FLN and the idealised emancipation of Algerian women" (95). Riegler, in the same vein, recounts the immense effects the film had on student activists who used ululations in one of their protests:

> The spectacle of a defying people succeeding in their fight for liberty and especially the active role of women within this struggle, left also an everlasting

> impression on Student activist Paula Rabinowitz, who saw *The Battle of Algiers* 'a dozen times' during her first year at Berkley. (51)

This instrumental scene in the movie is considered by Ranjana Khanna as the starting point that marks a change in the role of women in the Algerian society.

This scene is undoubtedly significant due to the symbolic use of mirrors and the intimidating martial drum beat that orchestrates it. This symbolism is created through the repeated focus on the image that we see in the mirror in conjunction with the lighting and with their anonymity. Helen Mellen suggests that "we are entering the consciousness of the three" (Mellen 9). Khanna builds onto that argument, saying that this scene marks also the viewer's entry "into the unconscious of the film" (116). She adds:

> The metamorphoses of these women or at least the image of them takes place in a cocoon of mirrors, almost a film set dressing room, where the image and the imago- the idealized image misrecognized in the reflection as self-completeness- are confused to such extent that the question of what it means to be an Algerian woman becomes highly questionable, and is exploded and imploded. (117)

What is intriguing in this statement is the fact that women were significant FLN members even before this scene of unveiling. Several women are seen carrying guns and bombs, while at the same time wearing their traditional cultural marker. So can be the unveiling still be considered a sign of emancipation? After a closer reading of the film and a resort to history and the years that followed the war of independence one would answer this question with a negative, for "it is

pertinent to note that in ultraconservative, patriarchal societies, it is only in times of crisis that women have some unmediated say of their own" (Eid 153). As to the years following independence, a Civil War loomed, following a coup negating an Islamist electoral victory, which goes to show that traditional religious values were taking a hold in Algeria.

Conclusion

Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers* portrays the masculinist struggle between colonizer and colonized by portraying how torture is used to subdue Algerians. Colonel Mathieu's tactical genius and militaristic mercilessness are overtly delineated in this film, leading to a national boycott of *The Battle of Algiers*. This highlights that France's masculine domination did not cease after the end of colonisation but persevered and infiltrated the French film world in order to censor the film. The latter also brings to the fore the importance of women in the Algerian war of independence as they were depicted as active participants in the Algerian cause. While this involvement could be understood as a step towards emancipation for Algerian women, it rather shows how female FLN members were instrumentalized to uphold the masculinist struggle between France and Algeria.

Chapter 3: Toxic Masculinities: An Analysis of Antagonistic Masculinities in Mohsin Hamid's the Reluctant Fundamentalist

Introduction

The events of September 11, 2001 were described by some as "absolute" with the collapse of the twin towers having the "greatest symbolic impact" (Bourdieu 3, 8). The scale of the events attracted immense interest by various writers, journalists, and researchers, creating a new discourse revolving around the attacks, their impact and symbolism (John Updike's *Terrorist*, Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*, Jonathan Safran Foer's *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close*, Jess Walter's *The Zero*)[1]. Numerous studies similarly emerged interpreting the towers' iconicity and the effects of their destruction on a global scale in American and world literatures. While some scholarship explored the psychological aspects of the attacks on Americans, others expounded on its effects on global security questions and issues of terrorism. The scholarship of Vaheed Ramazani and Ann Thickner focuses attempts to interpret these events in term of gender and sexuality, further expanding the seemingly endless discourse on 9/11. By acknowledging the gendered nature of 9/11 and its coverage, Thickner ascertains that the response to the attacks was

[1] The innumerable literature on 9/11 is written from the perspectives of white male authors, involving renowned novels such as John Updike's *Terrorist* which explore ideas of radicalization and fundamentalism, recreating stereotypes of the easily manipulated and radicalized other. Yet Hamid, like Changez, "is marked by his migrant identity and, in the specific case of 9/11, his Pakistani ethnicity," enabling them to "tell their stories from a position of liminality" and so responding to and subverting these stereotypes (Bjerre 257). Both Hamid and his focal character understand that the fate of the migrant, to put it in Salman Rushdie's words, is "to be defined by others, to become invisible, or even worse, a target, it is to experience deep changes and wrenches in the soul" (210). These torn loyalties are successfully conveyed in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist.*

marked by masculine behaviour which was back "in vogue", for "our TV screens were full of "mostly white" men in charge briefing us about "America's New War" both at home and abroad. We feel safer when "our men" are protecting us (Thickner 335). Ramazani, on the other hand, analyses the symbolism of 9/11 in terms of masculinity, claiming that:

> Whether or not one wishes to accord any significance to the phallic iconicity of the World Trade Center, it is obvious from the administration's pronouncements following the attacks that the collapse of the Towers was experienced as emasculating, although "humiliating" is the term that the press prefers to use to describe the sudden wound to our national pride. (Ramazani 118)

Ramazani astutely observes the significance of this event in terms of it creating a masculinist milieu that perpetually creates different antagonistic and toxic masculinities. Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) is replete with representations of different masculinities, adding another layer to the "seemingly endless discourse on September 11" by not only highlighting the effects of the Twin Tower attacks on minority groups and the resultant surge in discrimination against them in the United States (Braz 241).

Framed as a political dramatic monologue, the novel revolves around the protagonist Changez who also critically assesses and questions US military involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan, bringing to the fore the detrimental consequences of the retaliatory War on Terror. To date, many scholars have examined Hamid's novel in relation to themes of liminality (Hartnell), the genre the dramatic monologue (Ilot) and the critical reversal of power structures

(Gasztold). Yet there is little scholarship on how the gendered nature of the attacks resulted in the emergence of a toxic hyper-masculinity that can be observed in the novel. In fact, different masculinities permeate Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, whether it is what Raewyn W. Connell defines as a "transnational business masculinity," which is a new form of managerial masculinity that "is involved in exercising and legitimizing collective power, institutional power, and personal authority in the workplace" (359), or the militaristic masculinity, exhibited internationally by the United States and represented in the novel by the mysterious American character. Underwood Samson's attempt to impose this masculinity on its employees results in Changez adopting a "protest masculinity" that leads him to give up is position and return to his country to teach at a Lahore University.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the foundational role of 9/11 in creating what I call a "hyper-masculinist milieu" that is characterized by the construction of differing masculinities. While Changez successfully emulates and adopts a transnational business masculinity, he learns that his entrance into that milieu comes at certain costs, i.e., the sacrifice of his national and ethnic sensibilities. His consequent "protest masculinity," characterized by his nationalism and ambiguous fundamentalism, is inextricably linked to the transnational business masculinity that he endeavours to espouse. This highlights the toxic nature of masculinity and the environment it creates that is conducive to violence. My chapter explores how the different masculinities are connected and dependent on each other, and how a masculinist milieu engenders antagonistic masculinities, creating a vicious cycle of violence.

Transnational Business Masculinity in The Reluctant Fundamentalist

Set shortly after the events of September 11, 2001, Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* recounts, retrospectively, the story of Changez, an alienated yet highly educated Pakistani who worked for a prestigious in New York firm. His disillusions after the attacks and the discrimination he faced are revealed in a formal epic monologue that tackles a range of topics concerning cultural identity and American power. Underwood Samson is central to that discussion, for it merges financial might with global influence, creating a masculinist milieu, that is instrumental in the analysis of the novel.

R.W Connell, in her discussion of her case study on business masculinity, expounds on her findings, foregrounding the importance of capitalism and globalization in the creation of a new form of masculinity she refers to as "transnational business masculinity." In fact, it is global markets and transnational corporations that "provide the setting for a transformed pattern of business masculinity, which is achieving a hegemonic position in global gender relations" (362). She identifies power and money as the main incentives that lead young men to join the business milieu, claiming that "in this central respect, the new managerial masculinity does not depart from the old. It is involved in exercising and legitimizing collective power, institutional power, and personal authority in the workplace" (359). Several participants of this study convey their pride about delegating and managing others, especially older men. Management, in this context, also takes a broader meaning, as bodies and appearances are integral aspects that need to be managed. While managing the finances of global companies and the strain and pressure that accompanies that task, the employees are also asked to conform to certain policies in order to keep their employment. Managing one's body and abiding by a strict regimen (consisting of long phone calls, consecutive meetings, etc.,) are habits several interviewees share. While none of the respondents were actively asked to follow a routine, they claim that the environment in which

they worked pressured them to do so. This consequently leads to long working hours and numerous business trips.

