The Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTERS THESIS

Study programme: Master in English and Literacy Studies	Spring semester, 2021 Open
Author: Shaher Alhaj Abdullah	…… (signatur author)
Supervisor: Sonya Louise Lundblad	
Title of thesis: Themes of Alienation in *Frankenstein* and *Home Fire*	
Keywords: Alienation Integration Radicalisation Refugees Violence	Pages: 101 + attachment/other: 7 Stavanger, May 10, 2021

Acknowledgment

First, I would like to express my gratitude to my excellent supervisor Dr. Sonya Louise Lundblad for her consistent support, guidance, and thoughtful comments throughout this project. Thank you.

Second, I would also like to thank my loving and caring wife *Huda*, it was impossible to accomplish this thesis without your encouragement and your support. And finally, to my two wonderful kids *Batoul* and *Omar,* you were so understanding and so smart throughout the year, love you.

Abstract

The Radicalisation of Muslims in the West is not a new phenomenon, yet it has increased significantly since the early 20th century. According to Khaleel Mohammed, a study of more than 400 cases of American jihadists, following the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, had shown that the common factor behind their radicalisation was found to be alienation (Mohammed 383). In contrast, the negative image of Islam in the West and the prejudice against Muslims are some of the main factors behind Western Muslims' sense of alienation and lack of integration in the Western societies. Western Muslims' exclusion and sense of non-belonging to the West make them more susceptible to become radicalised and engage in violent attacks on Western targets.

In this thesis I investigate themes of alienation in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, and Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*, and its impact on the protagonists in both novels. This thesis also investigates to what degree the novels reveal connections between alienation and radicalisation, (in terms of becoming violent). In addition, this thesis takes into consideration Slavoj Zizek's criticism of the West, as it pertains to European society in particular, with a special focus on reception of Arab Muslim Refugees; the cultural differences between newcomers and the West; and also the question of integration and how the failure to consider complexities of integration might be connected to themes related to the causes of alienation and/or radicalisation in the novels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

> My vices are the children of a forced solitude that I abhor; and my virtues will necessarily arise when I live in communion with an equal. I shall feel the affections of a sensitive being, and become linked to the chain of existence, from which I am now excluded.
>
> (The Monster, Shelley 1818)

The inspiration of this thesis came from a short talk with a young French man of Muslim background who left France for Syria to join ISIS. The incident took place in the summer of 2014, in my hometown near the Syrian-Turkish borders. When I asked him what on earth pushes young European men to leave their luxurious and peaceful life in Europe to a ruined country suffering the scourge of civil war, he answered: simply because we do not feel at home in Europe; we lack recognition and sense of belonging; Muslim minorities in the West are excluded and estranged; we are not seen as part of the Western society because of our religious, social and cultural values. He resumed, hundreds of thousands of refugees are heading to Europe nowadays, but they will soon discover the falsity of the Western notions of equality, acceptance and tolerance.

The question that suggests itself, if it is true that alienation is the real presser that pushes these people to the extreme where they find no other way than resorting to violence to change their situations, then would violence really solve the problem? would not it generate more alienation, exclusion and enmity towards these groups and their backgrounds in the sense that violence generates more violence?

This thesis investigates themes of alienation in Mary Shelley's (1797-1851) *Frankenstein* (1818), and Kamila Shamsie's (1973) *Home Fire* (2017), and its impact on the protagonists in both novels. This thesis also investigates to what degree the novels reveal connections between alienation and radicalisation, (in terms of becoming violent). In addition, this thesis takes into consideration Slavoj Zizek's criticism of the West, as it pertains to European society in particular, with a special focus on reception of Arab Muslim Refugees; the cultural differences between newcomers and the West; and also the question of integration and how the failure to consider complexities of integration might be connected to themes related to the causes of alienation and/or radicalisation in the novels.

This thesis is divided into six chapters. The first chapter is a short introduction to my thesis. In the second chapter I study the theory of alienation and its development from Idealism into Materialism through the works of Hegel, Marx and Erich Fromm. One of the earliest meanings of alienation in Western thought was linked to the concept of idolatry according to Eric and Mary Josephson (57). In pre-Christian times, people created things and worshipped them; this act of submission to a man-made object was referred to as an act of alienation (57). Hegel defines alienation as a process of self-consciousness and self-development by which man strives to know himself according to Sean Sayers (4). Hegel referred to the biblical story of the fall of man; Adam and Eve were banished from the garden of God because of their disobedience and seeking knowledge (18). Sayers explains that Marx inherited the idea of alienation from Hegel, but he argued that the real alienation occurs in the material world, not in ideas as Hegel promoted (5). Marx defines work as activity unique to the human species, because it distinguishes man from animals (15). According to Sayers, Marx's account of alienation describes a condition of separation and hostility between man and his work, his product, his species being, and his fellow man (81). I close chapter two with Erich Fromm's reading of alienation and its impact on man in our modern society.

In the third chapter I bring in Slavoj Zizek's analysis of the refugee's crisis in Europe and the potential discrepancies of this convergence between Islam and the West as two incompatible forces. In his book *Against the Double Blackmail, Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with Neighbours*, Zizek called for more alienation, I explain Zizek's proposition of alienation as part of the solution in overcoming the clash between the new-comers and their European hosts (74). Finally, I discuss Zizek's interesting hypothesis interpreting the phenomenon of radicalisation and the engagement of refugees in violent attacks against Western society (84).

In chapter four I present my literature review, and in chapter five I analyse themes of alienation in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and its impact on the characters in the novel, particularly, on the three main protagonists, the Monster, Victor, and Robert Walton. I discuss how Victor's alienation from himself and his family had led him to create a monster that turned into a hostile power over him. Thanks to Mary Shelley for giving a voice to the monster so that he was able to tell us about the misery of being alienated, excluded and detested by all men and how his alienation pushed him to become violent and seek revenge from his creator and all people who did not sympathise with him. I delve into the Victor's upbringing and the family structure as well as the creature's early development to look for the sources of the problem.

In the sixth chapter I examine Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*, which depicts the young British Muslims' struggle for recognition and belonging to the British society against the social and political powers that isolate and stigmatise them. In *Home Fire* I analyse how conservative British Muslims are discriminated against, excluded and treated like potential terrorists (monsters) based on their cultural preferences and their families' backgrounds. I also investigate how British Muslim's sense of alienation and not belonging makes them susceptible to become radicalised.

2 THE THEORY OF ALIENATION

2.1 Abstract

Alienation is a central problem in modern society. Despite the advantages of our age, modern man suffers a deep rift between him and the world around him. According to Eric and Mary Josephsons, The unprecedented achievements of man in the various fields, economic growth, scientific and technological advancement, the development of means of communication did not secure the fears of modern man and did not make him feel at home in the modern world. Nuclear arms race, the widening gap between the rich and the poor and the increased threat of pandemics make people feel anxious of being in combat with everything around them (9). The Josephson wrote in the introduction of their book, *Alienation In Modern Society*, "The alienated man is everyman and no man, drifting in a world that has little meaning for him and over which he exercises no power, a stranger to himself and to others" (Josephson 11). At times of possessing the best means of communication, people lose contact with each other and do not find somebody to talk to. Moreover, people fail to construct meaning in their relationships to each other and to the world around them; modern man loses control over his life and his relationships to nature and feels estranged, excluded and threatened in the world (12). The Josephsons' introduction, elaborately illustrates various manifestations of man's alienation in modern industrial societies. They say,

> In diverse language … that man in modern industrial societies is rapidly becoming detached from nature, from his old gods, from the technology that transformed his environment and now threatens to destroy it; from his work and its products, and from his leisure; from the complex social institutions that presumably serve but more likely manipulate him; from the community in which he lives, and above all from himself—from his body and his sex, from his feelings of love and tenderness, and from his art – his creative and productive potential. (Josephson 10)

The Josephsons describe relationships of man and himself and the world around him as impacted severely by a sense of detachment and hostility. Man in modern society produces versatile objects that can be used in a way that threaten him such as modern technology. The same applies to man's social and economic relationships. In this sense, the Josephsons argue that man runs in a vicious circle of self-estrangement; the more man engages in this process, the more he becomes alien to himself and to the world around him (10).

2.2 Definition:

According to Sean Sayers in *Marx and Alienation*, the concept of alienation is one of the most problematic and misunderstood concepts of the Marxist philosophy. The complexity of the concept of alienation is primarily emanated from its varied meanings and implications (Sayers x). Most English Dictionaries give different definitions of the term alienation due to its usage in different contexts. If we look up the word alienation in the Oxford English Dictionary, we notice how the meaning varies in each context, for example, 1. In Religion: alienation is the estrangement of man from God. 2. In Marxism: it refers to the condition of the workers in the capitalist society feeling alienated from their work, their nature and from each other. 3. In Law: alienation means the transferring of ownership of something to another ("alienation, n"). Still, there is a common meaning of alienation that most people understand and agree on. This common meaning refers to an act of separation and unfriendliness between people or things. When we alienate something, we usually isolate it from its surroundings, and when we refer to somebody as alienated, we mean that he/she is separated from people and things around him/her. According to Lukacs, the German terms *Entfremdung* and *Entäußerung* in Marx's works were translated respectively as estrangement and externalisation, but the most common translation for most English speakers of these words was Alienation. Lukacs says, "these terms were originally the German translations of the English eighteenth century word alienation used in an economic or legal sense to mean the sale of a commodity or relinquishment of freedom" (qtd. In Sayers ix). To help understand the social meaning of the concept of alienation, we need to trace its origins and study the concept's development as it became basis for social relationships and therefore relevant to the study of literature.

2.3 Early Origins of Alienation

According to Erich Fromm, the early origins of the concept of alienation were first found in the western thought in the Old Testament concept of idolatry. He argues that idolatry is not worshiping many gods at the same time, but idolatry means that the idols are the works of man's own hands (Fromm 79). Idols are man-made things. Man worships things he created himself. These things obtain their power and meaning from man. Fromm says,

> In doing so he transforms himself into a thing. He transfers to the things of his creation the attributes of his own life, and instead of experiencing himself as the creating person, he is in touch with himself only by the worship of the idol. He has become estranged

> from his own life forces, from the wealth of his own potentialities, and is in touch with himself only in the indirect way of submission to life frozen in the idols. (Fromm 79)

Man robs himself from his own powers and skills through relocating them into entities of his own creation, then prays to his creatures to extend him with what he had already conferred on gods and deprived himself from. Man starts to experience the world through his idols; he sees through their eyes and hears through their ears. Man's alienation from himself and from the world widens as much as he becomes reliant on his gods and negligent to his own potentials. According to Fromm, "the idols can be a god-like figure, the state, the church, a person, possessions" (Fromm 79). Man's idols change their objects according to man's preferences; man can put his powers in a person or a system and subjects himself to it. On the whole, Fromm's theory causes us to see alienation in every kind of relationships where man is robbed of his potency and made into a passive thing.

According to Istvan Meszaros, one of the earliest manifestations of alienation in the western thought was perceived in the traditions of Judaism and Christianity and it was known as the man's alienation from God. Meszaros says, "The divine order, it is said, has been violated; man has alienated himself from the ways of God, whether simply by the fall of man or later by the dark idolatries of alienated Judah, or later again by the behaviour of Christians alienated from the life of God" (Meszaros 2). In the Bible, God created man in his own image, and ordered him to submit to God's tradition, but man was tempted and had sought forbidden knowledge, hence, God banished man from his grace and cast him out from his garden to earth as a punishment for of man's deviance from God's ways. This disobedience of man and the separation between the creator and his creature, represents man's first alienation. Man had first alienated himself from his God when he ignored God's orders, and God had alienated man when he excluded him from his grace and his garden and sent him to endure the plight of his original sin on earth. Meszaros argues that the advent of Christianity had put an end to man's alienation from God, and that Christ's way unified the different opposing groups of people. Meszaros quotes Paul the Apostle words,

> Remember that ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made High by the blood of Christ.... Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. (Meszaros 2)

Judaism freed only the people of Israel from their alienation, moreover, it established the concept of God's chosen people and split society into opposing and conflicting social classes and allowed Jews to dominate and oppress other parts of society (3). Christianity, on the other hand, unified all the opposing strangers and freed them from their alienation and from the elite society of Judaism, and the blood of the Christ was the cost of man's redemption and return to the way of God (4). According to Sayers the Christian doctrine of man's fall and his original sin had aspired the eighteenth-century philosopher George Hegel (1770 – 1831), to the crucial role of the concept of alienation in the process of the evolvement of the self-conscious spirit (18). It is true that the concept of alienation was first philosophically elaborated by Hegel, but it owes its critical meaning to his student, Karl Marx (1818 – 1883), who took the idea from Hegel and developed it radically according to Sayers (5). Thus, understanding Hegel's and Marx's account of alienation is inseparable, especially that Marx was highly influenced by the ideas of his teacher, Hegel, in his early works (Sayers x).

2.4 Alienation from Hegel to Marx:

The concept of alienation is one of the most prominent concepts in Hegel's social philosophy. In the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel discussed the key role of alienation in the evolvement of the self-conscious spirit. Sean Sayers pointed that out, "The concept of alienation is central to Hegel's account of the development of spirit (Geist), and thus of the process of human self-development" (Sayers 2). For Hegel, the human self does not know itself; Its knowledge of the self evolves through acts of self-alienation and its overcoming in a process of self-discovery and self-creativity. Sayers says, " By 'alienation' Hegel refers to the process by which 'finite spirit', the human self, 'doubles' itself, externalises itself, and then confronts its own other being as something separate, distinct and opposed to it" (Sayers 3). These acts of self-division and self-reconciliation are necessary for the evolvement of the self-conscious spirit according to Hegel. He sees the human self as historical and social creation, and it develops absolute knowledge of itself when it overcomes its alienation. Hegel defines the human spirit as finite and restricted by nature. The finite spirit can free itself from this restriction through understanding nature; this happens through work and thought, thereafter it raises itself to the infinite spirit of God (Sayers 3). Thus, the evolvement of a self-conscious spirit undergoes different social and historical forms such as, subjectivity, individuality, and freedom (4). Sayers describes this process, he says, "a process in which the self is alienated from itself and then

comes to recognise itself in its alienation, so that, at the end of the process, the self eventually comes to be at home with itself" (Sayers 4). For Hegel, harmony and unity are characteristics of earliest communities, but these were overcome by alienation and fragmentation of community. Anyway, Hegel had an optimistic view of the future of man in the modern world, he argued that self-conscious man in liberal communities can overcome his alienation and reconciliate with his social and natural world (Sayers 4).

