
The Global War on Culture

The Occupation of Arab-American Cultural Citizenship in Randa Jarrar’s Short Fiction

by Erich Simmers

“To articulate the past historically...means to seize hold of memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger.”

—Walter Benjamin

WHEN UNITED AIRLINES FLIGHT 11 CRASHED into the World Trade Center, cultural categories such as “Muslim” or “Arab” became crudely aligned as markers of a new “enemy” — the *terrorist* — in the Global War on Terror. This state of emergency defines Arab-American cultural citizenship such that anyone who accepts that definition faces an indefinite military occupation, not within geopolitics but cultural politics. In this war culture, the grounds for admission into Arab-American citizenship are those of occupation: friend and enemy. However, global hegemonies each vie for complete control of this occupied cultural space. The result is that communities, families, and even individuals are torn to pieces. Randa Jarrar interrogates the violence of this cultural occupation in her short stories, “A Frame for the Sky” and “Lost in Freakin’ Yonkers”.

The narrators of these two stories struggle with the mental and physical boundaries of an occupied cultural citizenship. In “Frame,” a nameless middle-aged father recounts the worst moments of his life from the death of his mother, who never wanted him, to the September 11 Attacks. Reflecting the experience of the Arab Diaspora, the wistful narrator of “Frame” follows his refugee journey from Palestine to Egypt to Kuwait, and finally, to the United States. In contrast, “Lost” mediates personal tragedy with biting humor. Aida, a young Arab-American woman, becomes a refugee from her own family when she refuses to marry her non-Muslim boyfriend or abort her child. The forces of globalization permeate these two texts, inscribing their narrators as contested cultural spaces under the influence of global antagonisms in which their cultural citizenship becomes an occupied territory.

In both stories, Arab-American cultural citizenship mirrors our conception of occupied territories. In the article “Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making,” Aihwa Ong uses the term “cultural citizenship” to describe the following:

“...the cultural practices and beliefs produced out of negotiating the often *ambivalent and contested* relations with the state and its hegemonic forms that establish the criteria of belonging within a national population and territory. Cultural citizenship is a dual process of self-making and being-made within the webs of power linked to the nation-state and civil society. Becoming a citizen depends on how one is constituted as a subject who exercises or submits to power relations... [emphasis added]”¹

Mental and physical borders are disputed, and global hegemonic forces contend for control. Subaltern cultures are compelled to admit the hegemonic in “being-made,” but there is also room for “self-making” in the individual’s adaptation of culture to suit his or her needs. In “Frame” and “Lost,” the forces that occupy Arab-American cultural citizenship are global, so one must expand Ong’s definition. In an occupied cultural citizenship, the “ambivalent and contested relationships” are not constrained between the individual and one territorial state. Instead, a multi-

tude of global forces—sometimes aligned, sometimes opposed—act upon the individual. For immigrants, these vectors may include a connection to one’s country of birth, political antagonisms outside the region where one resides, and supranational affiliations, which become inscribed on the individual’s construction of cultural citizenship.

In *The Concept of the Political*, Carl Schmitt envisions a political landscape in which “state and society penetrate each other” such that “everything is at least potentially political.”² Schmitt organizes this landscape according to one ultimate distinction: friend or enemy. “The distinction of friend and enemy,” Schmitt writes, “denotes the utmost degree of intensity of union or separation, of an association or dissociation.”³ Cultural citizenship is distinctly political in the Schmittian sense, because the “criteria of belonging” defines who are friends and enemies: those granted cultural citizenship and those who are not. In this sense, Schmittian cultural politics have the capacity to draw together as well as separate. However, cultural “union” or “separation” becomes more complicated under occupation, because the friend-enemy distinction no longer corresponds to set, territorial boundaries. In the case of Arab-American cultural citizenship, friend and enemy are synthesized in one category. It is no longer simply one’s relationship to a territorial state that is “ambivalent and contested.” A myriad of equally ambivalent and contested relationships, which borders once separated but now are thrust together, emerge. Opposing hegemonic vectors clash as they struggle to define the values of cultural citizenship in a type of cultural partition violence.