Connell also clearly distinguishes between older bourgeois masculinities and transnational business masculinity, not without underlining a continuity between both. She says:

> The association with power and preoccupation with the techniques of money remain. Indeed, the money is bigger than ever … yet a cultural hollowing out seems to have occurred, with "management" reduced to an exercise in strategizing and controlling. It has no deeper rationale than the "bottom line"—in fact, no rationale at all except profit making. This managing, however culturally rootless, is a material and embodied practice … The contemporary manager has to manage the body as part of constructing a career. Yet, this body-reflexive practice is not primarily a matter of self-reflexivity; it is, above all, a collective practice, the creation of a common way of life, the insertion of bodies into institutional and cultural matrices, and the living pursuit of … profit. (361)

Underwood Samson is the epitome of what Connell describes as transnational business masculinity, for it creates a highly competitive environment, exercising pressure on its employees, who, in return, strive to adapt to that lifestyle. Changez embraces this doctrine and, albeit temporarily, succeeds in this milieu. Before I further elaborate on Underwood Samson's transnational business masculinity, I will discuss the gendered nature of the different institutions that culminate in the creation of this specific expression of masculinity.

From the very outset, Hamid's main character sets up a tension when relaying the events of his arrival in New York and his attempt to find his place in busy entrepreneurial New York. When we first encounter Changez, whose story spans Hamid's entire novel, we hear him offer help to and then engage in a conversation with a mysterious American, in a Lahore café, in Pakistan. Throughout, Changez retrospectively recounts his experience in the United States: his studies at Princeton University, his job offer at an elite management company, Underwood Samson, his struggles as a brown man, a Pakistani in 9/11 America, and his return to Pakistan, as well as his new life as a university professor.

Whether it is academia or work, Changez adopts a strikingly gendered diction to depict his journey. The meticulous selection and recruiting processes are prominent examples of Changez' gendering, that happens on the level of different institutions, both nationally and globally, and constructing a power hierarchy. Princeton, for instance, is introduced through its vigorous selection process, which is heightened when it comes to international students. Changez recounts:

> Looking back now, I see the power of that system, pragmatic and effective like so much else in America. We international students were sourced from around the globe, sifted not only through the well-honed, standardized tests but by painstakingly customized evaluations- interviews, essays, recommendations- until the best and the brightest of us had been identified. (Hamid 4)

This thorough selection of students foregrounds the power with which Princeton uses its privilege as one of the most prestigious schools in the United states and attracts students from all

over the world, addressing the damaging phenomenon of human capital flight or brain drain, the emigration of highly skilled and intelligent workers and students. Macroscopically it echoes the ways in which powerful nations such as the United States exploit resources from other countries. In return, those students "were expected to contribute [their] talents to [the American] society, the society [they] were joining" (Hamid 4).

While Princeton exercises its power over students, it is simultaneously subordinated to another hierarchy i.e., towards other companies. This manifests itself through the school's feminization, for "every fall [Princeton] raised her skirt for the corporate recruiters who came to campus and showed them her skin" (Hamid 4). Changez further elaborates:

> The skin Princeton showed was good skin, of course- young, eloquent, and clever as can be- but even among all that skin, I knew in my senior year that I was special. I was a perfect breast, if you will -tan, succulent, seemingly defiant of gravity- and I was confident of getting any job I wanted. (Hamid 4-5)

Princeton, an Ivy League university and one of the main providers of qualified work force for prestigious companies such as Underwood Samson, is not only feminized by also seen as abused by those very companies, who only grab the most appealing "breasts." This overt sexualisation of the body of Princeton and the talent of its students reflects the ways in which female bodies are sexualized and treated in patriarchal, masculinist environments. In fact, this scene can be linked to a beach scene in the novel during which Changez adopts a similar masculine gaze to

appraise the women around him. Changez manifests a hegemonic stance towards Erica, which I will further elaborate below.

Changez perceives himself as "the perfect breast" to be picked out among his Princeton colleagues, yet he is unaware that this in turn makes him part of that feminized and subordinate body of the Ivy League institution, at the mercy of and dependent on being selected by the predatory recruiters. Oblivious to this aspect, he strongly believes in his superiority, his assets and his uniqueness. When entering the interview with Jim, for instance, he remarks that the latter is looking at his resume "like a jeweller when he inspects out of curiosity a diamond he intends neither to buy nor to sell" (7). Changez's confidence and his "hunger" are two features that according to Jim make the young applicant suitable for the corporate world (Hamid 9). The rather aggressive diction is further reiterated later in the novel, when Jim tests Changez' valuation skills, requiring him to get into a "mental state" akin to that "of ancient warriors … before they went into battle, ritualistically accepting their impeding death so they could function unencumbered by fear" (Hamid 9). Jim, here, expects Changez to ruthlessly approach his task, disregarding the consequences his valuation might have on a company's future. Maximum profit, Underwood Samson's mantra, had to be followed by every employee. This profit oriented behaviour, although not explicitly violent, is adequately captured by Hamid's metaphor, which deliberately juxtaposes violent conquest with transnational business agreements.

While the aforementioned recruitment of Princeton students by corporations such as Underwood Samson exhibits masculine behaviour such as aggression and dominance, the corporation itself dictates and enforces masculinist values as well. The emotional detachment and repression of fear and anxiety are two prominent features stereotypically associated with masculinity that mark Changez' journey with the corporation. Its inherent transnational business

masculinity is further demonstrated by the militaristic diction that its employees use, which in return depicts the masculinist fundamentals it prescribes. From the very beginning, Changez clarifies the company's status quo by comparing it to his previous experience at Princeton, addressing his American interlocutor:

> I see you are impressed by the thoroughness of my training … It was a testament to the systematic pragmatism- call it professionalism- that underpins your country's success in so many fields. At Princeton, learning was imbued with an aura of creativity; at Underwood Samson, creativity was not exercised … it ceded its primacy to efficiency. (Hamid 37)

While feminine Princeton is known for its creativity, talent and individuality, Underwood Samson represents the opposite end of the spectrum: conformity, assimilation, and maximum profit. Changez, in this respect, relays his experience in order to claim that for the corporation "maximum return was the maxim to which we returned, time and again. We learned to prioritize -to determine the axis on which advancement would be most beneficial- and then to apply ourselves single-mindedly to the achievement of that objective" (Hamid 37). The company's extensive focus on "fundamentals," which borders to a religious obsession and which underlines the company's masculinity, can be better explained by Connell and Messerschmidt's concept of "hegemonic masculinity." They not only trace different developments in the field of men and masculinity studies, but they also expound on the idea that hegemonic masculinity is not necessarily perpetuated by male individuals but finds its formulation through institutions.

Connell explains that "hegemony did not mean violence, although it could be supported by force; it meant ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion" (832). Underwood Samson is such an institution, making profit off of other companies and enforcing its policies on employees such as Changez. Connell and Messerschmidt further demonstrate how "a diversity of masculinities is also found in particular institutions, such as the military" (835). They elaborate: "a particular focus of this research was the military, where specific patterns of hegemonic masculinity had been entrenched but were becoming increasingly problematic" (Connell 836). While the military constitutes a prime example for their study, a mixture of military masculinity in conjunction with a transnational business masculinity can be observed in Underwood Samson. Changez' first references to the military are raised in his narrative when he discusses his colleagues at Underwood Samson, whose appearances are akin to soldiers. He narrates to his American guest:

> I looked around as we raised our glasses in a toast to ourselves. Two of my colleagues were women; Wainwright and I were non-white. We were marvellously diverse... and yet we were not [..] It struck me then -no, I must be honest, it strikes me now- that shorn of hair and dressed in battle fatigues, we would have been virtually indistinguishable." (Hamid 38)

Hamid's use of military metaphors is striking in this respect, as it foreshadows the United States' military involvement that is discussed later on in the novel, after the pivotal events of 9/11, resulting in Changez' realization that in order to fit in and be successful at Underwood Samson,

he had to give up his identity and emulate the prescribed ideals of the corporation to ensure its success globally. This is elaborately discussed through Hamid's focal character, who offers a critical analysis of the United States' involvement in global affairs and its aggressive pre-emptive initiatives taken in Iraq and Afghanistan, interrelating corporate masculinity with a militaristic one. Changez' interlocutor similarly exhibits a masculinity that is characterized by a militaristic attitude and which can be representative of the US' position in a global arena.

This masculinist stance is further reinforced as he objectifies Erica. This is particularly true when he describes her nude body at the beach in Greece. He delineates the physical features of her upper body in great detail, revealing that he had been staring at her for quite some time.
He further complains about the fact that the other female Princetonians "unfortunately had thus far failed to embrace" the European custom to sunbathe naked (Hamid 23). This objectification of women can be explained by referring to Kate Millet's exploration of "sexual politics," which aligns coitus with "power structured relationships" (24). She explains:

> A disinterested examination of our system of sexual relationship must point out that the situation between the sexes now, and throughout history, is a case of that phenomenon Max Weber defined as *Herrschaft*, a relationship of dominance and subordinance. (25)

She analyses this power imbalance on different levels, ranging from religion to psychology and sociology. If we apply her theory on Changez's treatment of Erica, we can notice a clear pattern of objectification that degrades her and puts him in an elevated position.