Although Marx's idea of alienation was originally taken from Hegel, it became relevant outside philosophy. He used the term to describe a condition of hostility and estrangement between man, his work, and his product in the capitalist society. Sayers writes, "Marx's account of alienation draws explicitly and directly on Hegel's work. He uses the term to refer to a situation in which our own activities and products take on an independent existence and become hostile powers working against us" (Sayers 5). In other words, the situation in which our products and activities become alien and independent entities that stand and work against us as hostile opponents. Marx criticised the Hegelian view of alienation and its overcoming in the modern society. He argued that alienation is characteristic of modern society because of the capitalistic form of labour, and it can only be overcome when this order will change (Sayer 5). Despite of Marx's main use of the concept of alienation to criticize the work milieu in capitalist society, but it also has a social dimension. Marx also talked of alienation in terms of social, religious, and political relations. Sayer notes, "Marx's ideas in this area are directly inherited from Hegel, and there is a considerable congruence between their social theories. Marx agrees with Hegel in regarding the self as a social and historical creation He regards self-alienation as a social and historical phenomenon which is destined to be overcome with historical development and progress. Thus in Marx, as in Hegel, the social and spiritual aspects of alienation and its overcoming are united" (Sayer 5). Giving a historical and social account of the self is common among the Hegelians and the Marxists, both camps regard alienation and its negative consequences in modern society as necessary and unavoidable condition in the process of self-development.

2.5 The Significance of Work:

Work is a central theme in Marx philosophy according to Sayers. For Marx, work is man species activity, and his liberating activity (14). Marx's account of work draws on Hegel's

ideas of the importance of work, and it cannot be fully understood without turning to Hegel. Marx notes,

> The importance of Hegel's Phenomenology lies in the fact that Hegel conceives the self-creation of man as a process, objectification as loss of object, as alienation and as supersession of this alienation; that he therefore grasps the nature of labour and conceives objective man – true, because real man – as the result of his own labour. (qtd. in Sayers 14)

Hegel perceives work as man's fundamental activity, through work man understands himself and his nature, Sayers writes, "for both Hegel and Marx work has both a social and a material aspect. Through work the worker relates not only to the object of work and hence to the natural world, but also – and through it – to other human beings" (Sayers 15). Both, Hegel and Marx, agree that work is the fundamental activity that distinguishes man from other species in regard to their relation to nature. Animals for example, are natural being, they have direct relation to nature and other objects around them. Animal's relation to nature is based on their instincts. Hegel describes the animal relationship to nature as immediate and conducted by the animal desire to consume, Hegel says, "Furthermore, this consumption involves the immediate negation, the annihilation of the object" (qtd. in Sayers 16). According to Sayers, unlike animals, man is not quite natural being in Hegel's philosophy; he is self-conscious being, which means that the human being is able to separate himself from the natural world around him and see himself in his separation from other objects around him at the same time (16). Human being's practical activity (work) and his self-consciousness enable him to represent himself to himself according to Hegel (Sayer 16). Hegel sees that man's relation to the natural world is established through work (16). While animals annihilate other objects, man preserves them, develops them through work and create new forms of the object and incorporate them. This process of shaping the world has negative and positive sides according Sayers (17). Work finds a breach between man and the natural world and puts them on opposite ends (17). However, man is still able to overcome this separation from nature through transforming himself in his objects. Hegel says,

> Through work, the human being imbues the external world with his will. Thereby he humanizes his environment, by showing how it is capable of satisfying him and how it cannot preserve any power of independence against him. Only by means of this

> effectual activity is he no longer merely in general, but also in particular and in detail, actually aware of himself and at home in his environment. (qtd. in Sayers 17)

For Marx, this is a process of objectification (17). Work enables man of objectifying himself in his product, and this makes him realize the influence of his powers and skills in changing the world and humanising it. This development of man self-consciousness allows man to overcome his alienation from nature and makes him feel at home in the world. Marx says,

> It is … in his fashioning of the objective [world] that man really proves himself to be a species-being. Such production is his active species-life. Through it nature appear as his work and his reality. The object of labour is the objectification of the species-life of man: for man reproduces himself [Sich verdoppelt] not only intellectually, in his consciousness, but actively and actually, and he can therefore contemplate himself in a world he himself has created. (Sayers 18)

This process involves alienation from nature through work and reunification with it or the overcoming of this separation of man from nature, so he finally feels himself in harmony with a world man created in his image.

Hegel, on the other hand, uses the biblical story of the fall of man to refer to this process. God created Adam in his image and placed him in God's garden to live in harmony. When Adam was tempted by the serpent and ate the fruit, he was banished from God's garden and was condemned to labour. Hegel argues that the truth is that the separation is inevitably happening because of an innate desire of man to discover and awaken. Thus, all sons of Adam are destined to go through the same process of awakening, loss of innocence and separation from nature (Sayers 19). In this way, work is not just a punishment, it fulfils man's need to learn and understand, and through work man succeeds at shaping the world and developing it. When man objectify himself in the world, the division between himself and nature will be overcome, and man will no more feels alien in a world of his creation (19). According to Hegel this development is purely human since nature is stative and does not develop (19). Marx was aware of this problematic, he notes that animals work and produce as well (19). Birds and bees, for example, work to eat and feed their young or build nests and cells; this kind of work is typical to that of humans when the motive to work is just to satisfy the man's basic needs (19). Man raises himself above animals when he starts to produce more than he needs or when his motive to work change from natural to more conscious and more human, according to Marx (20). In this sense, other species also work, but their work is instrumental and driven by their

desire and their instincts; they work to feed their young and protect them or to fulfil their basic needs. What distinguishes the human work, claims Marx, is that it is driven by plan and preceded by thinking (20). Moreover; animals are not free, their work is determined by their needs, unlike human beings who are capable of producing even when they are free from their physical needs and this free activity is the highest form of human work as in the case of art i.e. composing music (22).

Sayers argues that, Marx developed the Hegelian's account of work by proposing that, work is not always a self-realising activity and self-developing activity; under alienation, work is transformed into forced labour where man sinks in alienation rather than defeats it (23). Marx says,

> Under conditions of alienation, "labour, life activity, productive life itself", is perverted so that it is, external to the worker, i.e. does not belong to his essential being; that he therefore does not confirm himself in his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not develop free mental and physical energy, but mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind.… His labour is therefore not voluntary but forced. (qtd. in Sayers 24)

What distinguishes Marx account of alienation is his materialist approach; he perceives labour as economic activity, while Hegel adopts an idealistic approach, labour for Hegel is mental and spiritual activity (24). Hegel sees just the positive side of work as fulfilling, liberating activity, and as a mean by which mean overcome his alienation as I have shown. Marx considers work conditions in modern society hostile to man essence. Economic work in capitalist society became alienating; man does not like his work, he is forced to do it. According to Sayers, Marx accuses Hegel of presenting an ideal image of work conditions in modern society (25). Contrarily, Hegel argues that he is aware of the problems of work in modern society, but he believes that these conditions are necessary for the development and they are destined to be overcome because of the process of progressiveness, and what we can do is to try to live with these uncomfortable conditions (30). Sayers refers to this dispute between Marx and Hege, he writes, "It is quite evident from these passages that it is wrong to suggest that Hegel is uncritical of the society of his day. On the contrary, he sees well enough that people are alienated from the world that capitalism and large-scale industry were creating" (Sayers 29). However, Marx did not ascribe alienation in modern society to industry, according to Sayers, but to the capitalist society, and he believed that with the help of industry, man can change the capitalist

mode of production and replace it with a new social system where alienation will be overcome (31). Thus, work is conceived by Hegel and Marx as man's means to overcome alienation as long as it is free, self-realising and self-developing activity. This helps to understand Marx's theory of alienation as it pertains to the mode of work in the capitalist society which conducts man's activities and shapes man's relationships with people and with the world around him as I will show later in this discussion.

In this context it is important to talk about Marx's account of the individual and the social relationships and see how Marx uses them to criticise the liberal and communitarian notions of modern society.

2.6 Marx Notion of the Individual and the Society:

According to Sean Sayers, Marx's approach to the individual in modern society is more fruitful and more realistic than the dominant approach of the liberals and the communitarians. Advocates of the liberal thought argue that the individual can exist free from any social relations, and that his existence in society is not imperative but voluntary. Sayers says,

> Much liberal social thought starts from the assumption that the individual is an atomic entity, 'unencumbered' by any necessary social relations. Individuals are taken to exist and to have an identity which is logically prior to and independent of any social relations. Work is treated as an individual activity to meet individual needs which involves relations with others only contingently, and society is regarded as a mere collection of such individuals interacting together. (Sayers 48)

According to Sayers, Marx rejects this view. He argues that when we talk about production, this means that we refer to social individual (48). Marx criticises the atomistic approach of Adam Smith to explain his notion of social totality. Smith suggested that an isolated man like Robinson Crusoe, work and produce just things he needs in his daily life. his survival was not bound to entering relations with others (49). Sayers explains that Marx rejects this view because of its empirical assumptions. For Marx there is no historical evident of the pre-social isolated man, he says, "The more deeply we go back into history, the more does the individual, and hence also the producing individual, appear as dependent, as belonging to a greater whole: in a still quite natural way in the family and in the family expanded into the clan; then later in the various forms of communal society arising out of the antitheses and fusions of clans" (Sayers 49). This attitude is based on Marx conception of work; work is not instrumental activity to

satisfy basic needs. According to Marx, in work man does not just produce materials, he produces social relations as well (Sayers 49).

Sayers argues that communitarian thinkers, as well, refuse the idea of the atomic individual as advocated in liberalism given that the liberal society resembles the loss of the social bonds in community and turn people into competing individuals (Sayers 50). In his response to the theory of the liberal society, Sayers turns to Alasdair MacIntyre who comments that it is true that the shattered society became a reality but it is just a result of the free market, he says, "Under the impact of the market, society has been dissolved into a mass of separate individuals each pursuing their own independent interests" (qtd. in Sayers 50). Other communitarian thinkers were more explicit in their critique of the liberal society notions according to Sayers. Walzer argued that liberal theory account of the atomic individual is not true and does not reflect the real image of modern society, he says, "the deep structure even of liberal society is … communitarian, we are in fact persons and … we are in fact bound together" (qtd. in Sayers 50).

According to Sayers, for Marx, the assumed individuality of man in modern society is a consequence of the development of the social systems. Marx advocates that, man in pre-modern societies was more dependent on his family and his group; the fixation of the social roles in such societies has led to dividing people into certain groups within the social order, he says, "In such societies, people 'enter into connection with one another only as individuals imprisoned within a certain definition, as feudal lord and vassal, landlord and serf, etc" (qtd. in Sayers 51). Anyway, people became more independent and freer to purchase their needs in the free market without locating them into specific group only under the development of the modern society according to Marx. Thus, the idea of the isolated individual is not universal as the liberal theorists suggest and it is not idiosyncratic to human nature, as Sayers illustrates (52). According to Sayers, this Marxist attitude is inherited from Hegel. He argues that, Hegel was one of the first philosophers who talked noted that the development of social life will create a space for individuals where they can set free from their social bonds to pursue their interests in the free market independently as much as this economic exchange serves to satisfy interests of all these individuals. Hegel called that the civil society. (Sayers 52).

Sayers indicates that, Marx main criticism of the free market is that it turns to be a space for competition and conflict between individuals, instead of being a space for meeting and reconciliation as Hegel suggested (60). Being governed by its own laws, Marx fears that the

market is becoming an independent force that operates autonomously and impose its laws on individuals who founded it according to Sayers. Marx says, "Modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells" (Sayers 62). Concerns of this kind are now universal, Sean Sayers quotes Dr. Collin Morris's sentiment about the impact of the market, Morris says,

> The Sunday newspapers were full of reactions to the Budget. They said things like: before [the Budget] the Stock Market had been 'sceptical' or 'nervous', but now it's 'pleased' or 'happy' – as though it's a sort of living being. It's the kind of language people once used about that other invisible force called God. In Old Testament times, the people feared Jehovah's reaction to what they'd done. These days, it's the Market's verdict that is awaited with anxiety. (Sayers 56)

Sayers argues that, for Marx this is another form of alienation; when man creates something, gives it life and loses control over it, then this man-made thing turns to become independent and operates as a hostile entity that threatens man (56). This is the way, Sayers demonstrates, in the liberal society, people ostensibly seem to be independent while their activities are interconnected, and they appear free, but in reality, they are governed by the laws of the market (56). According to Sayers, this economic form of alienation in the free market is intertwined with another form of social alienation because producing objects involve producing and reproducing social relations as well (57). Another criticism of the liberal society is that the atmosphere of the free market allows social differences and inequality between people to arise, Sayers writes, "Specialisation and division of labour are inevitable features of modern economic life" (Sayers 57). All these are forms of social alienation, because our economic life determines the nature of our social life. people are categorised based on the kind of work they do, and this limits and restricts the social contact and impacts the social connectedness. Add to that, Marx thinks that the nature of liberal society imposes forms of social and economic alienation and limits individuality and freedom because people do not have control over their social and economic relations (59). Anyway, this discussion invites us to believe that modern man can overcome his alienation whenever he regains his freedom and his control over the market in which he works and establishes his economic and social relationships with others.

2.7 Marx Concept of Alienation in the Capitalist Society

According to Sayers, Marx's theory of alienation focuses on the social and economic relations in the capitalist society. For Marx, work is the most important activity of the human being; work is man's species activity, through work man transforms the world and humanises it, discovers himself and his powers, and develops his creative and self-conscious nature (78). Marx noticed that the work milieu in the capitalist society creates favourable conditions for forms of social and economic alienation. He found that individuals in the capitalist society has lost control over their own lives, so that their acts, their works, their objects, and their economic and social relations became alien to them. Marx distinguishes four different forms of alienation in the capitalist society, argues Sayers. These forms are: 1- Man's alienation from his productive activity (his work). 2- Man's alienation from his product. 3- Man's alienation from other men. 4- Man's alienation from his species (81).