The historical precedent for this violence is the Arab Diaspora. Whether immigrants came seeking opportunity or asylum, mass migrations brought 3.5 million Arabs to the United States. This heterogeneous immigrant population reflects the diversity of the Arab world. Amidst the first large Arab-American immigration from the 1870s to World War II, the vast majority of Arab immigrants to the United States had Lebanese or Syrian heritage and were Christian. Many were poor and uneducated. Following World War II, immigrants became far more diverse in geographical origin and religious affiliation. This wave included Arabs from

The forces of **globalization** permeate these two texts, inscribing their narrators as **contested cultural spaces** under the influence of global antagonisms in which their cultural citizenship becomes an **occupied territory**.

all Arab countries including North Africa, consisting of many more Muslims. Unlike pre-World War II immigrants, these new immigrants' motivation for coming to the United States included regional conflict such as the Palestinian-Israeli, the Arab-Israeli, Iraq-Iran, Iraq-Kuwait conflicts as well as civil wars in Lebanon and Yemen. Radical social and political changes in Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere also drove many upper and middle class Arabs to the United States. This movement included many more wealthy, well-educated, and professional classes than did the previous wave.⁴

The narrators of "Frame" and "Lost" are participants in this second wave of immigration. In "Frame," the narrator is wholly constituted within states of emergency such as war and political upheaval while Aida has no memory of these events to construct her cultural citizenship. As a participant in the Arab Diaspora, the narrator of "Frame" recounts his life in terms of political crisis. All of these moments center on military action and occupation including the Arab-Israeli conflict, the 1991 Gulf War, or the Global War on Terror. In the same way as Walter Benjamin's *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, the narrator "seizes hold of memory as it flashes up in moments of danger."⁵ Throughout "Frame," he traces the seven worst moments of his life in terms of these "flashes." Each moment represents a continuing, cultural precedent of expulsion and abandonment. The most painful day of the narrator's life was when he received news of his mother's death.⁶ In a sense, he had already mourned her for years. He remembers her this way: "Nobody really knew my mother; she spent most of her days away from us, and when she was present she rarely

conversed.”⁷ Not only does this begin the narrator’s personal history of abandonment, it symbolizes a national inheritance passed through flashes of danger. These two themes play out in “Frame” as the narrator’s mother “passes on” not only her “demeanor” but also a political antagonism that infects all elements of social and political life in Palestine.⁸ She inherits a political antagonism that entangles the personal with the political. Raised by her aunt, the narrator’s mother was told that her mother and father had died together. The “truth” is later revealed when her mother returns alive. The narrator recounts, “my mother’s father was killed by enemy fire during the days of the war, that her mother had to remarry or be left on the street, and that she’d left my mother with her aunt for her own good.”⁹ His mother refuses to forgive. As with cultural politics of the Global War on Terror, armed conflict dissociates its victims from community, family, and ultimately oneself. Moreover, this historical violence echoes through the cultural politics of present-day cultural citizenship as an “inherited” cultural partition violence.

The connection between the occupied cultural space of the Global War on Terror and its historical precedent can be theorized in Schmitt’s “state of exception,” a moment of crisis when violence prevails on the political landscape. In these states of emergency, law is suspended to maintain political order. Often, the sovereign uses these moments to establish physical and psychological borders between friend and enemy (*Political Theology*). In “Frame,” the narrator’s worst moments are all flashpoints of Schmitt’s “exception.” Following the pivotal 1967 Arab-Israeli War, the narrator experienced the second worst day of his life when he was forbidden from re-entering Palestine.¹⁰ The annexation of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank separated “refugees, men of every age,” from their country and their families, furthering the connection between the individual and national histories of abandonment and exile. Following the antagonism of the narrator’s childhood, the painful moments all feature emergencies where borders are redrawn and enemies are classified.