This very definition of objectification and sexualisation of the female body is substantiated by Changez' attempt to have sexual intercourse with Erica. During the first attempt, Changez deliberately ignored Erica's unwillingness to have sex with him. He describes the incident as follows:

> Mainly she was silent and unmoving, but such was my desire that I overlooked the growing wound this inflicted on my pride and continued. I found it difficult to enter her; it was as though she was not aroused. She said nothing while I was inside her; but I could see her discomfort, and so I forced myself to stop. (Hamid 90)

Changez uses Erica's objectified body to satisfy his needs and regain the dominance he lost at Underwood Samson. Sex, in this respect, is "a status category with political implications" and coitus a way to achieve this dominance (Millet 34). The latter, nevertheless, is not achieved, for he has to "force" himself off her when he realizes that his sexual sentiments are not reciprocated. In fact, Changez has to pretend to be Chris, Erica's former deceased lover, in order to attain her sexual arousal. He describes his experience as though he was "under a spell, transported to a world where [he] was Chris … Her body denied [him] no longer" (Hamid 105). Millet further elaborates:

> Coitus can scarcely be said to take place in a vacuum; although of itself it appears a biological and physical activity, it is set so deeply within the larger context of human affairs that it serves as a charged microcosm of the variety of attitudes and

> values to which culture subscribes. Among other things, it may serve as a model of sexual politics on an individual or personal plane. (24)

Changez' forced pretence is reminiscent of his subjugation to Underwood Samson policies, adding yet another hierarchical gendered layer.

Physical appearance is a similarly integral part for Changez to integrate fully into the business milieu. In *Buttoned Up: Clothing, Comformity, and White Collar Masculinity,* Erin Masin De Casanova explores how office attire influences workers' performance, particularly in the way in which suits convey conformity and "links of power and obedience" between employer and employee (1). De Casanova goes on:

> In capitalist organizations, workers' bodies are the object of discipline and dress is one aspect in which discipline is felt … power becomes concentrated in the hands of managers (mostly men) who self-consciously manage their bodies as well as their money. (2)

Looking professional, conforming to the company's dress code, becomes an integral tool for belonging, for workers are under constant scrutiny and evaluation, which is the case for Changez. During his training and even after he is employed, his co-workers and himself had to undergo monthly evaluations that would focus on their performance. The women, albeit a minority, complicate this to a certain extent. While there is only brief mention of female co-

workers, one can only assume that they are subjugated to extensive testing as well and hence partake in what Connell names "complicit masculinity," in that they do not challenge the hegemonic power structures at Underwood Samson (56). Being evaluated and watched by other men is one of the pillars that Michael Kimmel identifies as integral to the construction of masculinity. He says: "we are under constant careful scrutiny of other men. Other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval" (33). While in a corporate environment, Changez does not seem to mind the policing, being rather content and proud of his position in the prestigious firm. Only after his epiphany in Chile is he able to identify how identities are misconstrued after 9/11. Chiu in this respect claims:

> Changez consistently references prevailing constructions after 9/11 of what Leti Volpp calls a "new identity category" that groups "together persons who appear to be "Middle Eastern, Arab, or Muslim" and subsequently identifies them as terrorists as they simultaneously are "disidentified as citizens." (147)

The appearance of new categories after 9/11 and the consequent discrimination leads Changez to espouse a reactionary protest identity.

Changez's Protest Masculinity

When Changez introduces himself throughout his monologue, the young Pakistani clearly sets himself apart from his guest both physically and ideologically, which is in opposition to his active attempt at integration in New York. In fact, the suppression of these very differences, the markers of his otherness such as his beard and his attire, were imperative to ensure his

assimilation, seamlessly fit in the group of his colleagues. At some point in the novel, he actively attempts to adopt American mannerisms to pass, explaining:

> I attempted to act and speak, as much as my dignity would permit, more like an American … I was often ashamed. But cowardly I gave no sign of this. (Hamid 65)

Changez, here, tries to give the impression of his impenetrability and his strength, only to later on realize that his hard work, and his intellect, which he thought enabled him to reach this position, are insufficient once he adopts markers of his otherness. In fact, after he returns bearded, from a visit home, he notices that his "colleagues greeted [him] with considerable - although often partially suppressed- consternation," for despite his mother's request, he had not shaved his two weeks old beard. Even Jim comments on his appearance, saying he looked "kind of shabby," adding that he didn't care because it's his "performance that counts" (Hamid 130, 137). Changez admits that his beard is a "form of protest … a symbol of his identity" that eventually makes him lose his job because his "protest masculinity" (both in attire and work ethics) is antagonistic to the expected "transnational business masculinity" of Underwood Samson. The term protest masculinity, according to Connell, refers to "a defined pattern of motives arising from the childhood experience of powerlessness, and resulting in an exaggerated claim to the potency that European culture attaches to masculinity" (Connell 111). Changez's protest masculinity does not arise from childhood powerlessness, it is rather his disillusionment and conformity to dress codes and behaviourisms that he disagrees with that culminate in him

adopting a "protest masculinity." The powerlessness, here, rather arises from the post 9/11 masculinist milieu in which he finds himself and which denies him from completely being accepted into the American society.

Changez's inability to assimilate and be accepted in the new masculinist milieu is further underlined during a conversation he has with Juan Baptista in Chile, who compares him to a Janissary.

> Have you heard of the janissaries?... They were Christian boys ... captured by the Ottomans and trained to be soldiers in a Muslim army, at that time the greatest army in the world. They were ferocious and utterly loyal: they had fought to erase their own civilization, so they had nothing else to turn to." (Hamid 151)

It is only after this encounter that enables Changez to look at his position critically and see that being a warrior for Underwood Samson is indeed not a noble task. He reflects on his role as "a servant of the American empire at a time when it was invading a country with kinship to mine and was perhaps even colluding to ensure that my own country faced the threat of war … I had thrown in my lot with the men of Underwood Samson, with the officers of the empire, when all along I was predisposed to feel compassion for those like Juan-Baptista, whose lives the empire thought nothing of overturning for the sake of its own gain (Hamid 152). Juan Baptista, here, is explicitly linked to the arts and books, rendering him a feminized subject. His feminization and subjugation to the U.S corporate power leads Changez to come to the realization that he is excercising the same hegemony that affects him as well.

Changez rejects this attitude and is indeed averse to it, leading him to make the pivotal decision of leaving the United States and returning to his roots. Hartnell in this respect claims:

> The "fundamentalist" free-market principles represented by the firm work in tandem, Changez comes to feel, with the nation's military arm, and wage war on those Changez sees as his own people. That this moment is also one in which the "marvelous" diversity of the group melts away is significant. For Underwood Samson seems to represents the pragmatic face of American state power. It is consistently described in the novel as ruthlessly future oriented. And it is on this site that America's melting pot is ostensibly realized, not on the grounds of the more romantic elements of American nationalism outlined elsewhere in the novel. (340)

His identity crisis is only exacerbated after this realization, further subjecting him to more scrutiny. This is not only due to his rejection at Underwood Samson but the challenges Changez faces are particularly prominent after 9/11, which shattered the image of an invincible United States. While most of the conflicts that this world power was engaged in were fought on foreign territory, militant terrorists brought the battle home, exposing the nation's vulnerability but also the deeply prevalent divisions on the level of culture. The young Pakistani witnesses this division and later on animosity first hand. He is bewildered and outraged when he is wrongly categorized as an Arab, and consequently verbally abused. By openly criticising the racial profiling that Changez had to endure, Hamid unifies readers against cultural typing.

These experiences lead Changez to develop a "protest masculinity", which by definition is "marginalized" or "divergent" and which according to Connell:

> picks up themes of hegemonic masculinity in the society at large but reworks them in a context of poverty … The project of protest masculinity also develops in a marginal class situation, where the claim to power that is central in hegemonic masculinity is constantly negated by economic and cultural weakness. (116)

When applied to Changez, we can clearly see him espousing this masculinity. In fact, the young Pakistani, as an immigrant, is part of a marginalized group, for which he is discriminated against after 9/11, making him lose his sense of dominance. He is, furthermore, of a different social class when he enters the business milieu. He repeatedly expresses his discontentment about this very aspect: "I tried not to dwell on the comparison; it was one thing to accept that New York was more wealthy than Lahore, but quite another to swallow the fact that Manila was as well" (Hamid 64). Gwen Broude adds to the discussion of "protest masculinity" by defining it as "extreme forms of sex typed behaviour on the part of some males" (103). While excessive violence is amongst the markers of protest violence, one cannot immediately discern such behaviour in Changez' case, although the deliberate ambiguity that Hamid included at the end of the novel might corroborate and feed into that definition. Gwen Broude also cites "destructiveness, low tolerance for delay of gratification, crime, drinking, and similar dispositions" as feature that similarly helped identify this specific type of masculinity (103).

Destructiveness and drinking are in fact prevalent attributes that the young Pakistani exhibits. The former manifests itself in the form of him deliberately sabotaging a work assignment, eventually leading to the dismissal of his duties at Underwood Samson. The latter is only mentioned sporadically throughout the novel, although towards the end, i.e after his epiphany, one notices an increase in his alcohol consumption.