2.7.1 Man's Alienation from his Productive activity:

Bertell Ollman argues that this kind of alienation emerges from the worker's lack of control over his work. In pre-capitalist society, man's relation to his work was spontaneous and direct. Work was conceived as natural and free activity because it aimed to fulfil his natural needs. Early man enjoyed his work because it was satisfying and beneficial to him. However, this self-realising activity has turned to be an alienating activity in the capitalist world according to Marx. Marx says,

> First, the fact that labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and his work feels outside himself. He is at home when he is not working, and when he is working, he is not at home. His labour is therefore not voluntary, but coerced; it is forced labour. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a means to satisfy needs external to it. (Ollman 136)

In capitalist society, our natural activity has become external to our lives because we do not work to fulfil natural needs in direct and spontaneous way, we work for wage according to Sean Sayers. He says, "The result is that productive and socially useful work – our 'essential' and distinctive 'species' activity – is made into a means to earn a wage. Work becomes a purely

instrumental activity, related only externally to the needs it satisfies: any kind of work will do as long as it pays" (Sayers 92). Work is our species activity; it is the activity that distinguishes us from animals as we have discussed in Marx theory. However, when work is no more that distinctive activity by which we objectify ourselves, then it is reduced to its animalistic form. Bertell Ollman argues that the worker in the capitalist society denies himself because his work does not belong to his essential being. The capitalist work does not develop man's skills and powers; it consumes man and restrains his creativity. The repetitive mode of work turns man to a machine-like figure, Ollman says, "instead of developing the potential inherent in man's powers, capitalist labour consumes these powers without replenishing them, burns them up as if they were a fuel, and leaves the individual worker that much poorer. The qualities that mark him as human being become progressively diminished" (Ollman 137).

According to Ollman, the capitalist work causes mental, spiritual and physical damage to the worker; it ruins his brain and his body as Marx noted. Not just the worker's skills and creativity that shrink, but physical diseases show up as well; his muscles, his eyes, his lungs and his legs are all influenced which decreases his efficiency to perform his work tasks. Ollman writes, "In Marx words, "the worker is a mere fragment of his own body, a living appendage of the machine, and he looks the part" (Ollman 138). In addition to this physical pain, there is a psychological pain as well, Ollman argues (138). The worker does not feel himself in his work and does not feel that this kind of work is meaningful or comfortable exercise for him. The worker does not like his job, he feels that his job is alien to him, he does not want to work more, unless he is paid more money. People feel coerced to wake up, dress, and go to work, because if they do not go, there would be deduction in the salary. Workers suffer during their work hours; they just want to escape their factories and their offices and go back home. The worker's commitment in this case is not to his work, but to his salary; he works to get money in order to make living. The worker cares about the work efficiency as much as it influences his payment. Marx describes this break in the relation between man and his activity, he says, "The external character of labour for the worker is demonstrated by the fact that it belongs not to him but to another, and that in it he belongs not to himself but to another.… The activity of the worker is not his own spontaneous activity. It belongs to another, it is a loss of his self" (qtd. in Sayers 91). All these are aspects of what Marx calls, alienated labour, a labour that does not express man's essential being and does not meet his natural needs; a labour that is meant to satisfy man's external needs, not man's natural needs (Ollman 140).

2.7.2 Man's Alienation from His Product:

The second type of alienation in the capitalist society according to Marx, is the alienation between the worker and his product. Marx describes the relation between the producer and the product as alien, he says, "the relation of the worker to the product of labour as an alien object exercising power over him" (qtd. in Ollman 141). The product is a direct result of the production process, in which the worker has used his time and his skills to produce something. Consequently, this thing now stands on its own; it is an independent object that does not refer to its producer, it does not bear his name, and it is not his, nor it is the buyer's object. Add to that, the producer cannot decide how this product will be used later; this right is of the owner of the product, the one who buys it, has the right to decide how to use it. The owner of the product is the capitalist who controls the production's process through his money, then it is the buyer or the consumer who pays to buy the product. The production process transforms the worker's time, skills, and energy into a material. This material turns into an autonomous power where its existence is dependent on the worker's suffering as we have discussed in the previous section. In our modern society, we notice how the products impose their power over both of the producers and the consumers. As much as the product succeeds to please the consumer, it arouses his need to consume more, and hence he demands the workers to work more. The value of the product does not go to the worker's pocket; the worker gets a minimum part of the product's value, and most of the product's value goes to the capitalist. The worker cannot decide how much products to produce or when to stop producing. Again, it is the capitalist who decide the whole process; to produce as long as he is winning or to stop if he is losing. All these are aspects of the worker's alienation from his product. This takes us back to man's alienation from the productive activity; hence man was alienated from the act of the production, then the result of this act will appear strange to him. Marx argues, "how would the worker come to face the product of his activity as a stranger, were it not that in the very act of production he was estranging himself from himself?" (qtd. in Ollman 141). Man estranged himself from his product because he chose to work for the wage not the product itself, then he no more can claim that the product is his (Sayers 90). The product is not the worker's own product, it is a part of him, his energy, his time, and his skill. In this way, the product is an objectification of the worker that is taken away from him and sold in the market for certain value.

2.7.3 Man's Alienation from His Fellow Man

According to Ollman, that the worker becomes alienated from the capitalist as soon as he becomes alienated from his product. The product is the worker himself objectified in a form of a thing; whenever this product is taken over by somebody else other than the worker himself, hostility arises (147). As much as the worker become alienated from his product, he become alienated from his work master who controls over it. Marx says, " through alienated labour man not only engenders his relationship to the object and to the act of production as powers that are alien and hostile to him; he also engenders the relationship in which other men stand to his production and to his product, and the relationship in which he stands to these other men" (Ollman 148). In some way, the alienation from the product causes other forms of alienation such as the alienation from people who take part in the production process.

Sayers argues that the worker's subordination to the laws of the capitalist and to the market puts him in competition against other workers. Workers compete with each other to keep their jobs and get higher wages, whilst the profit of this competition goes to the capitalist. The worker sees other colleagues and co-workers as a threat not as a society (93). Marx adds that alienation pervades the working class to the capitalist because they cannot have human relations with each other according to Ollman (154).

2.7.4 Man's Alienation from His Species

Man's species being is his human's being. It is all the human elements that distinguish him from other species according to Ollman. Man differs from other species that he is self-conscious being and he is condemned to develop his consciousness through free creative activity (150). What distinguishes man from other species first and foremost is work according to Marx and to Hegel as I have previously discussed in this chapter. Animals also work, but their work is restricted to satisfy the basic needs for their existence; they work just to live. They have direct relation to nature; they use what is immediately present to them. Their work is not preceded by plan and thinking. Conversely, man's relation to nature is different. Man does not work just to live, he works to develop his self-consciousness, to satisfy his physical, mental, and spiritual needs. This development is constructed through working on the world, transforming it, and humanising so that man feels himself at home in a world he had created. Man uses his ability of objectification to express his creativity and develop his skills. He tends to produce objects to duplicate himself in nature (151).

Sayers claims that the alienation of man from his species in the capitalist society manifests itself in different ways. Man's work is no more a free and creative activity; it is forced labour

that does not serve as means of self-realising and self-discovering activity. Work is reduced to an instrumental activity, to its animalistic form. Man does not work to duplicate himself and create his world. Man works for wages (92). Work becomes a continuous suffering for the worker. Moreover, as we have seen, the worker's product is a mark of his ability to transform nature into an object. In the capitalist society, man's object is alienated from him because it is owned by another man. Marx argues that taking over the worker's product means concealing his species being. He says,

> In tearing away from man the object of his production … estranged labour tears from him his species life, his real species objectivity, and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him. Similarly, in degrading spontaneous activity, free activity, to a means, estranged labour makes man's species life a means to his physical existence. (qtd. in Ollman 150)

The advantages of man over animal is put into an object. Whenever this object is owned by another man, then these advantages become disadvantageous.

2.8 Alienation in Modern Society

In his account of alienation, Marx refers to man's relation to nature as a relation of objectification and appropriation according to Ollman (89). This means that man works on nature to create a world of his own creation where he feels at home and integrated. We have discussed that Marx refers to labour as man's species activity and man's means to shape the world and recreate it in his image, this entails that labour should be a free and self-realising activity. Thus, alienation occurs when man's work becomes forced, his products become alien and hostile, and necessarily, his human relations with others get influenced and declined as a consequence of this process. This phenomenon is akin to the relations of modern society according to Marx. He describes alienation in modern society as a moment where society loses control over its own tools and relations, he says,

> Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is

> like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. (Sayers 178)

Again, this is typical to the concept of idolatry, which we discussed in the beginning of this chapter, there man creates an idol, projects all his powers and richness unto it and starts to worship it. Similarly, in our age, man feels alien in a world he had created, but he no longer rules over it. Erich Fromm, a German psychoanalyst who wrote about alienation in modern society, argues that alienation in modern society manifests itself through acts of submissive worship of man-made idols (58). Fromm argues that man engages in numerous submissive relationships where he confers his powers and strengths on the other person or thing and awaits his idol to give him back what man already had given away. For example, being in a submissive love relationship, voting for political leaders to rule over him, or even man's worship of his own desires and following them can be alienating (58). Fromm says,

> What is common to all these phenomena – the worship of idols, the idolatrous worship of God, the idolatrous love of a person, the worship of a political leader, or the state, and the idolatrous worship of the externalisations of irrational passions – is the process of alienation. (qtd. in Josephson 59)

By transmitting all his powers, rights and forces to his idol, man turns himself into an inferior dependent thing, who waits for his superior idol to lead him and decide over him.

According to Fromm, alienation in contemporary society is a consequence of man's enslavement to his man-made world. It resembles the negative aspect of man's productivity. Primarily, man tends to produce things that help him to integrate in the world. The more these objects become independent and powerful the more man becomes powerless and dominated by the things he has created. Fromm writes,

> Alienation as we find it in modern society is almost total; it pervades the relationship of man to his wok, to the things he consumes, to the state, to his fellow man, and to himself. Man has created a world of man-made things as it never existed before. He has constructed a complicated social machine to administer the technical machine he built. Yet this whole creation of his stands over him and above him. He does not feel himself as the creator and the centre, but as the servant of the Golem, which his hands have built. (Josephson 59)

Modern society is very organised. Man has founded social, religious, political, and economic institutions and has set rules and laws that arrange and control every single aspect of the human life. Yet, the passive interaction with these laws and institutions has turned man into a slave, sometimes also called a good citizen. To obey your political leaders, to follow the laws of the state, and to follow the instructions of your church or your mosque passively; all these are mere acts of surrender and subservience to man-made constructs.

On the other hand, the increasing domination of this culture impacts our social interaction according to Fromm (68). He argues that man's relationship to his fellow man has been influenced by the alienated culture of our society, people became separate atoms and indifferent about each other, they perceive each other as abstractions, as things, he says,

> Everybody is to everybody else a commodity, always to be treated with certain friendliness, because even if he is not of use now, he may be later. There is not much love or hate to be found in human relations of our day. There is rather, a superficial friendliness, and a more than superficial fairness, but behind that surface is distance and indifference. (Josephson 68)

What brings people together is personal interests, not social bonds (68). This turned society into a space of estranged and disassociated atoms that approaches and interacts with each other as much as this interaction satisfies the personal interests of both parts, says Fromm (68). Fromm argues that with the absence of the community, man tends to put himself under the umbrella of the state and subjects to its laws and commands to fulfil his need for sharing, associating and belonging. This fulfilling of the social feelings makes man idolises the state and defends it being his last refuge for communion according to Fromm (69).

Overall, in conclusion of what we have discussed of Marx's theory of alienation in Sayers, Ollman, and Fromm, we can say that alienation in modern society, is experienced as a state of estrangement and of separation in which man feels himself alien from his work, his object, his species being, and from other people. Man experiences work as an external activity and he is forced to do it to make living, although it does not belong to his essential being and he does not enjoy doing it. The product of the work is alien from the worker because it does not belong to him, it confronts the worker as something alien from him, as a hostile thing over him. The worker put his energy, his time and his skill in the product, but he cannot claim the ownership of the product because it is taken by the capitalist. Thus, the loss of the product resembles the loss of the worker's self. Man is also alienated from his species being which is creative and

self-realising work. Work is our species being because it distinguishes us from animals. However, in the capitalist mode of production, work has lost its meaning as self-realising activity and became a commodity. People work for profit and wages not for developing their essential being. Finally, and may be the worst form of alienation, as we have discussed in Fromm, is that man is alienated from his fellow man. People are alienated from each other in which they lack compassion and intimacy in their interaction, they do not treat each other as human beings but as objects, driven by their egoistic interests. We interact with the other as much as this interaction satisfies our individual needs. Man is looked at as an instrument, a customer, a sexual object, a passport, a piece of paper or as an impoverished thing.

3 SLAVOJ ZIZEK

Slavoj Zizek is a Slovenian philosopher and a cultural theorist who works on themes of political theory, psychoanalysis, and popular culture, with an apparent influence of Hegel, Marx, and Lacan. Zizek's controversial views and provocative style in his critique of the west has made him one of the most criticised contemporary thinkers in Europe. Zizek resorts to philosophy, in his seeking to describe the present political and economic situation in the world and to analyse current crisis such as the influx of immigrant, clash of cultures, islamophobia and the war on terror (Bulajewski). Here, I exhibit some of Zizek's responses to current crisis, in particular, those on immigration, cultural clash and violence.