The narrator of “Frame” has his cultural citizenship defined and redefined through recurring states of emergencies. He attests to this condition

when he visits American history museums: “I went to museums and saw dinosaur bones and art that came from my birthplace and had, like me, been transported all the way over here and given a strange name (‘Canaan’), a practical name (‘Levantine’), any name (‘Phoenician’), anything other than ‘Palestinian.’”¹¹ The narrator’s namelessness is symptomatic of this condition. Hegemonic forces each stake a claim to cultural citizenship, and his inability to be named shows the contested nature of this reality—the push and pull of “self-making” and “being-made.” This tension can be expressed living under another kind of occupation: being a minority. In “Lost in Freakin’ Yonkers,” Aida chooses a “strange name” for herself as well—*Arab-American*. Aida figures as one of the second- and third-generation Muslim Arab-Americans who are not part of the Arab Diaspora but legal citizens of the United States. In *Globalized Islam: The Search for the New Ummah*, Olivier Roy writes that “a third of the world’s Muslims now live as members of a minority.”¹² Roy asserts that for these Muslims “[t]he link is no longer one between a Diaspora and a host country, but between immigrants and new sets of identities, most of them provided by the host country.”¹³ In choosing to call her self an “Arab-American,” Aida’s construction of cultural citizenship is not a simple process of assimilation into an “American” monoculture but a negotiation of a diverse poly-culture with its own internal antagonisms, which itself is impacted with the forces of globalization. In *Globalized Islam*, Roy makes the following argument: “The blurring of the borders between Islam and the West is not just a consequence of immigration. It is linked with a more general phenomenon: deterritorialisation.”¹⁴ Roy is referring to Islam’s decreasing connection to any given territory or region. However, this concept can be applied to any number of political and cultural distinctions in the wake of globalization.

In the same way that the narrator of “Frame” is expelled from territorial states, Aida risks a cultural expulsion throughout her negotiation of “ambivalent and contested relations,” not simply within the state, but between global cultural hegemonies. Amidst the crush of cultural “being-made,” any act of “self-making” jeopardizes one’s position in a culture.

To resist these occupying forces is to become a cultural insurgent, an enemy of warring cultural vectors. Before Aida becomes pregnant, she was a student at the exclusive, “all-girls” Wellesley College where her parents had intended to protect her from the dangers of “American” sexuality.¹⁵ In “Lost,” this is the site where Arab and American hegemonies become contested. On one hand, her ‘liberal’ arts education arms her with the discourse of rights that can belie the “liberalist alibi” for American cultural hegemony.¹⁶ At the same time, Arab cultural hegemony seeks to restrain her sexuality. A similar pattern can be seen in “Frame.” When the narrator sees John Travolta in *Saturday Night Fever*, he shares the experience with his comrades in Alexandria who were awaiting the censored version to be brought into Egypt. He also “bought *Playboys* and was nauseated at the first viewing, but packed them for friends back home.”¹⁷ Each of these gestures illustrates how the United States—as John Milbank writes in *Sovereignty, Empire, Capital, and Terror*—extends its “frontiers of cultural reach.”¹⁸ However, this hegemonic American culture occupies individuals alongside hegemonic Arab culture.

According to Roy, it is creation of a category such as Arab-American that “pushes [Muslims] to internalize a common grammar of social relationships, even if they stick to their own values. One can use Western syntax with an Islamic morphology.”¹⁹ It is this “self-making” that is the risk for individuals. When faced with her conservative Arab father, Aida is given the choice to abort the child and submit to a hegemonic Arab cultural citizenship. Aborting her child would expel the physical symptom of the American element of her occupation, but it would also go against her Islamic faith.²⁰ Although her child’s father James²¹ is an American, her choice to give birth to the child is an effort to protect that which makes her a Muslim. It is precisely the opposition to both occupations in her construction of Arab-American cultural citizenship, which leads to Aida’s expulsion.