Conclusion

Whether Changez adopts a violent form of masculinity after his return to Lahore is ambiguous. We know that he teaches at a university and that one of his students was taken into custody for plotting a terrorist attack. We can also only speculate on the deliberately ambiguous ending that juxtaposes the American interlocutor to Changez. It is, nevertheless, clear that the masculinist milieu in which Changez was placed and against which he constructed his "protest masculinity" is a toxic one. On a macroscopic level, one notices similar patterns in Iraq and Afghanistan, after the US invasion, as more terror organizations popped up, recruiting new by perpetuating anti American sentiments, which makes Hamid's novel an insightful template for the existence and interconnectedness of several masculinities, offering a broader understanding of how terrorism operates.

Chapter 4: Lost Masculinity in the Aftermath of 9/11: Don DeLillo and the Quest for Masculinity in *Falling Man*

Introduction

Shortly after the pivotal 9/11 attacks in 2001, Don DeLillo published an essay in *Harper's Magazine*, entitled "In the Ruins of the Future: Reflections on Terror and Loss in the Shadow of September," in which voicing disbelief, he denounces this "catastrophic event" (n.pg.). His commentary, while sentimental, challenges the "massive spectacle that continues to seem unmanageable, too powerful a thing to set into our frame of practised response" (n.pg.). Despite such assertions, DeLillo reiterates George W. Bush's "us versus them" discourse in response to the attacks.[2] Underlining the fact that "the terrorists of September 11 want to bring back the past," he establishes a dichotomy between the US and the terrorists' countries of origin, lauding the former and endowing it with financial, economic, and technological expertise. In fact, this narrative is predicated on principles of American exceptionalism and technological advancement that, DeLillo implies, incite envy and disdain in the non-west. The events of September 11, 2001, however, overshadowed US global power and influence and brought to the fore its vulnerability that needed to be countered and overcome. This manifested itself in a hyper masculine rhetoric that permeated the political discourse and was most salient in its pre-emptive and reactionary military involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. Meghana Nayak writes:

---

[2] In his address to the nation on September 11, 2001 George W. Bush uses melodramatic terms to juxtapose the good American who fell pray to the "evil" terrorist.

> [In] order to save US state identity … Bush and his advisors have promoted hypermasculinity … Hypermasculinity is the sensationalistic endorsement of elements of masculinity, such as rigid gender roles, vengeful and militarized reactions and obsessions with order, power, and control. (36)

The masculinist power display of the US presented the nation globally as a beacon of freedom, which both lifts it to a morally superior position and demonizes the countries it is militarily engaged with. Predicated on Samuel P. Huntington's thesis on "The Clash of Civilization,"[3] this discourse facilitates the stereotyping and essentializing of an entire culture, paving the way for inaccurate media representations and deepening the grievances between the "west" and the "rest" (22).

Like Huntington, DeLillo establishes a juxtaposition between the West and the Rest in his essay which is articulated through an aggrandized delineation of the United States that clearly shifts the power dynamics in favour of it. As DeLillo explains:

> [T]he primary target of the men who attacked the Pentagon and the World Trade Centre was not the global economy … It was the high gloss of our modernity. It was the thrust of our technology … It was the power of American culture to

[3] The Clash of Civilization theory lists religious and cultural differences as the main factors of conflicts between major superpowers with the "West," being posited against the rest of the world and with Muslims being inherently evil and "convinced of the superiority of their culture and ... obsessed with the inferiority of their power" (22; 35).

> penetrate every wall, home, life and mind … We are rich, privileged and strong … We live in a wide world, routinely filled with exchange of every sort, an open circuit of work, talk, family and expressible feeling. ("Ruins" n.pag)

By deploying these comparisons, DeLillo constructs an environment of rivalry, symptomatic of a masculinist milieu of competition between the United States and other nations. While global politics is briefly and indirectly touched on in DeLillo's 2007 novel *Falling Man,* my chapter will explore the effects of the 9/11 attacks in shaping masculinity and will examine the ways in which the attacks restructured the gender order, reverting it to a more regressive and patriarchal nostalgia.

Falling Man revolves around the character of Keith Neudecker, a survivor of the attacks, and his relationship to his estranged wife Lianne, as well as Hammad, one of the terrorists that flew into the South World Trade tower. The novel painstakingly follows the journeys and ordeals of these characters, both before and after the attacks. In this chapter, I will analyze the characters of Keith and Hammad as representatives of different types of masculinity, who try but fail to adapt to the newly constructed milieu. I particularly focus on Keith and his quest to regain his sense of manliness, which was stripped away from him during the attacks. His masculinity undergoes a metamorphosis and transforms into a more nostalgic and patriarchal hyper masculinity, characterized by a fetishistic obsession with homosocial environments such as the poker setting he constantly returns to. While discussing Keith's masculinity, I will include a brief analysis of the roles of the novel's women, namely Lianne and Florence who contribute in different ways to reinforce and uphold his identity construction. DeLillo's anachronistic and discontinuous narratives foreground a sense of loss, brought about by the collapse of the

symbolically laden twin towers, emblems of America's global economic prowess. Theories of masculinity by Pierre Bourdieu will serve as a theoretical framework in this chapter.

By focusing on masculinity, this analysis will add to the existing research that primarily turns to DeLillo's novel to explore themes such as the "limits of representation" of an event such as September 11, 2001 (Caroll), the "affect and the aesthetics in 9/11 fiction" (Smith), and the controversy around representing the point of views of terrorists in fiction (Dawes). In contrast, my chapter offers a new reading of the novel, by taking into consideration the pivotal impact of September 11, 2001 on different gender identities, particularly the masculinity of Keith and Hammad. Scholars have noted the importance of gender after the 2001 attacks. For instance, Henry Ivry, who also examines DeLillo's novel, believes that September 11, 2001 has been integral in affecting male identities in that it has become a ubiquitous signifier for a fundamental cultural shift in American identity. Feminist scholar Zillah Einstein, in *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and 'the'* expresses a similar opinion when discussing 9/11: "it must also be viewed in relation to the way that male patriarchal privilege orchestrates its hierarchical system of domination" (152). For Elizabeth S. Anker, the impact of 9/11 on masculine domination can be seen in literature, particularly in the "early novelistic responses to September 11" (465). Anker believes that these masculinist responses "almost unanimously rend[er] 9/11 as a crucible in middle aged masculinity … through recurrent plot devices and motifs that both capture the domestic in jeopardy, and indict narcissistic American self- reference" (464). DeLillo's "scrupulously domestic, relentlessly downbeat" September 11 novel is part of these responses and indulges in similar stylistic and thematic tropes (Litt, n.pag.). Masculinity constitutes a central organizing theme of his text, since the novel constructs different masculinities that develop and change over time as a result of the 9/11 attacks. I will argue against Henry Ivry's

claim that Keith's masculinity is perceived as "softened" after 9/11 because, as Ivry explains, "the epistemic intrusion of 9/11" fractures his outwardly performative masculinity and destabilizes it" (22). Instead I contend that the post-September 11, 2001 environment is conducive to the construction of a hyper masculinity characterized by strict gender hierarchies and patriarchal gender roles. DeLillo's characterization of Hammad and his masculine expression will similarly be scrutinized in this chapter, as this character is juxtaposed to Keith, in an attempt to create disdain for the former and sympathy for the latter. My analysis reveals, however, that Hammad's hyper masculinity exhibits salient resemblances to Keith's, in that he retreats in homosocial environments and in his treatment of women and sexuality.

Keith's Body and Mind Tension and his Quest to regain his Masculinity

The opening sentences of DeLillo's *Falling Man* are set at ground zero when the attacks of September 11, 2001 are still unfolding. The suffocating air and the overcrowded alleys are replete with the screams and moans of injured survivors. Keith, only introduced as a white male who "wore a suit and carried a briefcase," emerges from the chaos covered in glass and blood (3). This description, deliberately situating the suit and the briefcase as Keith's markers, foregrounds his transnational corporate masculinity and defines him as a businessman. Although replete with poignant depictions of suffering and disorder, in his novel DeLillo establishes a clear distinction between Keith and the other survivors by repeatedly referring to the others as "they" and enumerating their belongings and actions "they had shoes, they had handkerchiefs [..] they ran, they fell" thereby stripping them from their agency and humanity (3). DeLillo further situates the other survivors within the events: "They ran and fell, some of them, confused and

ungainly, with debris coming down around them" (5). Keith is deliberately excluded from the group of victims who were frantically running for their lives, and is kept at a distance, as a mere observer, suggesting calm and tranquility. One might almost believe that Keith is the manly heroic and composed survivor, unaffected by his surroundings, if it wasn't for some interjections that offered insight into his mind and exposed his detachment as shock and apathy.