In 2005, a small Danish newspaper had published an offensive caricature of the prophet Muhammed which prompted millions of Muslims around the world to go in massive demonstrations shouting not just against the magazine or against Denmark, but against the figure of the imperial west (Zizek 58). Such incidents reflect a real image of the modern world. In his book, *Violence, Six Sideways Reflection,* Zizek talked about this incident and how it triggered a crisis between the west and the Islamic world. Zizek explained how globalisation made the world appear as one small village where the news roam rapidly, so that millions in Pakistan go to the streets protesting against a cartoon published by a small newspaper in Denmark because they feel it humiliates their prophet, while on the other side, people in the west can immediately feel the ramification of the emerging crisis (Zizek 58). Zizek pointed out that the world became too connected and close to each other so that countries like Denmark, Syria and Pakistan seem as neighbour countries, yet, in the crisis of the caricature the world appeared as fragmented and disintegrated. Zizek claimed that in the modern world we live close to each other, but we do not really understand each other and the more we indulge in each other's lives, the more our differences and our conflicts will resurface (59). In order to avoid this confrontation according to Zizek, we need to get ourselves out of the each other's lives, until we understand and become able to respect each other's values and ways of life. Zizek says, "Perhaps the lesson to be learned is that sometimes a dose of alienation is indispensable for peaceful coexistence. Sometimes alienation is not a problem but a solution" (Zizek 59). Zizek thinks that Alienation is not always a passive phenomenon; it does not always mean enmity; it could be a specific situation a distance that allows understand yourself and understand the other. Zizek based his opinion on two facts, first, the fact that most Muslim demonstrators did not see the caricature and do not understand that such acts fall under the freedom of the speech in the west (59), and second, Muslims demonstrators were not only

offended because the caricature was humiliating and did not just protest against the newspaper but they protested against the image of the imperial west and all its interventions in their lands (108). The same principle applies to the west; the Danish see that their state guarantee the freedom of the press, thus they are sure that there are no legal consequences to publishing caricatures that can offend somebody in a remote land, but what they did not understand that such caricature is considered taboo for Muslims and that they need to respect Muslim's values and religion (107). In this sense, this kind of misunderstanding may result in violence if not solved through proper communication. Conflict arises whenever the neighbour comes too close to us, when he starts to change our values and our way of life or vice versa. Zizek's conclusion draws on the Freudian's concept of the neighbour; we react in aggressive way toward the neighbour whenever we see that his different values and his own way of life disturbs and threatens ours (59). Zizek advocates the idea that to truly embrace, respect and coexist with the other, is to keep him at a certain distance so that he does not disturb our life.

In summer 2015, the European borders witnessed one of the largest flows of refugees. The ongoing civil wars in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, beside the terrible situation in some African countries has led hundreds of thousands of people to migrate their countries and cross the Mediterranean towards Europe looking for new lives in the old continent. On the 13th of November of the same year, a bloody terrorist attack against civilians in hit Paris and left 130 victims (Zizek). The attack was classified as an Islamist terrorist attack, carried out by ISIS members, and reports talked that the attackers has come into Europe among the refugees themselves. In Europe there were two main reactions towards the refugee crisis. Those who supported the open-borders policy and called for receiving even more refugees, arguing that we are all humans and we need to show solidarity and save lives as much as we can, putting in mind that refugees themselves are victims of terror and deserve help to start a new life. And the anti-immigrants who criticised the European plans in dealing with the situation and called for closing the borders in the face of immigrants. They saw that receiving these huge numbers of people of different religion, culture and values makes a threat to the European way of life especially when knowing that there are radical Islamists among the new-comers (Zizek).

Zizek discussed the refugees crisis thoroughly in his book *Against the Double Blackmail, Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with the Neighbour*, published in 2016. He criticised both of the pro and anti-immigrants' views on the crisis. He claimed that we cannot easily shut the borders and stop giving help to those in need for escape, nor we leave our doors widely open without considering the consequences of such policy. Zizek argued that both visions do not

offer good solutions to the problem on the long run (Zizek 7). Zizek pointed out that the most important aspect of the refugees influx and the Paris attacks is that they resemble a reminder for Westerners that they are isolated from the rest of the world where terror and violence is a daily routine. Scenes of violence which they used to see on TV have become real terror in the heart of Europe according to Zizek. He writes, "Significantly, of course, the attacks focused not on the western military or political establishments, but on symbols of everyday popular culture – restaurants, rock venues, football stadiums" (Zizek 4). For Zizek, what has been hit is the normality of the everyday of life. This should make Europeans think how it feels to live in those countries which refugees come from, where these violent acts are part of the everyday life.

In this book, Zizek talked again about the idea of the neighbour and how this idea is applicable in dealing with refugees. The problematic of our relationship with our neighbours resides in the creepiness of the neighbour according to Zizek. Creepiness Zizek says, as defined by Adam Kotsko is, "creepy is today's name of the uncanny nature of a neighbour; every neighbour is ultimately creepy" (qtd. In Zizek 73). In this sense, what we fear in the neighbour is the mysterious side of him. This mystery is not the neighbour's acts per se, according to Zizek, but the unspoken motive behind them (73). The relationship becomes disturbed when we do not understand why our neighbour is acting in a certain way and what he wants of this act. This lack of understanding develops into conflict whenever this neighbour comes too close to us so that his weird acts and practices troubles our lives. To overcome this clash, Zizek promotes Peter Solterdijk idea that understanding each other involves getting out of each other's' lives. Solterdijk claims that "more communication means, above all, more conflict" (qtd. In Zizek 74). Accordingly, Zizek argues that a dose of alienation is needed for peaceful coexistence with the neighbour i.e. refugee, Muslim, other. Alienation not in the sense of segregation and excluding the other, on the contrary, Zizek calls for alienation in the sense of a proper distance that allows every party understands itself and understands the other better and respects him. Zizek writes,

> One of the things alienation means is that distance is woven into the very social texture of everyday life: even I live side by side with others, in my normal state, I ignore them. I am allowed not to get too close to others. I move in a social space where I interact with others obeying certain external mechanical rules without sharing their inner world. (Zizek 74)

Zizek's alienation is a part of the process of overcoming alienation. Which means that he does not call for segregation and exclusion, but for stepping back from the very inner side of the neighbour in order to develop self-understanding as well as understanding of the other and to avoid the conflict with him. For Zizek, what prevent the indifferent coexistence with the neighbour is the inhuman side of the neighbour which breaks the humanist universality (76). In this way, Zizek calls for helping refugees not on just on humanitarian basis but because it is our ethical duty to do so. When we help somebody because we empathies with his suffering, we may cut our help if we find that this person is different from us. Zizek says, "What if getting to know them reveals that they are more or less like us – impatient, violent, demanding – plus, usually, part of a culture that cannot accept many of the features we perceive as self-evident?" (Zizek 81). Thus, what if you found out that the Muslim refugee you are helping has his own cultural preferences, values, etc, and disagree with some of your notions and principles, would you give up helping him.

Terrorist attacks and violent acts in the West are not new phenomena of course, but what is new and maybe shocking is that they are carried out by refugees. Shocking because refugees themselves are victims of violence. In his analysis of the motives that push refugees to engage in violence such as the Cologne sex attacks in 2016, were many women were reported to be sexually assaulted and raped by aggressive gangs of refugees in the city centre of Cologne during the New Year's Eve celebrations (91), Zizek distinguishes two driving forces behind them: the first is the desire for the west, and the second is the envy of the west (Zizek 84). Zizek builds his claim on Alain Badiou's reading of the global situation after the Paris attacks. Zizek writes,

> Alain Badiou discerns three predominant types of subjectivity in today's global capitalism: the western civilised middle-class, liberal-democratic subject; those outside the West, possessed by the desire for the West/*le desir d'occident*, desperately endeavouring to imitate the civilised lifestyle of the Western middle-classes; and those fascists nihilists, those whose envy of the west turns into a mortal self-destructive hatred. (Zizek 84).

As for the first type, they recognise themselves as superior to others given their human rights, freedom and values, and they are afraid of this other who live outside the west to come and invade their utopia (85). The second type is immigrants whose desire for the developed west led them to depart their ruined countries and try to build new lives in the promising West (85).

The third type, Zizek argues, resembles those whose unfulfilled desire for the West had turned into resentment and envy, he writes,

> Frustration and envy get radicalised into a murderous and self-destructive hatred of the west, and people get engaged in violent revenge. Badiou proclaims this violence a pure expression of death drive, a violence that can only culminate in acts of orgiastic (self)destruction, without any serious vision of an alternate society. (Zizek 85)

This is very similar to what happened to Frankenstein's Monster; in the beginning, the Monster was peaceful creature and sought to get recognition and acceptance of the humans, but when he failed he turned into a violent Monster who dedicated his life to revenge from every human being, motivated by his anger and his envy of humans who enjoy their social lives while he was alone (Shelley 95). In the case of the Muslim refugees in the West, they become radicalised and engage in violence to express their anger and to revenge from the society which they could not be part of. According to Zizek, the new-comers' feelings of not belonging and disintegration in the new society, turns into feelings of hatred and envy where the desire to find a place in society and be part of, turns into a desire for destructing that society. He says, "Fascisation offers them an easy way out of their frustration: an eventful risky life dressed up in a sacrificial religious dedication, plus material satisfaction (sex, cars, weapons…)" (Zizek 87). Accordingly, Islamic radical groups with nihilistic agendas like ISIS, attracts frustrated Muslim immigrants because it offers them a space to express their anger from the west and seek revenge. Moreover, Zizek believes that, through attacking the west, the radical groups aim to press on moderate Muslims in the West and radicalises them through creating a total war between Muslims and the Western world (88). Another important characteristic of these fundamental groups, Zizek refers to, is that they are a consequence of the Western intervention in the Islamic world (88). Just as in *Home Fire*, Farooq associates the hatred of the West and the desire to revenge, to the Western military intervention in the Islamic world that eliminated the Islamic supremacy (Shamsie 129).

In Zizek's view, finding solutions to the current situation of refugees in Europe can be achieved through taking various actions. The chaotic immigration's flows into Europe should be more organised through finding reception centres that register new-comers and distribute them according to the recipient countries capacities (97). Discrepancies of values and ways of lives should be solved through communication, if not through the law (98). Coexistence within the multicultural society should be based on mutual respect instead of clinging to the notion of the

dominant culture (100). Yet, a permanent solution for immigration demands eliminating the reasons that cause immigration (103).

4 LITERATURE REVIEW

Frankenstein is a story of a Swiss student who cut himself from the world after his father's incorrect response to his obsession with occult knowledge. Victor Frankenstein, the older son of an upper-class Genevese Family, isolates himself from the world pursuing his dream of creating a human being after his discovery of the elixir of life. Victor's creature was made in a shape of man, but with a giant size and hideous face that neither Victor nor other people in society could receive him. Consequently, Victor escape and leave the new-born creature behind alone to face other people cruelty and prejudice. Laura Claridge discusses that Frankenstein is a about disturbed familial relationships, where fathers do not do their responsibilities towards their sons and toward society, Claridge says, " The parental failures are emblematic for those people unwilling to fulfil their duties to society at large: just as the hunter, that mythical image of a strong and protective father, reacts incorrectly and injures his charge's rescuer, so even the priestly fathers respond insensitively to their children's needs" (Claridge 17). Victor do not embraces his creature because the creature was ugly. Celina Jeray argues that Victor's fault was that he judged the creature based on his appearance, she says, "He regarded him as a mere animal; and he assigned to him features of moral monstrosity based only on his outward ugliness" (Jeray 68). According to Anne Mellor, the creature's problem is that he did not look European, he was not white like his creator; the fact that the creature is of different race had caused him to be banished from society, she writes, "The Creature then, is not an European, not Caucasian, but of some other race, like those found by Captain James Cook in his famous recent voyages to the Pacific Islands or by the East India Company's trading ships sailing among the spice islands in the Indian Ocean" (Mellor 2). While for Anne McWhir, lack of beautify is just part of the problem, she thinks that the real problem lays in the racial and oppressive society that do not accept those who are different. McWhir adds that the creature resembles all the marginalised groups in society, she says, "The creature thus has something in common with other anomalous, marginalized creatures of controversial human status: black people, wild men, idiots, orangutans, women" (McWhir 80). Franco Moretti, in the *Dialectic of Fear*, argues that Frankenstein's monster represents the oppressed proletariat which seeks to get recognition of its rights peacefully in the beginning (Moretti 69). However, the Creature's attempts to overcome his alienation and be part of society fails; his rights are neglected and his demands stay unfulfilled. Sir Walter Scott argues that the monstrosity of the creature was a consequence of a long journey of abandonment, exile and mistreatment, he says, "the result is, this monster, who was at first, according to his own account, but a harmless monster, becomes

a ferocious and malignant, in consequence of finding all his approaches to human society repelled with injurious violence and offensive marks of disgust" (qtd. In Shelley 227). The failure to be part of community turns the peaceful, loving creature into a violent monster. Like Scott, Percy Shelley discusses that the monstrous situation of the monster of being a social outcast turned him from a good creature to a violent monster, Shelley says, "yet the circumstances of his existence are so monstrous and uncommon, that, when the consequences of them became developed in action, his original goodness was gradually turned into inextinguishable misanthropy and revenge" (qtd. In Shelley 214). Shelley makes it clear, he says, "treat a person ill, and he will be wicked" (qtd. in Shelley 214). Wickedness is a direct consequence of bad treatment, exclusion and injustice; two evils which fuel each other.

Home Fire is a post-9/11 novel that deals with the predicament of Muslim communities in Britain in times of the rise of islamophobia and the war against the so-called Islamic terrorism. *Home Fire* is a novel about radicalization of Muslims according to Claire Chambers. Chambers read it in the lens of approaching and listening to the marginalised other, she says, "It also considers whether we need to listen to—while simultaneously refusing to condone— jihadists" (Champers 202). The novel depicts the struggle of young Muslims trying to find their path in British society, resisting the unfriendly and exclusive political and social powers that try to alienate them. Lisa Lau and Ana Cristina Mendes argue that the novel is about the resistance of the stigmatised Muslim's minority against the coercive polices and the discriminatory social and political conditions in post-9/11 Britain, they write, "*Home Fire* demonstrates that, placed in the invidious position of having to declare against their own in order to prove safe political allegiances to the West, some young Muslim women still manage to resist and refrain from re-orientalizing" (Lau and Mendes). *Home Fire* investigates the consequences of the exclusive policies toward minorities and how they can drive individuals to adopt violence against the state and the rest of society as a way of change. Conservative Muslim families in Britain are alienated, discriminated against, and judged based on their customs and appearances. When travelling to the USA, Isma makes sure that she does not carry any family pictures, Quran or any Islamic thing that can get her stopped at the airport, yet she is detained and suspected for rubbery because of her hijab.