Long before September 11, 2001, forces of global hegemony were creating a state of emergency for Arab-American cultural citizenship. Roy identifies one such force in the “shift from self-evident universal religions

embedded in given cultures.” As part of this change, the individual believer “is no longer a true member of a community simply by birth.”²² This creates conditions where stable cultural citizenship is disrupted—even when there is an absence of armed conflict. With this disruption, Aida’s father also feels compelled to define friend and enemy even if it means that her daughter is the enemy. While he justifies his daughter’s expulsion in terms of “Islamic morphology,” he is surrounded with American cultural commodities. Aida remembers, “The den: wood paneling, fireplace, Americana par excellence. Baba switched the TV off.”²³ Besieged by global cultural hegemonies, Aida’s father must construct a cultural citizenship that corresponds to his immediate needs as a minority living in the United States. However, it is Aida’s *gendered* and *sexual* choices that threaten her relationship to her family and her father’s definition of Arab-American citizenship. To enforce this definition, Aida’s father evokes the literal Occupied Territories. He adapts the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to explain the siege state of cultural citizenship. In delivering his final ultimatum, Aida’s father “adapts” the Mahmud Darwish poem “On Wishes”:

“Ibnati [“My Daughter”] Aida,
Each river has its source, its course, its life.
My friend, our land is not barren.
Each land has its time for being born,
Each dawn a date with a rebel.
If you have the child, we will no longer be your family. You will be dead to us forever.”²⁴

There is a humorous irony that her father chooses a Darwish poem that asks its readers not to “wish” to participate in revolutions from Algiers to Aswan but to *create* one in their own homeland.²⁵ While the poem calls for resistance against hegemony, he appropriates Darwish to enforce his hegemonic construction of Arab-American cultural citizenship. “Was I supposed to be the land, or the rebel, or both?” she asks. “I didn’t know; I couldn’t care. I didn’t understand that there are different ways to love, and this was the only way Baba knew how to love.”²⁶ Aida is unsure if,

as a woman, there is space to rebel in her father's cultural imaginary and turns outward to find alternatives.

To enforce his definition of cultural citizenship, Aida's father produces a definition of the enemy that borrows elements from various cultural hegemonies. In "Frame," the narrator—another father, facing his daughter's rebellion—also reproduces hegemonic definitions of the enemy. Once again, a daughter's *gendered* and *sexual* activity becomes the fulcrum for the determination of friend and enemy. In this case, she wants the freedom to come and go as she pleases and have a Western-style dating life outside her conservative Arab household. When his daughter defies his authority,

We have **all** become citizens of a
global culture.
Therefore, when we **make war**,
we make war on enemies from **within**.

the narrator of "Frame" reacts with violence mirroring the Haganeh intelligence officers he feared in Palestine.²⁷ He remembers, "She wouldn't tell us where she'd been, or apologize for her flight, and so, as they say here in America, I kicked her ass." The American state asserts its monopoly to police cultural practice when his daughter presses charges. He remembers, "There was still the matter of the state versus dad."²⁸ Throughout his life, the narrator has a perilous relationship to the state. On the third worst day of his life, the narrator is expelled from Kuwait when the PLO endorses Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, making him a refugee once again.²⁹ The same is true for September 11, 2001. He remembers, "on the seventh-worst day of my life, those fingers pointing up in a peace sign at the tail end of Manhattan have crumbled. Everything on continues to change in my world."³⁰ These moments factor prominently into narrator's "terrorist" imaginary, which he uses to describe his rebellious daughter: "When I saw old pictures of her, her hair long and brown, body small, I knew who she was, but this lunatic with a head of short curls, a nose ring,