This opening scene, in fact, marks the rupture between the old and the new masculine orders. While Keith, during the collapse of the towers, tries to maintain an outwardly detached and emotionless attitude vis-à-vis his chaotic environment, his sense of self collapses at the sight of his vulnerability in this perilous situation. This is substantiated by his instinctual grabbing of a briefcase, symbol of his corporate identity and defining characteristics of his being, as well as his immediate return to his estranged wife Lianne. The security of his home, surrounded by his family, provides Keith with a regained sense of superiority and domination, for it is in this environment that he assumes the role of the breadwinner, husband and father, in the institution of the family; he is at the top of the gender hierarchy.

In this respect, the significance of Keith's instinctual return lies in Pierre Bourdieu's claim that fatherhood, legitimized through marriage, is a cultural practice that enables men to establish and achieve higher positions in a gender hierarchy. This rite of passage, according to Bourdieu, is meant to distance males from the grips of their mothers, in an attempt to masculinize them. In his footnotes, he explains the use of the term "rite of passage," citing marriage as an example:

> On the reasons which led me to substitute the notion of rite of institution (a term that should be understood in the sense both of what is instituted - the institution of marriage and the act of instituting - the instituting of the heir) for the notion of rite of passage, which probably owed its immediate success to the fact that it is simply a prenotion of common sense converted into a scientific-looking concept. (25)

Marriage, hence, is a means to instate an heir as well as a rite of passage, which males have to undergo in order to be considered masculine. Keith in this case has already instated an heir, his son Justin; but masculinity, as a performative act, is dependent on constant re-enactment, preparing his son for the masculinist milieu he is going to enter and imbuing him with masculine ideals. Keith's coming home can therefore be viewed as his attempt to undergo and re-experience his rite of passage to manhood again, as marriage and fatherhood are conceived to be important milestones in a man's life.

When discussing Keith's masculinity, it is also imperative to note his emotional and physical retraction. In fact, Keith throughout the novel is repeatedly described in terms of his thoughts, his stream of consciousness. His physical indulgences are either related to his monotonous physiotherapy exercises, which provide him with a sense of routine and control, or to his sexual encounters with Lianne and Florence. This fracture between mind and body, past and present, as well as his entrance into an unfamiliar masculine milieu throws Keith in an identity crisis as he is trying to cope with the new circumstances. Like the Falling Man

performance artist, David Janiak[4], who suspends himself in mid-air, mimicking the shocking images of people jumping and falling from the towers, Keith is performing a balancing act. He shows courage and emotional detachment during and after a perilous situation, symbolized by Janiak's brave performance act, but he also deals with the repressed fears and anxieties that arise from this very situation. Janiak's eventual death parallels Keith's retreat into the hyper masculine world of poker, a move that represents the death of his pre-September 11, 2001 masculinity. In fact, Keith reconstructs his entire life and identity within and around the exclusive world of the casino, "an environment in which the future becomes irrelevant and where he is safely shielded from the press and expectations of time, events, and relationships" (Parish 185). The context of the casino provides him with "physical and psychological stasis" (185). It enables him to recreate his lost sense of control and autonomy through his dedication to the game. This withdrawal into the poker setting reflects the inability of stereotypic masculinity to create a counter-narrative to terrorism but it also underlines the frail constructions of masculinity and its inherent limitation in creating a functional and healthy identity.

David Janiak's real life double, artist and photographer Kerry Sharbakka, provides further insights into the significance of the balancing act, which can be used to understand Keith's internal conflict. Sharbakka reproduces the iconic Falling Man photographs, which depict victims launching themselves from the towers to evade the fire that was raging within. He claims that his art openly questions ideas of agency and control. External factors, such as war and other threats, destabilize an individual's sense of self and can engender a crisis. Like

---

[4] David Janiak, a fictional character, reproduces and performs The Falling Man photograph which was taken by photographer Richard Drew of a man falling from the North Tower on September 11, 2001 immediately after the attacks (Whitworth n.pag.).

Sharbakka, Keith oscillates between performing the role of the heroic masculinist survivor and the scared and traumatized victim, with the 9/11 attacks destabilizing his sense of self. He grapples with the appearance of a new masculinist milieu, which he tries to resolve in his recourse to "a nostalgic, or originary" masculinity (Ivry 5). Contrary to Ivry's claim, I argue that this retrospective move hardens his masculinity rather than softening it.

Engaging in an affair with Florence, another 9/11 survivor whom he met after accidentally taking her briefcase on the day of the attacks, is one way that Keith copes with his loss. The notion of repetition is key in recovering that lost manliness, as Jenn Brandt asserts:

> Keith is constantly on the surface that has been inscribed by 9/11. Unable to tell his own story about what happened to him in the North Tower on the morning of September 11, Keith attempts to relive and work through his trauma via … Florence." (588)

Strikingly, Keith does not deal with his trauma directly and immediately; rather, it is mediated through Florence's story. Keith monopolizes her trauma and uses it to deal with his own. This is substantiated by his predominant silence when they discuss the events of September 11. He is a listener, an observer and rarely comments on her narrative: "he didn't interrupt. He let her talk and didn't try to reassure her … he waited … he watched her … she speaks, he listens … he needed to hear what he'd lost in the tracings of memory" (56; 57; 89; 91). In fact, Keith's relationship with Florence is solely based on and revolves around his need to reexperience that fateful morning through "an outside body that was also there" (Brandt 590). Keith rarely shares

his own experiences, which would help Florence cope with her trauma, but indulges in a one-sided relationship in which Florence is clearly more invested.

Repetition as a ritual additionally surfaces in Keith's weekly poker games in a male dominated environment that imbues the protagonist with a strong sense of masculinity. DeLillo sets up the scene as follows:

> The poker games were at Keith's place … there were six players, the regulars, the business writer, the adman, the mortgage broker … men rolling their shoulders, hoisting their balls … each man tried to entrap the others and fix limits to his own false dreams, the bond trader the lawyer … they used intuition and cold war risks analysis … there were elements of one's intent to shred the other's gauzy manhood. (96-97)

This scene is striking in two ways. On the one hand, DeLillo sets up a purely corporate masculinist setting populated by lawyers and mortgage brokers, the kind of individuals that Keith would associate with pre-9/11, thereby giving him the illusion that the old masculine order is still intact. At one point in this scene, the men in the room even discuss different liquors, trying to decide which among them had "manlier tones and deeper and more intense distillations," further highlighting the shallow construction of masculinity (98). But it is also imperative to note the ways in which the scene is constructed stylistically. In fact, DeLillo deliberately aggrandizes the entire game of poker by establishing a war metaphor, likening the players to soldiers who utilize intricate strategies to outsmart their opponents. This setting provides Keith with a masculine

outlet to rebuild and express his identity. The weekly games are characterized by a display of hyper masculine behaviour *par excellence*. Poker also offers a distraction from the crisis he is in, as DeLillo asserts in an interview: "You have to give the game total concentration, and for that reason, a game of poker helps you forget, for a couple of hours, all the problems you've got" (Amend n.pag.). Nina, Keith's mother-in-law, from the outset recognizes Keith's masculinist personality, exclaiming to her daughter that "there is a certain type of man, an archetype, he's a model of dependability for his male friends … the closer a woman gets, the clearer it becomes to him that she is not one of his male friends" (DeLillo 59). It is in homosocial environments that Keith feels most at ease, hence his resort to poker, which provides him with a sense of control and oblivion to the internal struggles he faces in constructing his sense of masculinity. The other women in his life similarly contribute to the construction of his masculinity, by actively supporting conventional gender norms.

Women as Complicit Tools in the Construction of Masculinity

Keith's subconscious desire to return to a hierarchically structured gender order can be observed, as aforementioned, by his immediate homecoming. The familial life with his ex-wife, Lianne, and their son, Justin, would create a sense of stability and order in a chaotic post 9/11 environment. Lianne, who takes him in, offers exactly this environment. She shields him from "discussions," as "there's nothing to discuss right now (9). She adds that "he needs to stay away from these things, including discussions," but she also actively attempts to facilitate Keith's reintegration into the family, enabling him to assume his roles as a husband and father (9).

Lianne, on more than one occasion, stresses the fact that she is thrilled about Keith's return, particularly because of her son Justin: "And Justin. Having a father around the house again" (10). Lianne here is clearly supportive of the socially constructed gender norms and expectations and seeks to impart them to her son by integrating Keith as a male role model into their lives.