In their study of *Home Fire*, Lau and Mendes warn that racial and isolationist discourses in our post-9/11 world, would push Muslim minorities to the extreme and make them vulnerable to radicalisation, they write, "The banalization of a populist, anti-immigrant discourse positions Muslim communities, and particularly the Muslim male youth, in a space of Orientalist, radical

difference to the West" (Lau and Mendes 56). However, another view suggesting that these discourses fall within the context of preserving security in the times of the war on terror. Marcela Santos Brigida writes, "Throughout *Home Fire*, we learn that the reason why Isma Pasha was held at the airport was not exclusively related to her Pakistani-British identity or to the fact she was a Muslim. It was precipitated by her complicated family history" (Brigida 156). Rehana Ahmed explains that the unknowability of Muslim community represents a challenge to the state in which it works to decipher through surveillance of Muslims. Rehana uses Yegenoglou's example of the veiled woman, Ahmed writes, "For Yeğenoğlou it is precisely the assumed unknowability of the veiled woman that threatens the viewer's command of knowledge and elicits their need to decipher her (Rehana 6). Notwithstanding the argument of including these policies in the counter-terrorism plan to protect society, I content that society is harmed when policies meant to protect cause radicalisation. Champers points out to the role of the political circumstances in radicalising Young Muslims. Champers argues that Parvaiz's experience with the British Police had pushed him to violence, she says, "He has been stopped and searched twice for purely Islamophobic reasons by British police officers, and is regularly treated with suspicion as a young Muslim man in Britain" (Champers 207). *Home fire* examines the impact of the coercive policies imposed on Muslims and the consequential drift of young British Muslims towards radicalism.

5 FRANKENSTEIN

Frankenstein is a story that consists of smaller stories, yet these smaller stories are similar in their content to the main one. It looks like the Russian nested doll called, Matryoshka, where every doll has a smaller figure of the same sort inside. Some of the main themes of these stories in the novel deal with parent-child relationships, faith, friendship, social connectedness and seclusion, as well as pursuing knowledge. Character's lives in *Frankenstein* illustrate alienation and various societal causes of radicalisation. Each is impacted by their social and familial relationships and connections in ways that enables them, in turn, to impact each other. The three main characters, like Shelley herself, pursue knowledge. In order to understand the logic of their actions in relation to the main themes, first we need to dive into the history of their lives and examine the parent-child events that influenced their upbringing and shaped their characters.

5.1 Parent-Child Relationships

All children in *Frankenstein* have suffered from abandonment and isolation and tasted the bitterness of their familial and social bonds. From Caroline Beaufort kneeling by her father's coffin (19) to the orphans Elizabeth and Justine Mortiz, Victor, Walton, Safie (87) and finally to the Creature who was abandoned by his father and creator (36). According to Laura P. Claridge, parents play a large role in the novel's theme of duty, she writes,

> The parental failures are emblematic for those people unwilling to fulfil their duties to society at large: just as the hunter, that mythical image of a strong and protective father, reacts incorrectly and injures his charge's rescuer, so even the priestly fathers respond insensitively to their children's needs. (Claridge 17).

Fathers, in the novel, react to their children needs, but their reactions are thoughtless and incorrect. The inattentive reaction of Alphonso Frankenstein toward his son's obsession with occult knowledge has led Victor to his misery. Victor, the happy child of Alphonso Frankenstein and Caroline Beaufort, believes his downfall was a result of pursuing unlawful science, but he never acknowledges the fullness of his neglect of duty.

When he tells his story to Walton, he describes his childhood as ideal, filled with love and care, he recalls, "No youth could have passed more happily than mine. My parents were

indulgent, and my companions amiable" (Shelley 21). The image of the ideal family presented by Victor raises questions about the reality of his parent's role in his destruction and how the indulgence and his environment generally shaped his personality along with his decisions that accelerated his demise.

A sense of the parental failure comes by way of Victor's self-knowledge and identity. The first thing Victor says when he starts his narration: "I am by birth a Genevese; and my family is one of the most distinguished of that republic" (Shelley 18). He is not only giving himself an identity, but he reveals his pride being a Genevese and having a great ancestry. His forefathers were well respected and served the country, and he is not expected to do less than them. He says, "my ancestors had been for many years counsellors and syndics; and my father had filled several public situations with honour and reputation" (Shelley 18). The greatness of the ancestors puts pressure on the successors to be as great as their forefathers. The family rank and reputation lay an extra responsibility on Victor to have grand dreams and pursue high ambitions, or at least not to taint the family's history, he says, "I was the eldest, and the destined successor to all his labours and utility" (Shelley 19). This noble heritage of his ancestors turns out to be a burden and a curse when thrown on the child unguided.

Victor tells us that his father, Alphonso, was a respected man, known for his hard work serving his society, but guidance is lacking. Victor describes his father as a public and well-respected man, and he tells Walton that his father thought of marriage to give the state sons who might carry his virtues to the coming generations (18). This admiration and praise of his father's role in society, will double his father's failure in taking care of his son. According to Lee Zimmerman this description shows the faults of Alphonso and criticises him more than it praises and admires his role. He writes, "Victor introduces his father exclusively as a public man without a private self and defined utterly by his position in the social order." (Zimmerman 137). Alphonso's marriage was delayed by his public occupations "he passed his younger days perpetually occupied by the affairs of his country; and it was not until the decline of life that he thought of marrying" (Shelley 18). So he seems to be a pragmatic and patriotic man who spent his life fulfilling his duties towards his country. Alphonso did not get married because he fell in love or because he wanted to enjoy having a family life and children, and we never hear Victor say that his father loved his mother. Alphonso's marriage appears to be prepared and set by circumstances, he says, "two years after this event Caroline became his wife" (Shelley 19). It seems that Alphonso was doing everything on purpose including his marriage and having children. His marriage of Caroline was a kind of duty toward his dead friend, and his aim of

having children was a kind of civic, social, and familial responsibility to guarantee the survival and perhaps the power of the family and in some way the upper class he belongs to. Maybe he thought that his duty toward his dead friend pushes him to protect his daughter by getting married to her, or maybe because she was beautiful and from a noble ancestry, she can function as a mother to the sons that he wanted to give to the state. Even after marriage and having children, we do not hear Victor say that his father loved his mother, he says that his father was occupied by his public duties some of which he had to relinquish in order to do fulfil his new duty in educating his children (19). By doing this, Alphonso is literally equating public and private affairs.

Another story within Victor's story (that is within Walton's story) is the failed duty and subsequent abandonment of Victor's mother, an event that shaped the experience of Victor and the creature. In chapter I, Victor's recount of his mother's early life reveals that she was a victim of her father's circumstances. Beaufort, Caroline's father, lost his fortune and could not bear to live in poverty in the same society where he had lived a wealthy and magnificent life before (18). The loss of fortune was followed by the loss of society. Beaufort could not stand the social stigma and withdrew to a remote town in the countryside where he endured wretchedness the rest of his life (18). The society in which Beaufort used to live in did not protect him or help him to arise again. As if Shelley is trying to say that the society did not play its normal role as a shelter but turned to be the monster that preys upon its wrecked members, so that losing fortune is followed by losing reputation and acquiring a stigma where people in this situation hide themselves to avoid the harshness of their society as Shelley explains, "Beaufort had taken effectual measures to conceal himself" (Shelley 19). Beaufort's pride and irresponsibility did not hurt him alone but moved on to his poor daughter. Caroline had no choice but to support her father and nurse him during his sickness. The child had to spend her time working and taking care of her anguished father "her means of subsistence decreased; and in the tenth month her father died in her arms, leaving her an orphan and a beggar" (Shelley19). She found herself suddenly immersed in her father's dilemma, a situation she has no hand in it except being the daughter of the fallen man. She was alienated from her native community and her normal life and thrown in the midst of misery (Shelley 19). Beaufort's seclusion did not only kill him but wretched his only daughter who was found by Alphonso at the edge of death kneeling by her father's coffin suffering poverty and abandonment. Shelley goes so far as to characterise the wealthy Alphonso as being associated with supernatural benevolence to do God's work and lift out the poor girl out of affliction, she writes, "he came like a protecting

spirit to the poor girl" (Shelley19). Alphonso endeavoured to save his friend and when he failed, he felt duty-bound to save his remnant, Caroline, an act sanctified by a spiritual simile. The god-like figure lifted the girl out of misery and saved her life, moreover, he made the girl his wife just two years later. This is how Shelley sets up high expectations for Alphonso and his over-inflated sense of himself and his ambition to have done his duty to the utmost, when he raised Victor, in almost supernatural strength and quality. This is one way the dysfunction and pain caused by Caroline's father's irresponsibility gets transferred to her own son and cements her identity as an ornamental, docile wife beholden in all things to Alphonso.

Alphonso was a believer. He believed in his role to serve his community and believed that he as leading member in society had a duty to serve the public and help his friends to the utmost, and that is why he looked for Beaufort and got married of Caroline. He also believed in the responsibility to have children and educate them to be the inheritors of the family rank and fortunes, but there were other duties that appear to have gone unfulfilled or outside the bonds of his ability to provide (Shelley 19). After marriage, Alphonso had to renounce some of his "public employments" in order to start his new mission in raising children to be the heirs of the family heritage (19). Shelley juxtaposes Alphonso's role with that of Caroline's father and Elizabeth's father to let him shine more and highlights his responsibility and sense of duty when compared with negligent fathers. However, we find that he goes a bit too far to provide and indeed pre-ordain Victor's future spouse and at the same time neglects a certain discipline of mind that it seems was an equally necessary parental duty. After the death of Alphonso's sister, her husband requests Alphonso to take care of his nephew and not leave her to be brought up by stepmother, he says, "it is my wish," he said, "that you should consider her as your own daughter and educate her thus" (Shelley 20). Alphonso did not hesitate and hastened to bring Elizabeth and raise her even though he had very little communication with his sister (20). This appreciation of Alphonso's commitments of his role and position in society and family will turn soon against him as his words here were not always equal to his actions. When Elizabeth's mother died, her father did not take charge of her and she was supplied as a commodity to Alphonso to take care of her and educate her accompanied by her education fees, her father writes to Alphonso, "her mother's fortune is secured to her" (Shelley 20). The first thing Caroline notices about Elizabeth is that she is beautiful and affectionate and though suggested that she could be the future wife of Victor. This admiration of her beauty foreshadows the negligence of the monster as he was born ugly. Caroline understands that the woman's role in society is to be loving, gentle and docile. The submissive personality of Caroline consolidates

the omnipotent sense of her husband even after her death, as her last wish is that Victor and Elisabeth get marry to fulfil Alphonso's will (25). Even Victor did not recognise Elisabeth as a counterpart but as a puppet. He took care of her as if she were a favourite animal, he says, "from this time Elisabeth Lavenza became my play fellow" (Shelley 20). He places her lower than himself. He describes himself as a philosophical and reflective child, while Elizabeth as carefree and depthless "The world was to me a secret, which I desired to discover; to her it was a vacancy" (Shelley 20). Elisabeth is just another copy of Caroline; both of them were left behind, treated like objects moving from one hand to another, and only taken care of to be future wives.

Shelley also provides hints about Victor's own direct relationship with his father. One thing Victor blamed his father for was the lack of communication. He did not realize that he cannot communicate with his father until he became thirteen years old when he tried to reveal his enjoyment of the works of Cornelius Agrippa to his father, who did not explain to him or guide him but neglected his interests and scolded him, he told him, "don't waste your time upon this; it is sad trash" (Shelley 22). Cornelius Agrippa is a German philosopher and physician who lived in the early sixteenth century and wrote about occult science. Agrippa advocated that there are three different types of magic i.e., celestial, natural, and ceremonial. Chris Miles wrote an article about Agrippa called Occult Retraction where he explains that the ceremonial magic is the science that enables us to have control and dominion over other creatures, he says, "that is to say, achieve union with God" (Miles 437). Anyway, this little remark of Alphonso was enough to upset and puzzle Victor at the same time. Victor was upset because his father did not explain properly why it is considered a sad trash, and why he should not read it, and he was puzzled because his father knew the book immediately when he looked at it, which invites us to believe that he knew its contents, he says, "my father looked carelessly at the title-page of my book, and said, Ah! Cornelius Agrippa! My dear Victor, do not waste your time upon this" (Shelley 22), and here rests Alphonso's fault that; if he had read the book and knew it to be forbidden, as a father who should know and treat the normal curiosity of the child and his interest in the forbidden stuff and guide him to useful science that helps to enrich the education of his son and successor. Victor envies other pupils for the direction and guidance they get from their educators and scorn his lack of advice and instruction, he says, "if instead of this remark, my father had taken the pain to explain to me" (Shelley 22). As his passion of discovery led him to find Agrippa's book and read it, it also led him to discover his relationship with his father. Victor expresses his anger of his father's disregard of his pursuit and for not checking

more seriously his interests in such dangerous science. Alphonso's purpose of getting married and having children was to do his duty towards his society, and to raise these children to be Genevese as he is, so his fault was that he did not explain to Victor that this kind of science is not your way to be the expected Genevese who can inherit the family's name and reputation. According to John Dussinger, Victor's insisting on pursuing his unlawful interests can be understood as a revolutionary act to get out of his father's cloak of duty and to become Victor who represents himself and not the heritage of a family he was born in and a society he was raised in, he says, "Frankenstein's academic pursuit is a rebellion against the moral obligation between father and son." (Dussinger 38). The tension and enmity toward his father aroused not only because he did not explain to him, but he thinks that his father knew that Agrippa's books were considered forbidden knowledge and they were dangerous if not communicated properly to children because they provide unreal and inaccurate assumptions about the mysteries of creation. Victor blames his father for not trying hard to protect him, he says, "if instead of this remark, my father had taken the pains and explain to me that the principles of Agrippa were totally exploded" (Shelley 22). This remark did not prevent him from reading Agrippa, but he was not able to share his thought with his father and lacked proper guidance since a child's mind was not able to judge and check his own ideas about his reading, he says "I often wished to communicate these secrets stores of knowledge to my father, yet his indefinite censure of my favourite Agrippa always withheld me" (Shelley 22). After at he noticed the power of electricity, this inspired him to combine his knowledge of Agrippa with principles of galvanism, which is the ability to produce electricity by a chemical reaction. This discovery aroused his ambition, and he imagined that his scientific pursuit would enable him to discover the elixir of life, where he would be able to apply his knowledge to reanimate dead bodies and cure them from death (23).