and enough anger to fuel a second intifada was a stranger to me.”³¹

In “Frame,” the two other lunatics named are Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden.³² While these two figures are certainly part of the American “terrorist” imaginary, the narrator’s definition of cultural citizenship also bears the markers of Arab hegemony. Moreover, the same is true for his daughter’s resistance. As Roy points out, women wearing the *hijab* in Western cultures often do so to assert their Muslim identity as a form of “identity protest.”³³ In the case of the narrator’s daughter, her nose ring is an “Americanized” version of this phenomenon in which she protests her father’s construction of cultural citizen. Following his estrangement with his daughter, the narrator begins to understand the nature of his occupied cultural citizenship. He asks himself, “Had America changed me? Or had I not allowed it to change me, holding onto what I thought was my True (=Arab) identity, while never meeting with other Arabs, and was that really a bad thing?”³⁴ When he receives his American citizenship, he remembers, “I drove to the capital on a day that could easily have been either my best or my fifth-worst; my Americanness has brought me nothing but feelings of ambivalence.”³⁵ While the narrator is given legal citizenship to the United States, his cultural citizenship still reproduces the enmities of global American and Arab hegemonies. The narrator of “Frame” experiences the difficulty of crossing borders when he goes to visit the graves of his mother and father. To transcend the immense psychological borders between him and his parents, he must also cross a physical, fortified border between Israel and the Occupied Territories.³⁶ When he constitutes his own cultural citizenship, he reproduces these same impassable borders.

In both of Jarrar’s stories, literature is posited as a way to anticipate the production of these fortified borders—and perhaps dismantle them. Even before the narrator of “Frame” becomes aware of the danger cultural occupation represents, he has a premonition of the coming threat in the verse: “don’t tell me I’m a cloud at an airport, for all I want, from my country which fell out the window of a train, is my mother’s handkerchief, and reasons for a new death.”³⁷ Much like the father from “Lost,” the narrator uses a Darwish poem, “A Gentle Rain in a Distant Fall,” to

express the crisis of cultural occupation.³⁸ In this poem, he anticipates the occupation of Arab-American cultural citizenship in the wake of September 11, 2001 signified in the unending searches and interrogations at airports, the instability of cultural politics, and death-bringing conflict in the Global War on Terror. After the Darwish poem “On Wishes” announces Aida’s exile, she seeks out a literature for healing:

“I walk three miles to the college’s library, look up ‘Arab’ and ‘American’ and ‘Women’ and ‘Fiction’ on the computer, find nothing, then go into the girls’ room and weep into cheap toilet paper, wondering what I am supposed to be doing now. Defeated, I read *Beloved*, and when I’m done, it’s already nearing midnight.”³⁹

In searching for Arab-American Women’s fiction, Aida seeks to create “common cultural or linguistic heritage” to create united resistance to the forces that occupy her.⁴⁰ Unable to find such a literature, she leaves alone and unsafe. Here, Jarrar draws attention to the dire need for a literature that transcends the boundaries of occupied culture.

Language as a type of partition violence is a particular condition to the Arab-American. In *Globalized Islam*, Roy argues that the “so-called clash between the West and Islam” functions along two “fault-lines” that go through the developed and developing worlds in Europe and through a “linguistic frontier” in the United States.⁴¹ This notion of a “linguistic frontier” is a defining character of cultural citizenship within the United States. In “Lost,” the occupation of Aida’s Arab-American cultural citizenship expresses itself in a language that has disputed boundaries. When she tells her mother that she is pregnant, her mother decries her in Arabic: “*ya sharmoota*” [“you whore”].⁴² In an Arab cultural context, this is the worst curse in Arabic. However, the curse defies a traditional translation. Instead, there must be a cultural translation that accounts for the competing vectors of global hegemonies. It can be said that this curse becomes *cross-translated*—that is, it transmits cultural beliefs and practices across cultural boundaries. This cross-translation transmits “linguistic frontiers” from one culture to another in order to impose hegemonic values.