Reticent at first and keeping his distance from his wife, Keith becomes intimate with Lianne only midway through the novel, yet DeLillo includes a scene post coitus that might cast doubt on his sexual prowess: "After the first time they made love … she pressed herself naked to the full-length mirror … she pressed her body to the glass … nearly collapsed against the cool surface, abandoning herself to it" (106). Showcasing her body in such a way is suggestive, hinting that she desires something that Keith can not provide to her. Sex, to him, has become a self-serving means to assert his masculinity and to transcend his "smoke" like existence as Lianne describes it (8). In order to be a real man, Keith realizes that he has to engage with his wife physically. This becomes more evident when she attempts to redefine her relationship to him, claiming:

> she had never felt easy with that word. My husband. He wasn't a husband. The word spouse had seemed comical, applied to him, and husband simply didn't fit. He was something else, somewhere else. But now she uses that term, she believes he is growing into it, a husbandman, even though she knows this is another word completely. (DeLillo 70)

Keith's understanding of how to be a husband differs vastly from Lianne's idea of a "husbandman," as several passages in the novel hint. In fact, it becomes evident, through

authorial interjections, that Keith was involved sexually with several women over the years during his marriage, that he worked late hours and spent several days a week with his friends, playing poker. All these factors could be interpreted as Keith not adequately fulfilling his role as husband. Lianne's addition of the suffix "man" also suggests that she gradually understands that Keith is more man than husband, a realization that is in alignment with her mother's opinion of him, rendering the idea of husband and masculinity in mutually exclusive terms. The role of the husband includes emotional investment and shared parental responsibilities, which Keith is unable to fulfill due to the violent rupture brought about by the attacks. His quest for masculinity overshadows and dominates his existence.

Keith's need to engage sexually with Lianne can also be explained by his metaphorical emasculation during the attacks. Not only was he put in a perilous situation, causing feelings of fear and anxiety, but his place of employment was similarly destroyed, stripping him of his identity as breadwinner. Macroscopically, this is echoed by the collapse of the Twin Towers, an emasculation of the US, underlined by the hyper masculinist response of the American government after the attacks. The planes could be said to penetrate and annihilate the towers, with their phallic symbolism. Their collapse also strikingly affects the psyche of the American people, as can be clearly observed in Keith, whose ghost-like existence is mentioned in the text: "He was a hovering presence. There drifted through the rooms a sense of someone who has earned respectful attention. He was not quite returned to his body yet" (59). Physicality and sexual potency are his attempts to prove and solidify his presence. Bourdieu in this respect claims:

> Manliness, virility, in its ethical aspect, i.e. as the essence of the vir, virtus, the point of honour (nif), the principle of the conservation and increase of honour, remains indissociable, tacitly at least, from *physical virility*, in particular through the attestations of sexual potency - deflowering of the bride, abundant male offspring, etc. - which are expected of a 'real' man. Hence the phallus, always metaphorically present but very rarely named, concentrates all the collective fantasies of fecundating potency. (Bourdieu 12, emphasis added)

Bourdieu, here, outlines the inextricable link between honour and virility and the symbolic importance of the phallus. The latter is particularly significant for it directly relates to the Twin Towers and Keith's identity crisis. Bourdieu's theoretical framework similarly highlights the importance of physicality and performance acts in rendering the construction of masculinity. Susan Faludi refers to the exteriorization of masculinity as an "ornamental culture" that is acquired and has to be maintained (48). For Keith, hyper masculine ornamentation is hence a coping mechanism, as he has to recover from his psychological trauma. I argue that this exacerbates his crisis and fuels his sometimes crude and nostalgic hyper masculinity. To refer to
Faludi's "culture of ornamentation," hypermasculinity is marked by its performative validation as opposed to its ontological grounding (48). Keith, therefore, can only be masculinist if he relies on external factors to prove it. Yet this masculinity is not viewed negatively. In contrast, Hammad, one of the terrorists on the planes, is another integral masculinist character in DeLillo's novel. Although he seems to differ drastically from Keith, Hammad too relies on performativity and ornamentation in a homosocial environment to construct his masculinity. Yet

their two strikingly different delineations reveal DeLillo's bias against Hammad and his implicit endorsement of Keith.

Hammad's Masculinity

Hammad, one of the terrorists on the hijacked planes, is introduced to the reader in the Marienstrasse section of the novel, as a listener to a war anecdote. The "older man's story" comprises heroic accounts of him in Iraq carrying "weapons that nearly overwhelmed the smaller boys, Kalahsnikovs, too heavy to be carried very far," while fighting the Ayatollah in the Iraq-Iran War (DeLillo 77). The graphic account of Hammad's fellow mosque goers inspires admiration in him: "Hammad listened without comment but was grateful to the man" (78). During his initial introduction, Hammad is placed in hyper masculine setting, replete with stories of war, phallic symbolism, and aggrandised images of heroism (77; 78). Subsequent sections contending with this character are similarly laden with hyper masculine behaviour that ranges from sexually explicit encounters with Hammad's girlfriend to physically assaulting strangers. ~~Most of these instances interest~~ingly take place in exclusively male dominated environments (77; 78; 79; 80; 83). One passage in DeLillo's novel portrays a group of men discussing theological issues. Although they appear to share physical features i.e. their beards, there is, nevertheless, a marked difference between them. Some are described as "architecture and engineering … and urban planning" students, part of what Durre S. Ahmed calls "high fundamentalists" (11)[5]. Hammad does not fit into these categories, as he passively accepts any piece of information he

[5] Ahmed defines high fundamentalism as those "who are well educated by modern standards, including the sciences, but who nevertheless subscribe to a narrow, literalist and violent vision of Islam. As such they contradict the popular, widely held belief, particularly in the secular Muslim world, that fundamentalism is a lack of rationality which can be inculcated only through systems of modern education reflecting a strong scientific bias (11).

receives. He is described as having some type of "technical education," but is devoid of agency and critical thinking (79).

Hammad, "a bulky [..] and clumsy" man, is depicted as following the orders and commands of others, especially Amir, who is described as "very genius, others said" (79). This statement points to the fact that Hammad is dependent on others' opinion at this point in the novel and does not possess a full subjectivity. He is part of a group, his "brothers," and so his identity is inextricably linked to the collective. Beardedness is one of the marker that unites the members of this organization, but it is also a way to remain in that brotherhood. Hammad asserts that:

> They were all growing beards. One of them even told his father to grow a beard. Men came to the flat in Marienstrasse, some to visit, others to live, men in and out all the time, growing beards. (79)

The significance of the motif of the beard can be clearly observed as it recurs later in the novel, when Hammad "spent time at the mirror looking at his beard, knowing he was not supposed to trim it" (82). In fact, the idea of beardedness is heavily focused on by DeLillo, with the word "beard" being roughly mentioned over a dozen times in a span of twenty pages.

Yet beardedness, from the outset, is dehistoricized as it is depicted as a clear marker for a masculinity that is inherently linked to and characterized as pertaining to Islamic fundamentalism. Historically, to put it into Afsaneh Najmabadi's words, in the Persianate Medieval discourse, beardedness marked adult manhood:

> the adolescent male's transition from an object of desire to a desiring subject. For a male adolescent, to be an object of desire of adult men was considered unavoidable, if not acceptable or cherished by all. For an adult man that would constitute unmanliness. The manliness of the beard was not so much a sign distinguishing man from woman, as implied by the modern interpretation of beardless men as effeminate. (15-16)

Unlike contemporary markers of masculinity and femininity, facial hair used to indicate a male's availability to other males and sometimes symbolized beauty. The sensationalist media representations distort and dehistoricize the Islamic, cultural understanding of beardedness, transforming it into a signifier of Islamic extremism. This in turn facilitates the stereotyping and the demonizing of Muslims.

By ignoring the historical context of the beard, DeLillo resorts to generalizations, which establish a dangerous parallel between Islamic fundamentalism and facial hair. He essentializes the beard as an identity marker that is inherent to enemies of the US and so perpetuates misconceptions of Islamic fanatic terrorists. In *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine how we see the Rest of the World*, Edward Said highlights the construction of antagonistic binaries and the ways in which essentializing stereotypes about Muslims form, citing that "the public image of Islam … is invariably found in a confrontational relationship with whatever is normal, Western, everyday, 'ours'" (42). The Orientalist positioning of Islam as the alien Other against American norms and customs is according to Said akin to comparing

"Islam to everything you dislike, regardless of whether what you say is factually accurate" (42). This in turn enables an easy categorization of non-American behaviour and tradition as anti-American, providing justifications amongst Americans for US military involvements abroad.

One scene that highlights DeLillo's reductive understanding of Islam depicts beards as quintessential markers for anti- Western Jihadists, who have to grow and maintain their facial hair religiously. If not implemented adequately, punishment ensues. In *Falling Man* Hammad explains that:

> the beard would look better if he trimmed it. But there were rules now and he was determined to follow them. His life had structure. Things were clearly defined. He was becoming one of them now, learning to look like them. This was inseparable from Jihad. He prayed with them to be with them. They were becoming total brothers. (DeLillo 83)

Hammad completely gives up his sense of self and identity in order to conform to the ideology of this group. What is striking, however, is the extent to which Hammad equates Jihad[6] to the tightly linked homosocial collective identity that the group enforces. Like Keith, who requires external factors for his masculinity, such as the homosocial bonding he achieves through poker, or the sexual encounters with and support from the women in his life, Hammad is similarly reliant on performative elements and external validations. In *Gender Trouble*, Judith Butler

[6] Jihad: From Arabic jihād, literally 'effort', expressing, in Muslim thought, struggle on behalf of God and Islam. Refers to a struggle or fight against the enemies of Islam. The spiritual struggle within oneself against sin (OED).

explains that "gender proves to be performance—that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be. In this sense, gender is always a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed" (25).[7] In other words, without the beard Hammad is not a masculinist Jihadist. He has to actively maintain this prescribed appearance to pass as a man, which is repeatedly highlighted in DeLillo's text.