It is important to mention two incidents that preceded his departure to Ingolstadt. The first thing is that his parents decided that he should become a student at the University of Ingolstadt without asking his opinion, he says, "my parents resolved that I should become a student at the University of Ingolstadt. I had hitherto attended the schools of Geneva; but my father thought it necessary, for the completion of my education, that I should be acquainted with other customs than those of my native country" (Shelley 25). What he means by "my parents resolved", is his father accompanied by his mother' agreement; we remember that it was his father who brought him Elisabeth to be his future wife, and it was his father who prohibited him from reading books he loved. Victor knows that in patriarchal system nobody has power and can decide

except fathers. The second issue is that we notice how Alphonso's sense of sympathy is missed towards Victor. He orders him to travel to the University not long after Caroline's death, that Victor did not have enough time to recover or to be consoled (26).

Leaving his native community allowed Victor to recognise his emotional and intellectual separateness. It offered him an exit from his social and familial relationships that bounded his ambition and moved him from the narrow social web to the wide world in which he perceived that his existence was higher than his native society. This independence and liberation from any kind of censorship or supervision, induced the ego to purchase an illicit dream of creating an unlawful work, which he regretted later (35). When he told his story to Walton, he advised to learn from his experience and not follow dreams so ardent and ungraded as he was then, he says, "how dangerous is the acquirement of knowledge, and how much happier is that man who believes his native town to be the world, than he who aspires to become greater than his nature will allow" (Shelley 32).

After possessing the knowledge and ability to reanimate dead bodies, Victor thought of creating a being like himself or smaller (32), he was chasing his dream of becoming a creator, motivated by pride and selfishness, because he wanted to show off as the father who produced a being from nothing, thereafter, this being should honour him as a God, he says, "a new species would bless me as its creator and source. No father could claim the gratitude of his child so completely as I should deserve theirs" (Shelley 33). While Alphonso wanted to have children to serve his country, Victor wanted a child that would function as an object that refers to the maker hand and praise his craftsmanship. Anyway, to be completely grateful to your father, it supposes that the child ought to feel really happy and be well linked to his familial environment and satisfied with who he/she is; Victor does not feel the same toward his father. Victor's concept of fatherhood was shallow and limited and focuses mostly on the material side like the physical appearance and the expected benefit of his work. His thinking was peripheral so that he neglected other sides of his new creature such as the new child's name, legitimacy, identity, future, and whether it would be possible for this creature to live in society and be accepted by society members or not, all what he sought to have is a nice-looking creature. His irresponsibility manifests in bringing an illegitimate child to the world and leaving it behind soon after birth. He was busy of approving what he can do as a scholar, and physical appearance was the only thing he thought of regarding his new product. As soon as he finished his work and gave life to it, the creature looked ugly, strange, and different and caused the fear of Victor "unable to endure the aspect of the being I had created, I rushed out of the room" (Shelley 36).

The reason of the creature's ugliness is Victor's misjudgement of perceiving body parts as beautiful when separate, while he did not imagine how they would look like when united in one body and presented as a whole, he says "I had selected his features as beautiful" (Shelley 35). It seems that Victor inherited some of his father's faults when he cared mostly of the appearance of his new creature, where he sought to make him look beautiful. Victor justifies his fault by saying that he had good intentions, he wanted to benefit mankind by solving the problem of death. When the creature started moving for the first time, it seemed detached from Victor and looked different from which it was under work, he says that "I had gazed on him while unfinished, he was ugly then; but when those muscles and joints were rendered capable of motion, it became a thing such as even Dante could not have conceived" (Shelley 36). The feelings and the shock that Victor had, when he saw the new-born creature started moving in front of him, is more like the birth trauma in which the mother experiences panic attack and feels guilty of giving birth and wishes to get rid of her baby. To treat this birth trauma, Victor needed intervention of somebody to help him accept the existence of the new being. In addition, Victor's behaviour towards his baby indicates that his communication skills are not functioning properly. We notice that he avoids looking at the creature or even hearing the murmurs of the new-born being, he says, "he might have spoken, but I did not hear" (Shelley 36). The irresponsibility of the new father is in full swing since the birth hour. When the baby started breathing, his father left him and fled away (36). When Victor recovers from his fever after animating the creature, he states that his first thought would fly to communicate with his family and reanimate the ignored relationships with his family forgetting his responsibility towards his new family; the new-born creature, he says to Henry, "is that all? my dear henry. How could you suppose that my first thought would not fly towards those dear, dear friends whom I love, and who are so deserving of my love?" (Shelley 40).

The creature was abandoned by Victor because he was not aesthetically pleasing as Victor wanted him to be. Victor behaved as a negligent father because the final result of his hard work was no more than a hideous creature that did not grant Victor the desired happiness and glory (36). The ethical responsibility of Victor towards his offspring obliges him to accept it no matter how it looked like and present to the world as the work of his own hands, as if it were beautiful and pleasant. According to Claridge, we should not forget that Victor himself is a victim of his parents failure, she says, "In noting Frankenstein's brutal disregard of any parental duties, we should recall his analysis of his parents reaction's to him as a child" (Claridge 20). Victor repeats what he experienced of lack of passion and lack of guidance in his childhood in

his relation with the Creature; he not think that he is accountable for the result of his own deeds. The creature was a mere dream that belonged nowhere except for Victor's imagination, but now it became a reality, and the fault of Victor was to neglect its existing and belonging to him being the source and the founder of the creature.

When Victor and the monster meet for the first time, Victor treats the creature as his enemy and he speaks to him as an omnipotent God, he threatens, "Begone, vile insect! Or rather stay, that I may trample you to dust!" (Shelley 67), and pretends that he can take the monster's life, ignoring any commitment towards him. Celina Jeray discusses that Victor's parental failure is clearly disclosed in his negligence and bad treatment of the Creature, she says,

> Overall, Victor – perhaps a Shelleyan reminiscence of Rousseau – neglected his duty as a parental figure in the life of his Creature. However, he also failed as a person approaching the Other. His attitude is characterised by his monstrous immorality; he lacked a sense of justice, he had no kindness and openness, which resulted in his overwhelming distrust, disrespect, intolerance and oppressiveness. (Jeray 69)

Victor does not only shirk his responsibility as the creature's father, but he insults and threatens the creature as well. While the monster addresses Victor as his family and his connection to the world, the monster replies, "yet you, my creator, detest and spurn me, thy creature, to whom thou art bound by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of us" (Shelley 68). The monster realizes that he is dependent on Victor and he cannot belong to the society of men unless through its source and maker, therefore he calls Victor to consider the ties that connect them together. The monster is new in society; nobody likes him and everybody fears him because he looks strange and ugly; therefore, he asks his maker, who knows him well, to introduce him to the society of men to guarantee that he can live in peace with humans. The monster's situation is quite similar to the situation of the refugees in Europe; they are feared because they are different; they look different, speak different, have different religion, and different morals. In addition, there is a fear akin to Victor's in Western society that the creature reacts to, much the way radicalised Muslims have done.

The circumstances of the creature birth and his exclusion had deprived him from enjoying his childhood. When he talks to Victor, he speaks as his grown-up child who asks for his right of fatherhood and reminds Victor of his duty towards his own creation, being his only connection to the world, if not as a father, at least as a God who brought him to life, he pleads, "Do your duty towards me, and I will do mine towards you and the rest of mankind" (Shelley

68). The creature knows how to negotiates with Victor; he barters peace for coexistence. If you introduce me to society and admit that I belong to you, I will be peaceful and useful to you and your society, but if you neglect me and banish me, then I will declare war on all mankind. The monster's disobedience comes as a result of Victor's renunciation and irresponsibility towards him.

The reason why Victor could not perform his role as a father and relinquished the familial ties towards his progeny is attributed to his lack of these ties towards his family. The creature wants Victor to recognise their filiation and listen to him because he is the source of the creature's misery. Victor, at first, refuses to listen to the monster's complaints, because he realises that it is impossible for human beings to embrace such a hideous and murderous creature among them. In the beginning, Victor plays his father's role by avoiding the creature calls for communication, but after repeating his requests urgently, the monster succeeds at convincing Victor of his duty toward his creature, Victor says, "for the first time, also, I felt what the duties of a creator towards his creature were, and that I ought to render him happy before I complained of his wickedness". Both of Victor and the monster suffered from bad communications with their fathers. Victor could not share his secrets with his father because Victor feared scolding.

As for the monster, we notice that his personality was developed through different stages of his being and was shaped and changed by the different situations and conditions where he experienced the world. His journey starts soon after his birth when he was left alone in Victor's apartment, where he runs in the world and tests hunger, thirst, heat and cold (70). In the beginning he was not religious, yet he had morals by nature, he was good and wanted to do good to people and wanted to communicate but he got a bad treatment every time he meets people, he recalls, "I was benevolent, my soul glowed with love and humanity: but am I not alone, miserably alone?" (Shelley 68). According to Franco Moretti the creature, in the beginning, was just like the proletariat of the nineteenth century, a marginalised and excluded group who demanded its rights of citizenship (69). The monster was, similarly, deprived from his rights and all what he sought for was his rights of recognition and acceptance, argues Moretti. He says, "The monster's explicit 'demands' cannot in fact produce fear. They are not a gesture of challenge; they are 'reformist' demands. The monster wishes only to have rights of citizenship among men" (Moretti 70). The monster, in the beginning wanted to belong to society, he did not turn to violent until he was attacked and refused repeatedly and became convinced that he will not be accepted whatsoever.

After having a language, he became enlightened and by reading books such as *Paradise Lost*, he became religious because he took them as a real history. The monster started identifying himself with Adam once and with Satan other times. After his awakening and fulfilling his education he tended to read the scripts of Victor and took them as his own holy book or his own bible, where he found the recipe of his formation and the all the information he needed about his maker and his address. At first, he was fascinated by the neighbourhood of man for that reason he wished to communicate and like Adam he wished to have a female partner, he says, "no Eve soothed my sorrows or shared my thoughts; I was alone." (Shelley 91). When his order was refused by Victor, he started identifying himself with Satan being cursed, banished, and lonely in his wretchedness, he moans, "shall each man, cried he, finds a wife for his bosom, and each beast have his mate, and I am alone!" (Shelley 120). His envy and rage aroused because he felt not only banished but oppressed and unfree, where he cannot choose where to live or how to live. That ties with Zizek's argumentation about the violent refugees; when refugees fail to be part of society, they resort to violence to revenge from the society which did not accept them, driven by their envy and frustration (Zizek 98).

The monster understands the duty fathers owe their children. He gives an example of two families where the relation between fathers and sons was put to the test. The DeLacy family resembles the ideal family for the monster, where the father accepts his son's discretion, putting the whole family at risk of arrest and exile (chapter VI). We see that the father of the DeLacy is even though blind, yet listening, compassionate and kind (78). This kindness is well repaid by his sons as they love, respect, and take care of him "Nothing could exceed the love and respect which the younger cottagers exhibited towards their venerable companion. They performed towards him every little office of affection and duty with gentleness; and he rewarded them by his benevolent smiles" (Shelley 76). Company, speech, and tenderness were the factors that affected the creature the most. He who has no family, and no connections felt the meaninglessness of his life when he watched the DeLacy family, he bemoans, "they enjoyed one another's company and speech, interchanging each day looks of affection and kindness" (Shelley 76). The De Lacy school taught him that one's existence is dependent on having healthy social relationships, for our social communication gives meaning to our lives. However, the monster's discovery of the importance of having relations, awakened him to realize his misery being cut off any history or relations, he says, "no father had watched my infant days, no mother had blessed me with smiles and caresses" (Shelley 84). This awakening

resembles a turning point in his life because he felt the need to belong somewhere and started looking for his relations or those who would regard him as kin in some way.

Furthermore, the monster was very impressed by the story of Safie. He learns from her how the dishonest fathers behave and how their deception should be resisted (86). The similarities between Safie's story and the creature's story invites us to think that she is just a creature who succeed at fighting against the reasons of his misery and alienation, and she gave a lesson to the monster of what to do and how to rebel against exclusion and elimination. Safie's mother was a Christian Arab who was seized and enslaved by the Turks and recommended by her beauty she was made a wife by a Turkish merchant. Safie belongs to her mother's religion and values and abhors those of the Turks where women are not allowed to take a rank in society, the monster recounts "she instructed her daughter in the tenets of her religion and taught her to aspire to higher powers of intellect, and an independence of spirit, forbidden to the female followers of Mahomet" (Shelley 86). In both of Turkish and Arabic culture, sons usually relate to their fathers and belong to their cultures as well. Safie was brought up by her mother to be like her and to believe in her religion. For her mother's part, to bring up her daughter and educate her to belong to the mother culture and religion is a kind of resistance against her captivity and alienation. Anyway, her father was a Turkish merchant who used lived in Paris for some time and was framed and put in prison for a crime he did not commit, the narrator says, "it was judged that his religion and wealth, rather than the crime alleged against him, had been the cause of his condemnation" (Shelley 85). This discrimination against the Turkish will lead him to betray Felix who released him from prison and break his promise to Felix and Safie and flee away. When Safie discovered her father's intentions of betrayal, she tried hard to convince him fulfil his promise and she was very upset by his behaviour, but he did not listen to her and commanded her to travel with him (87), the monster narrates, "he loathed the idea that his daughter should be united to a Christian" (Shelley 86). The Turkish was married to a Christian Arab but did not want his daughter to get marry Felix because he was discriminated against and because the system was unjust and did not protect him when he was accused. When her father fled to Turkey, Safie was left alone without language and connection, exactly as the creature found himself in Victor apartment. She found information about the address of Felix in her father's paper which helped her to find her lover and seek to be unified with her real connections and live where she really belongs to, the creature says, "the Arabian was left alone, unacquainted with the language of the country, and utterly ignorant of the customs of the world" (Shelley 88). The creature's later plans were somehow modelled on those of Safie. He

succeeded to find Victor's address in the clothes he took with him from Victor's apartment and planned to find Victor and be reunified with him as the one he relates to.