This cross-translation is seen again later when she tells her boyfriend James ‘sweetly,’ “*Habibi, ibn il-sharmoota ya khawal. Yarab tmoot*” [“My love, son of a whore, you faggot. I wish you death”]. She tells him, “It means I will love you forever and ever.”⁴³ This deliberate mistranslation reveals much about barriers of cultural citizenship that underlie their relationship: the violence of their relationship and her complicated feelings of ‘Muslim’ guilt. More importantly, this cross-translation reveals how opposing cultural hegemonies transmit repressive syntax. In this contested and occupied space of language, competing cultural practices and beliefs become a self-destructive synthesis. Her own family has labeled her a whore, and her own child has the risk of being labeled “son [or daughter] of a whore.” The use of the word “*khawal*” is especially shocking, because it is such an uncommon term in Arabic. The origin is Egyptian, but an Egyptian would not use this today. In rare cases, a Palestinian would simply use “homo.” Of course, James is not a homosexual. This use of “homosexual” as a pejorative jibe is a product of American hegemony. In Arab culture, it is very rare for someone to label another person a “fag” or any similar epithet.⁴⁴ This cross-translation of Western cultural syntax and an Arabic vocabulary long disused shows how the conflation of destructive cultural practices and beliefs enacts cultural occupation on a global scale. Roy observes this phenomenon in the “Westernized” representation of homosexuals in the Middle East:

“The sudden legal prosecution of homosexuals in Egypt in 2000 was paradoxically a sign of the westernization of Muslim religious conservatism. Homosexuality was forbidden, of course, by Islam, but Egyptian society and the *ulama* used to turn a blind eye to it, so long as there was no scandal, and people were left to their private sexual lives. [...] Suddenly the issue became one of ‘cultural authenticity’ against the West (and Israel), but the confrontation utilized the language of the West: moral values and a formal categorization (almost medical) of sexual life.”⁴⁵

The construction of an ‘authentic’ Arab heterosexuality feels the impact of Westernization. Under such circumstances, “fag” becomes cross-translated. In *Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Pro-*

duction of Docile Patriots, Jasbir K. Puar and Amit S. Rai argue how the specter of the “fag” plays in the construction of the enemy. Puar and Rai articulate how the American response to the September 11 attacks, “a castration and penetration of its capitalist masculinity,” is to avenge its own emasculation with one of its own.⁴⁶ Rather than combat this production of the “monster, terrorist, fag,” the hegemony of the target culture reproduces the same language in its defense of its own cultural beliefs and practices. After she swears at him, James answers, “Yeah you hot *Arabic* princess baby I love you too” [emphasis added].⁴⁷ This common mistake, interchanging Arab and Arabic, shows how James is a sign of the “linguistic frontier” that defines her occupation. What is absent is a common language that can suppress violence. Instead, this destructive cultural translation reproduces violence: “He is drunk when he throws a dictionary at my belly and causes me internal bleeding.”⁴⁸ Similar moments of eruptions are repeated in “Frame.” For example, that narrator’s violent reprisal for his daughter’s disobedience is announced with the ‘American’ expression he “kicked her ass.”⁴⁹ It is a linguistic partition violence that global hegemonies reproduce again and again in the occupied territory of cultural citizenship.

IN HIS LECTURE “BIN LADEN IN OUR HEARTS,” Mattias Gardell stated that—whether we will admit it or not—we have all become citizens of a global culture. Therefore, when we make war, we make war on enemies from within. This is especially true when contemporary constructions of cultural citizenship reproduce the violent patterns of global conflict. In writing “A Frame for the Sky” and “Lost in Freakin’ Yonkers,” Jarrar reveals how the construction of cultural citizenship can form an occupation zone for Arab-Americans. This phenomenon existed long before the events of September 11, 2001, but the events of that day reveal the absolute necessity to understand the global hegemonies that produced its horror. To bring peace to this global war culture, we must deconstruct the hidden violence of cross-translation and create a language that aims to reconcile the breaches of global cultural citizenship. One

possible way to accomplish this is through language and literature that promotes the discourse between friend and enemy until we can dismantle all our borders and, at last, exile the fiction of the enemy. ❁