Enforcing rigid vestimentary codes and performance of behaviour creates a culture of violence and aggression, which can be seen at two different levels. On the one hand, the oppressive codes shape the individuals inside the group, whereas the repression of desires and earthly pleasures strain individual jihadists internally. Hammad, in this respect, echoes the character of Changez, whose masculinity has been shaped in response to the hyper masculinist rhetoric and global policies of the US. The oppressive masculinist codes of the Islamic group in DeLillo's novel suggests a similar reactionary need to construct a counter-identity to US hegemony. Anna Agathangelou and L.H.M. Ling have described how a cycle of masculinities and hyper masculinities emerges from threat and power: "[Hypermasculinity] arises when agents of hegemonic masculinity feel threatened or undermined, thereby needing to inflate, exaggerate, or otherwise distort their traditional masculinity" (37). It is this hyper masculinist environment that nurtures the violent ideology that is Islamic fundamentalism.

It is similarly important to note the complete absence of women in this part of the novel. Whenever females are mentioned in the passages involving the mysterious terrorists, they are

[7] Butler in an interview with Rubin explains: "When we say that gender is performed, we usually mean that we've taken on a role; we're acting in some way…To say that gender is performative is a little different…For something to be performative means that it produces a series of effects. We act and walk and speak and talk that consolidate an impression of being a man or being a woman…we act as if that being of a man or that being of a woman is actually an internal reality or simply something that is true about us. Actually, it is a phenomenon that is being produced all the time and reproduced all the time" (124)

reduced to their physique. In the introductory scene of Hammad, he thinks about a woman on a bicycle, but only describes her "wet" hair and "pumping legs" (79). Hammad's objectification and sexualization of women can be linked to his predominant male entourage, which prohibits female socialization and preaches anti-woman ideologies, to the point where women are considered enemies to the cause of Jihad, as they could cause distraction. This vilification becomes clear when Hammad's repeatedly refers to women as "whores" and mentions them mostly in contexts of physical pleasure (78). This emphasis on the material and the bodily is only exceeded by an obsession with unity achieved through brotherhood.

Hammad's exclusively masculine environment is further fortified by constant exposure to violence in the form of "jihad videos" (80). But his ideological commitment is undermined by his undisclosed physical pleasure. Hammad is secretly "jerk[s] off" in the washroom and indulges into a sexual relationship with his girlfriend. He clearly leads a closeted carnal existence among his brothers, who are his only link to the cause. In fact, Hammad is portrayed without a clear ideology behind his actions: he simply absorbs ideas from the individuals around him. It is as if his only reason to be part of this group is to be with and among his brothers, regardless of ideology. This can be explained by the fact that "Islam … is marked by tawhid, or fundamental unity" (Kepel 228). This unity and sense of brotherhood deepens the bond between the members but also furthers the extent to which they are manipulatable, for disobeying results in exclusion.

Conclusion

Masculinity in *Falling Man* is portrayed as a fragile construct that requires constant maintenance and repeated reinforcement. Whether it is Keith who retreats into the world of poker, or Hammad into the world of Jihad, both seek to feel manly and both exhibit toxic and violent expressions of

their identities. DeLillo's representation of these men and their respective desires to become more masculine reveals no only the performativity of their behaviour, but also the fact that hyper masculinity results in a dysfunctional and dangerous lifestyle.

Conclusion

This thesis has argued that different constructions of masculinity in film and fiction are integral in colonial and neo-imperial endeavours such as those in French Algeria and post 9/11 US. While these major events were analysed in terms of their representation of the Other or their historical accuracy, I examine them through the lens of gender and sexuality, particularly focusing on the role of masculinity. This race-specific, heteronormative and aggressive construction of masculinities not only accounts for the violent and reactionary responses to colonisation, with the appearance of the FLN and the 9/11 attacks and the resultant Iraq invasion, but they can also be linked to the emergence of protest masculinities. The latter I have shown can develop and be associated with terrorist tendencies, particularly in reaction to US global hegemonic power.

In *Ce Que Le Jour Doit à la Nuit* I argued that French colonisation led to the appearance of a masculinist milieu, an environment in which Younes, the film's protagonist, struggled to construct his identity. Torn between assimilating into the French world he was put in and remaining loyal to his Algerian roots and politics as seen later the Algerian battle for independence, the young man makes a number of reactionary decisions that culminate in the loss of his friends and destroy his potential love relationship with Emilie. This chapter also examined the gendered relationship between colonizer and colonized as well as the complicit role of women in maintaining French dominance. In The Battle of Algiers, on the other hand, I took a closer look at the violent clash between the French and the FLN during the battle of Algiers and the tactics deployed by the French military to feminize and subjugate Algerians. An analysis of Colonel Mathieu's masculinity was significant in this respect as it symbolized the violence and

aggression of French hegemony. My chapter also showed that Algerian women's necessary involvement in the battle for independence, although seemingly representative of emancipation, was a means to an end to defeating colonialism; female participation in this case contributed indirectly to the maintenance of a masculinist milieu.

I then shifted my focus to post 9/11 representations of the Twin Tower attacks. Here I focused on the gendered, masculine imaginings of the events, rather than the dichotomous representation of the American Self - Muslim Other. Indeed, while the Self Other dichotomy exists, it must be understood in *gendered* terms. In *The Reluctant Fundamentalist,* I studied the juxtaposition of what Connell calls "transnational business masculinity," to the reactionary "protest masculinity" of Changez, the Pakistani Other. I argued that the newly constructed masculinist environment and the aggressive US neo-imperial policies enabled the appearance of these antagonistic masculinities, as represented by Changez and his mysterious American interlocutor. In *Falling Man*, I took a closer look at the impact of 9/11 on the construction of the masculinities in a national context. Both Keith, a survivor of the attacks, and Hammad, one of the plane hijackers, are analysed in terms of their identity formation and their seemingly different yet similar struggles to achieve a hegemonic masculinity. In both works, I also analysed the role of women as complicit supporters of the gendered system.

Although I explored the effects of colonialism and neo-imperialism in the construction of antagonistic masculinities, I was unable to look at their impacts on a global scale, i.e., the sparking of anti-American sentiments and possibly the creation of terrorist organizations. Neither did I have the chance to elaborate and extend my analyses in regards to the effects of French military interventions in other North African countries, such as Tunisia and Morocco, or US interference in Iraq and Afghanistan due to the limitations of space in this thesis. I similarly

wished to analyse more characters that indirectly impacted the struggles of the protagonists. Martin in *Falling Man,* for instance, is such a character. His involvement in a German terrorist cell puts him on an equal footing with the novel's terrorist Hammad. Yet throughout the text he is repeatedly delineated in a positive manner.

While these texts contend with the fictional representation of colonialism, terrorism and neo-imperialism, their significance cannot be understated. In fact, the existence of these cultural productions is more important than ever as they offer multifaceted perspectives on iconic events such as September 11, 2001 and the Algerian War, which have been historically portrayed in a binary manner. With terrorist attacks permeating every corner of the globe, and with media coverage propagating Orientalist stereotypes about Islam, it is imperative to reflect upon these topics and their fictional imaginings for they can provide understanding and bridge the differences that are built on assumptions and stereotypes.

My analyses of Arcady, Pontecorvo, Hamid and DeLillo's works provide critiques of dichotomous categories; furthermore, my thesis highlights the inextricable link between masculinity and colonialism/neo-imperialism. My investigation shows that masculinist milieus are imperative to the maintenance of gendered hierarchies and the dominance as well as violence of colonizers in imperial contexts. My analysis shows how a re-energized masculinist identity similarly appears as a response to terrorist violence. Whether it is hegemonic masculinity or a counter-hegemonic protest masculinity, masculinity is a key component in the supposed battle between good and evil. Here, political conflict between groups is not only gendered but also catalyses antagonistic masculinities and so perpetuates a cycle of violence.

Bibliography

Agathangelou, Anna. "Power and Play through Posies: Reconstructing Self and Other in the 9/11 Commission Report." *Millennium: Sage Journals* 33.3 (2005): 827-853.

Ahmed, Durre S. „Gender and Islamic Spirituality: a Psychological View of "low" Fundamentalism." *Islamic Masculinities*. Ed. Lahoucine Ouzgane. Zed Books, 2006. 11-34.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Ahuja, Neel. "Abu Zubaydah and the Caterpillar" *Social Text.* 29.1(2011): 127-149.

Amend, Christoph, and Georg Diez. "I Don't Know America Anymore", Interview with Don DeLillo. *Dum Pendebat Filius*, 2008.

Anker, Elizabeth S. "Allegories of Falling and the 9/11 Novel." *American Literary History* 23.3 (2011): 463-482.