The story of Robert Walton is another example of how improper guidance as to moderation of ambition and passion has blinded the west. Joseph Lew argues that stories of discovery in Frankenstein reflect the Western obsession with the Orient at that time and the desire of exploring and taking over the Orient (276). He writes, "Walton's fantasies, unrealistic as they seem today, were not unique. His dream of the warm land indicates that, like Victor, he is a devotee of exploded systems" (Lew 259). Since he was a child, Robert was fond of reading about discovery voyages of North pole, yet his father banned him from reading books of sea life and discovery, Robert recalls "my education was neglected, yet I was very fond of reading" (Shelley 8). When Alphonso rebuked Victor for reading the works of Agrippa, he justified that by saying that they were sad trash, while Robert's father did not explain why he did not allow Robert of chasing his dreams, unless he perceived them as extreme ambitions of a child who wanted to leave his native land and sail off to towards lands never imprinted by the foot of man before, Robert remembers "these volumes were my study day and night, and my familiarity with them increased that regret which I felt, as a child, on learning that my father's dying injunction had forbidden my uncle to allow me to embark in a sea-faring life" (Shelley 8). Robert do not hide his anger of the limitation set by his father, yet he complied to his decision and tried to be a poet, but he failed. After his father's death, Robert ignored his father's will and started out his enterprise to discover new parts of the world which he thinks will give him fame and glory (9). We notice that the letters are not exchanged, it is only him who sends letter home, we never see a reply from his sister. It seems that his sister also disagrees with him regarding his interest of discovery and that she predicted him to fail, he says "you will rejoice to know that no disaster has accompanied the commencement of an enterprise which you have regarded with such evil forbidding" (Shelley 8). This opening of Robert letters to his sister is more than good news that he is safe, it is a ridicule of the family rules by the rebel son. Sometimes he intends to torture her by saying that he will not return, or that his ship is stuck in ice and they will not survive, and telling her that she will wait, and misses hopes of his return and that despair will hurt her , Robert addresses Margaret, "yet what, Margaret, will be the state of your mind? You will not hear of my destruction, and you will anxiously await my return. Years will pass and you will have visiting of despair, and yet be tortured by hope" (Shelley 153). This seems to be his method of vengeance and serves as proof of further disordered sense of belonging that increases his alienation in the novel.

In general, we have two prominent motifs in all the stories in *Frankenstein* that lay a foundation for how we can understand the problems outsiders within culture face. While Victor and Robert seek to relinquish the ties that link them to family and community and seek to follow their ambitions outside the family and society boundaries, the Creature and Safie seek unity with family, loved ones and society. The parent's failure is reflected through the bad communication between fathers and sons and fuelled by father's irresponsibility and deficiency to guide and follow up their children. The parent's negligence leads sons to rebel against their families and societies, and this rebellion is usually motivated by ambition and accompanied by overprioritizing it, adding misjudgement and misconduct. These heroic fatal flaws, depicted in early Western literature as well, may correlate to The West's current trouble welcoming others and the subsequent radicalization that results from it. That which designed the bad conclusions of these stories is alive and well in the hearts of newcomers to Europe from Muslim countries today.

5.2 Friendship:

If we are to synopsize the plot of *Frankenstein*, we can say that one main motif that exacerbates the events of the story is the search for a friend who can sympathise and close the bitterness of loneliness and this is another point of connection with current issues in Europe today where newcomers and migrants are feeling alienation. One source of alienation is Victor's pain from the lack of true belonging and fatherly friendship and attention in his early childhood, and it is passed on in his refusal of the friendship of his creature. Walton, the sea-farer, is looking for two things, glory and friendship, but he gains none of them. The monster's adversity is that his friendship is undesirable due to myopic interpretation of beauty, therefore, he commits a series of crimes to avenge the cause of his misery.

Beginning with Walton, in his second letter to Margaret, Walton says that the lack of friendship in his life causes him pain as he finds no friend who can communicate his feeling with, he complains, "I have no friend Margaret: when I am glowing with enthusiasm of success, there will be none to participate my joy; if I am assailed by disappointment, no one will endeavour to sustain me in dejection." (Shelley 10). If we were happy, we need a friend who share this happiness with us, and if we were depressed, we need a friend also who can support us and help us to overcome our grief. The creature discovers this fact observing the DeLacy family as I have shown in the previous section. Walton has never had a friend, neither tasted

the sweetness of friendship, moreover, he suffered the bitterness of friendship absence and isolation as he pursues his work as an explorer. He is, like Robinson Crusoe, communicating his feelings to a handmade object, a paper, and this communication medium deprives him of the humane response. The advantage of the human-human communication is the mutuality and the exchange of thought. When lacking the merit of this reciprocity, it means that one's ideas stays unrevealed, thoughts remain unchecked, and faults remain unrepaired, which is the most dangerous part in this situation. Walton believes that it is impossible to find a friend in Archangel among merchants and sea-men, thus his complaints are useless, because he is in the wrong place for doing so. Finding a suitable friend requires searching in the right environment. A suitable friend according to Walton's viewpoint is a person who speaks the same language as you and a friend who can communicate with you is preferred, a person who shares you certain ideas, principles, dreams or memories. These conditions exist in his lieutenant; an Englishman, noble, amiable, and generous, but as Robert explains, "he cannot endure to spill blood", which means that he is from the same environment and not the same nature as Walton, therefore, he can't be the wanted friend. We notice that Walton's letter receiver is not responding, and his letters and feeling remain not replied, which leads us to think that he is just an autophobic and has no sister either, and that he sends to an imaginary sister to break his alienation. He closes his third letter by saying "remember me to all my English friends,", the friends who did not exist in his life as he stated earlier. After rescuing Victor, he started looking at him as a brother in the beginning and not a friend, being a European and interesting creature meant that they were linked in some way to be considered as brothers and equals but not friends because friendship demands a higher degree of mutual understanding, add to that, friendship relations need some time to be built. Anyway, when they start trust each other, Walton explain his need of a friend to Victor who understands what it means to be in need for a friend, but he refuses for there is no chance for him to start new relationships as he lost hope in survival and at the end of his journey, while the other is still at the beginning.

As for Victor, he had one friend only, Henry Clerval, a talented boy and a son of one of his father's intimate friends. Victor enjoyed the company of Clerval, but the friendship wasn't so deep that he can reveals his secrets to Clerval. Clerval's interests were different, and Victor loved him as a brother and a familiar face and not as a close friend "I loved my brothers, Elisabeth, and Clerval, these were old familiar faces" (Shelley 27). Victor's self-conceit prevents him from seeking friendship, his regards of his own ideas and abilities makes him look at his companions as playfellows, unequal and less than being taken as friends, maybe as

brothers at best. This self-pride may affect his enterprise, and caused the deformity of the creature, where he seemed very confident about his work and strongly believed in his abilities, hence he did not pay much attention to the details and could not predict the final shape of his creature. This fault caused that the final result was a being less than man. The intense pursuit of the elixir of life represents the dark side of Victor's character, an image that moves him to a more negative stage beyond normal relationships because the elixir and his fame due to its discovery was his goal, not a relationship with the creature it produced or the people it might benefit. Victor recounts that, "study had before secluded me from the intercourse of my fellow-creatures, and rendered me unsocial; but Clerval called forth the better feelings of my heart; he again taught me to love the aspect of nature, and the cheerful faces of children" (Shelley 45). When he flees from the monster, the first person he meets was Clerval, who takes care of him and nurses him as a loving sister during his sickness (39). Clerval represents the innocence of Victor, the true and natural image of a companion and who he might have been had his parental relationships been normal. Clerval links him to his childhood, family, society, charitable normality of authentic belonging.

As for the monster, friendship of man was his elixir of life since he was banished, undesired, and disliked. His first contact with the villagers showed him the barbarity of man and alerted him to his misfortunes, nevertheless, when he watched the Delacy family, he liked their manners and knew that not all humans are heartless, and he soon wished to become a friend of them (77). The experience of the monster teaches us how important is showing kindness towards newcomers and immigrants because it motivates them to seek friendship and communion with the locals. The gentleness of the DeLacys led the monster to help them without their knowing. When hen he discovered that they suffered because of poetry, he thought to go at night and pile wood for them and put in front of their cottage (77). This friendly act towards people he does not know, and they who do not owe him anything, was unconditioned by any purpose except for feeling himself useful to the community, specifically his new neighbours. He tried to seem beneficial to neighbours and society by doing something that can help others. Work was the only mean that can introduce him to neighbours and society as a beneficial being, and not a feared enemy. By doing services to his neighbours, he wanted to help them to have their needs of woods and warmth, and to make them feel happy. These services, in turn, made him feel good about himself because it taught him that he can influence others through work (77). The monster planned to talk to the blind man and convince him first because he cannot see the differences between them and will not judge him based on his shape,

however when the younger cottagers came in, they attacked him immediately even before they listened to him, the monster says, “to be friendless is indeed to be unfortunate; but the hearts of men, when unprejudiced by any obvious self-interest, are full of brotherly love and charity” (Shelley 91). The creature turned out to be a monster only because his friendship appeal was refused, and his gentleness was countered by harshness of men. He says, I, “wished to tear up the trees, spread havoc and destruction around me, and then to have sat down and enjoyed the ruin” (Shelley 95). His extreme anger tainted his pure thoughts and radicalised his person, thereafter he sought to take revenge of all human beings and his first crime was burning the cottage of the Delacy family (97). However, Jeray argues that despite of his violent response, the monster deeds do not make him monstrous by nature, she says,

> As cruel as some of the Creature’s deeds were, they all can be to some degree excused by his motives, his pain and despair. And cruelty is not identical with moral monstrosity. This means that whatever cruelties he later performed, all of them were (at times unintentional) perversions of justice, which he saw as originally violated by his creator, cowardly and self-seeking Victor. (Jeray 65)

The monster’s cruelty was incited by his creator’s negligence, and by people’s friendlessness towards him.

When failed to befriend a man the monster started thinking of having a companion of the same species. The unsuccessful attempt to integrate in the outside community, pushed him back to find somebody like him who have shared characteristics. Later when Victor broke the deal and destroyed the female creature, the monster killed Clerval to let Victor experience the misery of not having a friend. According to Jeray, the monster would not resort to revenge if Victor had befriended him or helped him to get a friend, she says, “Given the promise of receiving a companion, the Creature was even less prone to harm others, patiently awaiting the emergence of a friend with whom he could withdraw from the rest of the human society” (Jeray 65). Thus, killing Clerval parallels the destruction of the female monster on the hands of Victor.

This demonstrates the vicious circle that is set in motion when people neglect their duty to those in need for connections that make life meaningful. The novel also addresses the impact of mythical underpinnings guiding individuals.

5.3 Higher Powers vs Free Will

In *Frankenstein*, the concept of destiny and fate is used repeatedly by the three protagonists to mask their irresponsibility, conceal their faults, or to justify their egoistic projects. Every time destiny is used in the novel, it functions as an excuse to illustrate why certain things or events happened to somebody or to explain why somebody did something. Destiny in the Cambridge dictionary is defined as: the force that some people think controls what happens in the future, and is outside human control ("Destiny"). In other words, destiny is everything happens to us without being able to predict it or resist it. The three main narrators in *Frankenstein,* Victor, Robert, and the monster, believe that they were destined to fulfil certain missions and perform certain roles that are imposed on them, and they claim that they need to follow their destinations to the end. Both Victor and Robert claim that they cannot change their plans and give up their missions because they were assigned to them. Robert, in his second letter, clarifies that his return to England is non-negotiable because he is following a predetermined destiny, he says, "but do not suppose that, because I complain a little, or because I can conceive a consolation for my toils which I may never know, that I am wavering in my resolutions. Those are as fixed as fate" (Shelley 11). What Robert calls fate here and blames for his persistence on his project is Robert's obsession with fame and glory. Robert believes that men of knowledge and strong resolve like him entitled to confer treasures of knowledge and prosperity on their lands. Robert challenges the complicated circumstances of his journey and tolerates his sense of isolation for the sake of following a dream he felt was irresistible. To avoid any possible blame in the future, he does not blame himself for not adhering to his father's injunction and for his irresponsibility towards his crew's safety, rather he lays the blame on his fate as an alienating force driving his actions. Robert claims that he is not free to return and leave his project because he has to follow his pre-set destiny.

Victor, as well, shares the same belief in fate, he encounters Robert's appeal for friendship by refusal because he thinks that he completed his role in life and cannot begin new relationships, he says, "I have lost everything, and cannot begin life anew" (Shelley 17). Victor is not only finding a reason to refuse Robert's friendship, but he is preparing Robert and the reader to say that what happened to me was not just a result of my lofty ambition and my irresponsibility towards my family and my friends, but it was something beyond my ability to defy. Robert feels that Victor was not mistaken when he followed his fate, yet maybe some

circumstances did influence his work and led to his failure, therefore he wished to hear Victor's story to learn from him, he says, "I felt the greatest eagerness to hear the promised narrative, partly from curiosity, and partly from a strong desire to ameliorate his fate, if it were in my power" (Shelley 18). Robert thinks that fate needs some changes, but he is unsure if he has the right to do so, because it is in the hands God. Moreover, Victor confirms that there is no chance for new ties because his fate does not permit new chances, he says, "I thank you, he replied, for your sympathy, but it is useless; my fate is nearly fulfilled" (Shelley 18). Victor is convinced that he is unfree to decide what chances he can take or leave because he is guided by an unseen force, i.e., God. Victor explained that he was born in a patriarchal society, and he was raised to be the heir of his father's wealth and position, he says, "of these I was the eldest, and the destined successor to all his labours and utility" (Shelley 19). Being the legal inheritor of his father's fortunes and position, Victor knew that he was obliged to meet the expectations of his family and his society of becoming fit to such a role. Victor, since a child, saw the world as a secret that he wanted to discover (20). This passion to investigate the facts of the world was fed up with reading natural philosophy that offered him a source of information to his inquiries about the source of life and the process of creation, he says, "natural philosophy is the genuine that has regulated my fate" (Shelley 22). One of the things Victor regrets is reading natural philosophy because it was the start point in his downfall.