NOTES

- 1 Aihwa Ong, "Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States," *Current Anthropology*, 37:5 (Dec. 1996): 738.
- 2 Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, Trans. George Schwab (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996), 22.
- 3 Schmitt, 26.
- 4 Throughout this history, racial classification has played an important role in the legal status of Arab-Americans. Although they have classified as "white" according to the United States census, Arab immigrants have often been refused entry to the country based upon being either "Asian" or simply "not White" (see Suleiman for addition information).
- 5 Walter Benjamin, "Critique of Violence," *Reflections* (New York: Schocken, 1986), 255.
- 6 Randa Jarrar, "A Frame for the Sky," In *Dinarzad's Children: An Anthology of Contemporary Arab American Fiction*, Ed. Pauline Kaldas and Khaled Mattawa (Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 2004), 36.
- 7 Jarrar, "Frame," 36.
- 8 Jarrar, "Frame," 39.
- 9 Jarrar, "Frame," 36-37.
- 10 Jarrar, "Frame," 33.
- 11 Jarrar, "Frame," 34.
- 12 Olivier Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for the New Ummah* (New York: Columbia UP, 2004), 18.
- 13 Roy, 22.
- 14 Roy, 18.
- 15 Randa Jarrar, "Lost in Freakin' Yonkers," In *Dinarzad's Children: An Anthology of Contemporary Arab American Fiction*, Ed. Pauline Kaldas and Khaled Mattawa (Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 2004), 45.
- 16 Rey Chow, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Columbia UP, 2002), 15.
- 17 Jarrar, "Lost," 34.
- 18 John Milbank, "Sovereignty, Empire, Capital, and Terror," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101:2 (Spring 2002): 309.
- 19 Roy, 36-37.
- 20 Jarrar, "Lost," 49-50.
- 21 The white, working-class James is himself a criminal outsider of American hegemony.
- 22 Roy, 36-37.
- 23 Jarrar, "Lost," 47.

- 24 Jarrar, "Lost," 47.
- 25 Mahmud Darwish, "On Wishes," In *The Vintage Book of Contemporary World Poetry*, Ed. J. D. McClatchy, Trans. Denys Johnson-Davies (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 299. The fact that this poem itself is *translated* opens interesting possibilities for interpretation, but I do not have space to explore that here.
- 26 Jarrar, "Lost," 43.
- 27 Jarrar, "Frame," 41.
- 28 Jarrar, "Frame," 39.
- 29 Jarrar, "Frame," 31-32.
- 30 Jarrar, "Frame," 42.
- 31 Jarrar, "Frame," 39.
- 32 Jarrar, "Frame," 42.
- 33 Roy, 24.
- 34 Jarrar, "Frame," 39.
- 35 Jarrar, "Frame," 40.
- 36 Jarrar, "Frame," 41-42.
- 37 Jarrar, "Frame," 31.
- 38 Randa Jarrar translated this passage from "A Gentle Rain in a Distant Fall" herself for the purposes of her short story (E-mail to the author).
- 39 Jarrar, "Lost," 52.
- 40 Roy, 30.
- 41 Roy, 44-45.
- 42 Jarrar, "Lost," 46.
- 43 Jarrar, "Lost," 50.
- 44 Thank you to Leena Dallahsheh, my Arabic teacher and friend.
- 45 Roy, 32.
- 46 Jasbir K. Puar and Amit S. Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," *Social Text* 72, 20:3 (Fall 2002), 127.
- 47 Jarrar, "Lost," 51.
- 48 Jarrar, "Lost," 49.
- 49 Jarrar, "Frame," 39.