Austin, Guy. "Trauma, Cinema and the Algerian War." *New Readings* 10 (2009): 18-25. Print.

Bjerre, AErvold Thomas. "Post-9/11 Literary Masculinities in Kalfus, DeLillo, and Hamid" Orbis Litterarum, 67.3 (2012): 241-266.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Masculine Domination*. Standford University Press, 1998.

Brandt, Jenn. "Don DeLillo and Topologies of 9/11." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 55.5 (2014): 580- 596.

Braz, Albert. "9/11, 9/11: Chile and Mohsin Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 42.3 (2015): 241-256.

Brisley, Lucy. “Melancholic Violence and the Spectre of Failed Ideals in Gillo Pontecorvo’s The Battle of Algiers and Yasmina Khadra’s Wolf Dreams.” *Panic and mourning. The Cultural Work of Trauma.* Eds. Daniela Agostinho, Elisa Antz, and Cátia Ferreira. Boston, Massachusetts: DeGruyter, 2012. n.pag. Print.

Broude, Gwen. “Protest Masculinity: A Further Look at the Causes and the Concept.” *American Anthropological Association* 18.1 (1990): 103-122.

Buchan, J. “Beyond belief.” *The Guardian*. The Guardian, July, 2006. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2006/jul/01/featuresreviews.guardianreview16

Bush, George W. "Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks," September 11, 2001. By Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Caillé, Patricia. “the Illegitimate Legitimacy of the Battle of Algiers in French Film Culture.” *Interventions* 9.3 (2007): 371–388. Web.

Caroll, Hamilton. “Like Nothing in This Life: September 11 and the Limits of Representation in Don DeLillo’s *Falling Man*.” *Studies in American Fiction* 40.1 (2013): 107-130.

Ce Que Le Jour Doit a La Nuit. Dir. Alexandre Arcady. Perf. Nora Arnezeder and Fu'ad Aït Aattou. 2012.

Chiu, Monica. *Scrutinized!: Surveillance in Asian North American Literature.* University of Hawai’i Press, 2014. Print.

Connell, Raewyn. *Masculinities.* University of California Press, 1995. Print.

Crowdus, Gary. “Terrorism and Torture in the Battle of Algiers: An Interview with Saadi Yacef.” *Cineaste*. 2004.

Dawes, Birgit. “Close Neighbours to the Unimaginable: Literary Projections of Terrorists’ Perspectives (Martin Amis, John Updike, Don DeLillo).” *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 55.3 (2010): 495-517.

De Casanova, Erynn. *Buttoned Up, Clothing, Conformity, and White-Collar Masculinity.* Cornell University Press, 2015. Print.

DeLillo, Don. “In the Ruins of the Future: Reflections on Terror and Loss in the Shadow of September.” *Harper’s Magazine*, December 2001.

DeLillo, Don. *Falling Man*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 2007.

DuBois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg&Co, 1903.

Eid, H, and K Ghazel. “Footprints of Fanon in Gillo Pontecorvo’s the Battle of Algiers and Sembene Ousamne’s Xala.” *English in Africa* 35.2 (2009): n.pag. Web.

Einstein, Zillah. *Against Empire: Feminisms, Racism and ‘the.’* Zed Books, 2004.

Faludi, Susan. *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man*. Harper Collins, 1999.

Fanon, Frantz. “Algeria Unveiled.” *A Dying Colonialism*. Grove/Atlantic, 1994. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *White Skin, Black Mask*. New York: Grove Press, 1968.

Freely, Maureen. “Water Lilies in the Swamp.” *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 5 June 2004. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/jun/05/featuresreviews.guardianreview14

Gasztold, Brygida. “Of Promises Delivered and Failed: Post-9/11 America through the Eyes of *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* by Mohsin Hamid.” *Journal of American Studies* 16 (2015): 17-28.

Hamid, Mohsin. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist.* Hamish Hamilton, 2007.

Hartnell, Anna. "Moving through America: Race, Place, and Resistance in Mohsin Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 46.3-4 (2010): 336-348.

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

Ilot, Sarah. "Generic Frameworks and Active Readership in The Reluctant Fundamentalist." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 50.5 (2014): 571-583.

Ivry, Henry. "The Commitment of our Fathers: Nostalgic Modalities of (hyper)masculinity in Jay McInerey's *The Good Life* and Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*." *Postgraduate English* 27 (2013): 1-30.

James TK. "Ce Que le Jour Doit a la Nuit*Yasmina Khadra*Alexandre Arcady*." *YouTube.* YouTube, 9 September, 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aYhDB9yOmMI

Kepel, Gilles. *The Prophet and Pharaoh: Muslim Extremism in Egypt*. London: Al Saqi Books, 1985. Print.

Khadra, Yasmina. "Yasmina Khadra - Site Officiel." *http://www.yasmina-khadra.com/*. n.d. Web. 15 Jan. 2016.

Khadra, Yasmina. *Ce Que Le Jour Doit à La Nuit*. Editions Julliard, 2008.

Khanna, Ranjana. *Algeria Cuts: Women and Representation, 1830 to the Present*. United States: Stanford University Press, 2007. Print.

Kimmel, Michael S. "Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity." *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States*: *An Integrated Study*. Ed. Paula S. Rothenberg. New York: Worth (2004): 81-93.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as experience and history in American life and letters*. UNC Press Books, 1984.

Labarra, Francois de. "Alexandre Arcady, l'Enfant de la Casbah." *ParisMatch.com* (2016). https://www.parismatch.com/Cutlture/Livre/Alexandre-Arcady-l-enfant-de-la-Casbah-1002970

Lacan, Jaques, and Alan Sheridan. *Ecrit. A Selection*. Tavistock Publications, 1980.

Lazreg, Marnia. *Torture and the Twilight of Empire: From Algiers to Baghdad*. United States: Princeton University Press, 2007. Print.

Litt, Toby. "The Trembling Air." *The Guardian* 26 May 2007

Loyal, Steven. "The French in Algeria, Algerians in France: Bourdieu, Colonialism, and Migration." *The Sociological Review* 57.3 (2009): 406–427. Web.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Meghana Nayak, "Orientalism and 'Saving' US State Identity after 9/11," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8.1 (2006).

Mellen, Joan. "An Interview with Gillo Pontecorvo Author(s): Joan Mellen and Gillo Pontecorvo."*Film Quarterly* 26.1 (1972): 2–10.

Messerschmidt, James, Raewyn, Connell. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Sociologists for Women in Society* 19.6 (2005): 829- 859.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics.* Doubleday and Co, 1969.

Najmabadi, Afsaneh. *Women with Mustaches and Men Without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

O'Leary, Alan and Neelam Srivastava. "Violence and the Wretched: The Cinema of Gillo Pontecorvo." *The Italianist* 29 (2009). Print.

Parish, Mary J. "9/11 and the Limitations of the Man's Man Construction of Masculinity in Don DeLillo's *Falling Man*." *Critique Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 53.3 (2012): 185-200.

Puar, Jasbir K., and Amit Rai. "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots." *Social Text* 20.3 (2002): 117–148. Web.

Ramazani, Vaheed. "September 11: Masculinity, Justice, and the Politics of Empathy." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 21 (2001).

Rejali, Darius M. *Torture and Democracy*. 4th ed. United States: Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2007. Print.

Repass, William. "Towards a Revolutionary Space." *CineAction* 92. (2013): n.pag. Print.

Riegler, Thomas. "Gillo Pontecorvo's 'dictatorship of the truth' – a Legacy." *Studies in European Cinema* 6.1 (2009): 47–62. Web.

Said, Edward. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. 1981.

Sharbakka, Kerry. "Artist's Statement." The Struggle to Right Oneself. 20 Sept. 2010.

Smith, Rachel Greenwald. "Organic Shrapnel: Affect and Aesthetics in September 11 Fiction." American Literature 83.1 (2011): 153- 174.

Solanas, Fernando, and Octavio Getino. "Towards a Third Cinema." *New Expression* (1969). Print.

Stora, Benjamin, and Jarrett Anderson. "The Algerian War: Memory Through Cinema." *Black Camera* 6.1 (2014): 96–107.

The Battle of Algiers. Dir. Gillo Pontecorvo., 1966. Film.

The Guardian. "Reader, I'm a He." *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 22 June 2005. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2005/jun/22/france.world

Thiong'o, Ngugi wa. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1900. Print.

Ticker, Ann. "Feminist Perspectives on 9/11." *International Studies Perspectives* 3.4 (2002): 333-350.

Todorov, Tzvetan, and Arthur Denner. "Torture in the Algerian War." *South Central Review* 24.1 (2007): 18–26.

Virtue, Nancy. "Poaching Within the System: Gillo Pontecorvo's Tactical Aesthetics in The Battle of Algiers." *Screen* 55.3 (2014).

Whitworth, Melissa. "September 11 photographer on capturing The Falling Man." *The Telegraph* 9 Sept. 2011.