At Ingolstadt, Victor regretted wasting his time in learning natural philosophy after he was scolded by Mr. Krempe, for it was useless and outdated knowledge, and he realised that he was ignorant (29). However, the other professor, Mr. Waldman, supported him and advised him to combine his knowledge of old sciences with theories of new sciences namely chemistry if he wanted to make some achievements, the words of Mr. Waldman guided victor to get over his previous mistake and encouraged him complete his project by setting a new plan for his future education, he says, "thus ended a day memorable to me; it decided my future destiny" (Shelley 30). Victor's future destiny meant that he will continue his work to make a creature similar to man which would refer to Victor as his great creator. Despit the horrible failure of Victor project and its terrible consequences, Victor insists that he is irresponsible for his decisions and plans because they were plotted by an unseen hand and were put in his way, he says, "when younger, said he, I felt as if I were destined for some great enterprise. My feelings are profound; but I possessed a coolness of judgment that fitted me for illustrious achievements" (Shelley 152). Victor denies all responsibility for his faults, he felt that his circumstances denote that he was born to do something great and everything happened seemed natural and necessary for the

completion of Victor's great discoveries. In his final speech, Victor disclose that all what he has done was plotted by God and imposed on him, therefore he has no choice but to follow his destiny until the end, he says, "you may give up your purpose; but mine is assigned to me by heaven, and I dare not" (Shelley 156).

The monster, on the other hand, was first tormented by his ignorance of the circumstances of his existence; he did not know where he came from, why people feared him, and why he is destined to be alone (83). After having education, the monster was also tormented by the idea that his deformity and wretchedness are the fruit of the irresponsibility of a man who framed his miserable destiny and left it unchanged, he says, "cursed creator! Why did you form a monster so hideous that even you turned from in disgust? God in pity made man beautiful and alluring after his own image; but my form is a filthy type of your's" (Shelley 91). Anyway, the monster could not endure that his fate is plotted by somebody else and he need to accept it as it is. The monster wanted to set free from the determination of his fate, from his eternal seclusion; he wanted to own friendship and love and sought to prove his destiny wrong, he says, "I resolved, at least, not to despair, but in every way to fit myself for an interview with them which would decide my fate" (Shelley 91). In modern times, most immigrants suffer from seclusion and lack the sense of belonging to their new communities; to overcome the conditions of their alienation, most new commers try to challenge their circumstances by learning the language of the new community and finding a job to show that they are useful in order to communicate and integrate with their new surroundings. In return, when these endeavours fail, people who first sought integration become indignant and, like the monster, turn out to violence to get revenge on those who caused their misery.

Destiny functions as an external power in *Frankenstein,* it has a huge influence on individuals and their choices in life. For Victor and Robert, destiny is used to defend their decisions and projects in life and works as an excuse for their indiscretion an as a cover for their irresponsibility. In contrast, the monster sees destiny as an enemy of his free choice and as a barrier that prevent his dreams of becoming social being to come true, therefore when he fails to escape its control, he decides to fight against it until the end of his life.

5.4 Repercussions of Alienation in *Frankenstein*

Frankenstein is an epic of alienated beings. The three main characters in the novel; Robert, Victor, and the creature have problems with social inclusion, disconnection with surroundings, and belongness. The three protagonists find themselves alienated from their families and their societies because they had different views, opinions, values, ambitions as in the case of Robert and Victor, and sometimes because of having different appearance as in the case of the creature. Furthermore, most minor characters in the novel endure influences of social alienation such as disconnection, belonging, and social seclusion. When one's goals, interests, values, or plans collide with those of the rest of society; man becomes defiant and rebellious because he finds himself in an open battle with the world around him. The society in *Frankenstein* is presented as an ideal cluster of rich, educated, beautiful, and well-respected people of great lineage. Members of society who do not comply with these inputs, lose their social bonds and positions, and find themselves rejected and alienated from the community. From Victor's laboratory to the shed of the DeLacy's farm, and to the stuck ship in the icy water of the North Pole, we follow our three protagonists in their struggle against these societal requisites, through a set of events to investigate the echoes of alienation in/on these characters and how it provides a view toward the radicalized immigrants living in Europe.

5.4.1 Walton

Robert Walton is an English explorer who embarked on an expedition to explore regions near the North pole (7). Robert's journey was on the expense of his familial and social ties. Robert departed his native land and lost connection with his sister to pursue his dream. In his first letter, after reassuring that he is safe, Robert seemed homesick and expressed his agony of being far north of his country, he says, "I feel a cold northern breeze play upon my cheeks, which braces my nerves, and fills me with delight. Do you understand this feeling?". The feeling he talks about is the feeling of being alone and far from home, which his sister apparently did not understand because women did not play any significant role outside the domestic atmosphere, thus Margaret, like all women at that time was not allowed to practice work in public or to seek personal fame, she had to stay at home and take care of the house and the family. Robert claims that what consoles him and make his loneliness bearable is that he will reach undiscovered lands and will contribute to more scientific advances which will confer knowledge and prosperity on humanity, he says, "you cannot contest the inestimable benefit which I shall confer on all mankind to the last generation" (Shelley 8). Robert wants to say that

he is not just an adventurer driven and enslaved by his desires, rather he is risking his life to serve humanity by finding roads to new regions and making new geographic and scientific discoveries. Robert's extreme ambition reveals his arrogance as he, in the beginning, puts his crew's safety in danger to seek praise and glory (153). Since he was a child, Robert was obsessed with reading about discovery voyages, but his obsession was rejected by his father who neglected Robert's education and banned him of becoming what he dreamt of, an explorer, as discussed in the previous section. After his father's death, Robert rebelled against his tyrannical father's decision and worked hard to achieve his ambition, fuelled by his pursuit of glory and knowledge, he says, "my life might have been passed in ease and luxury; but I preferred glory to every enticement that wealth placed in my path" (Shelley 9). Robert sought to attain a personal glory which exceeds all luxuries of life in upper class society. Anyway, Robert is tormented being heading northward away from his homeland, but he gets even more tortured when he imagines that he might return to his native land empty-handed. His conflict with his father might aroused his arrogance and he wanted to succeed to prove his father wrong, therefore he became angry when he imagined that his dream of attaining glory was about to end and that he needs to return to England, he says, "when shall I return? Ah, dear sister, how can I answer this question? If I succeed, many, many months, perhaps years, will pass before you and I may meet. If I fail, you will see me again soon, or never" (Shelley 9). It is not Robert as a person who cannot meet his sister; it is his career and his work that cannot occur within his social relations. Robert's determination embodies one of the typical maladies of the upper class where the material egocentric interests of individuals win over the worn-out domestic relationships.

Robert had no friends, yet we notice that he longs for the very communication and companionship he was born with but chose to discard and trade for fame and heroism toward his fellow man. He is, on top of everything else, is very communicative. We should not forget that he is the first author of Frankenstein's story. Without Robert's letters nobody would have heard of Frankenstein and his monster. Robert anguished over loneliness and to escape his exclusion, he wrote these letters to his sister, Margaret, in England, he illustrates, "if I am assailed by disappointment, no one will endeavour to sustain me in dejection. I shall commit my thoughts to paper, it is true, but that is a poor medium for the communication of feeling" (Shelley 10). Paper can register and document his thoughts, but it cannot correct his faults if he had any. Victor's journey deprived him of proper human contact and sense of integrated belonging, he could not find a companion among the sailors on the ship because of the

differences between him and the rest of his crew in regard to his large ambition and his enormous plans. He wanted a friend who can sympathise with him, check his ideas, and support his dream (10). When Robert met Victor, he liked and admired him and thought that Victor is different from other men, he says, “I have never saw a more interesting creature” (Shelley 14). The company of Victor soothed his isolation and made him enjoy the sweetness of company for the first time in his life, he tells, “you may easily conceive that I was much gratified by the offered communication” (Shelley 17). The company of Victor influenced Robert and saved him. Robert learned from Victor’s experience and that led him to change his plans and return home with his crew at the end of the novel. Robert realised that he cannot accomplish his work alone without help of his crew and he cannot neglect his relationship with crew as he did neglect his familial relationships and responsibility; therefore, he shifted his work from attaining personal fame to saving his ship and his crew (157).

Robert sought glory and uniqueness through his life. He did not have an ordinary education and spent his childhood reading about voyages of great explorers. When his education was neglected, he tried to become a poet to attain glory and praise, but he failed to achieve singularity and fame. To overcome his disappointment, he reverted to his primary dream of becoming a sailor, but not any sailor, he wanted to be among the greatest explorers in history, anyway, he was stuck in icy water before getting to the north pole. After that, when he listened to Victor’s story, he paid careful attention to the details of the process of creating the monster and asked a lot of questions about the formation of the creature. We do not know why Robert is interested in creating a new monster. It could be that he wanted to seek glory by creating a creature better than that of Victor, or maybe he wanted to use him as a tool of vengeance of those who let him suffer. He himself is unsure about that, yet when Victor noticed his interest in the creature, he asked him, “are you mad my friend? Said he, or whither does your senseless curiosity lead you? Would you also create for yourself and the world a demonical enemy or to what your questions tend? (Shelley 151). The world here is at the first place is the person’s close network of family, relatives, and friends. What are the reasons that make somebody avenge his society unless he is tortured and excluded from society because of having different goals such as those of Robert. This hostility is fuelled by Robert’s sense of belonging to those great men who benefited mankind by their discoveries, which means that he does not belong to the ordinary men of his country. We notice that when he decided to return home, he says, “it is past; I am returning to England. I have lost my hopes of utility and glory, I have lost my friend” (Shelley 155). From the beginning of the novel, he used to say, “my dear England”,

and expressed nostalgia and affection to his homeland as he was heading northward, yet when he was forced to return, he says “I am returning to England”, as if it the most detested place in the world to him.

Robert did not get an ordinary education. He only read about voyages in his uncle’s library, which means that he was lonely since he was a child (10). This early alienation is the origin of his suffering because it led him to take bad decisions. He was amazed by the discoveries of the explorers and determined that he will be a discoverer. when his father knew of his ambition, he forbidden him of fulfilling it. Robert was tormented by his father’s rejection and sought to achieve glory and create his own paradise in poetry, but he failed and that caused him disappointment (8). After his father’s death, Robert returned to achieve his dream and sought to find his paradise and the country of “eternal light” beyond the lands of “frost and desolation” (7). The discrepancy between Robert’s ambition and his father’s will led him to look for an alternative paradise where he can fulfil his goals away of the society that banned him of following his dream. Robert’s journey to the north pole resembles a self-inflicted divorce from his familial and social belonging and it appears to be linked to the problems of patriarchy in the west that propelled Victor into following passion above all else.

5.4.2 Victor

Victor Frankenstein’s description of his early childhood as a happy one which had never infected by grief or discomfort does not really present a full image of his upbringing and his relationship with his family (21). His “doting parents” had taken care of his physical needs and offered him education and brought him a companion who became his playfellow, but it seems that they did not pay much attention to his emotional and intellectual needs. The most significant detail of Victor personality was his curiosity, he recalls, “the world was to me a secret, that I wanted to discover” (Shelley 20). Victor was detached from the adults around him, namely his parents, who could explain to him what the world is. At the age of thirteen, he suddenly became obsessed with reading books of Cornelius Agrippa which contented theories of creation. Books of Natural philosophy was like the drug that satiated Victor’s ardent curiosity and stirred up his imagination and lighted up his aspiration. Victor, like Walton, found his paradise in his seclusion as he was occupied by reading what he loved. This enthusiasm was soon oppressed because of his father’s opposing response to his interests (22). Victor tried to share his ideas with his cousin, Elisabeth, but she did not share him the same interest, so

continued reading secretly to avoid his father's objection, he recalls, "and I was left by her to pursue my studies alone" (Shelley 23). Victor was disappointed by the reaction of his surroundings to his interests, yet this negligence proved his separation. Victor was alienated because his imagination and ambition were not of an ordinary man. The kind of science he was obsessed with was odd to his milieu; as a son of bourgeoise family, he was expected to enjoy luxuries of life, get married, have sons, and try to keep the family wealth and position as his father once tried to do, so if he owned everything he needed in life why should he look for something else. Furthermore, Victor's studies estranged him from his family because he devoted himself to read prohibited sciences with curiosity, without any censorship or control of his family to his new ideas. During this isolation, Victor developed an extreme ambition that transcended the human possibilities. He did not seek wealth but glory and his ambition was to discover the elixir of life and to eradicate death (23). When he travelled to Ingolstadt, Victor found himself alone, yet he did not wish to accompany any new friends as he says, "I believed myself totally unfitted for the company of strangers" (Shelley 27). Not only strangers, but also relatives as he already had a bad experience in communicating with them. The circumstances of his new life in Ingolstadt served his enterprise because it offered him suitable conditions to pursue such a project. Mr. Krempe noticed that Victor's education is unconventional and mocked his interest in an outdated science, he comments, "in what desert land have you lived, where no one was kind enough to inform you that these fancies, which you have so greedily imbibed, are a thousand years old" (Shelley 27). Mr. Krempe was the first person who perceived the impact of alienation and seclusion on Victor. For Mr. Krempe, devoting his time to pursue this old science means that you have lived in a total seclusion where no contact was made with others who could advise or guide you. After this scolding by Mr. Krempe, Victor worked harder to learn modern science and become familiar with new theories not only to fit in the university system, but he thought that it can serve him to achieve his goal. Victor believed that his dream will not come true unless he possesses the secret of life, so he went down to graves and spent days and nights watching the process of body decay until he knew the secret of animation and became able of bestowing life upon dead bodies (32).

According to Christa Knellwolf, "extreme circumstances give rise to extreme behaviour" (qtd. In Shelley 508), accordingly; Victor's sever seclusion influenced his senses during the process of creation and led to forming an ugly creature, Victor recounts, "in a solitary Chambers, or rather cell, at the top of the house, and separated from all other apartments by a gallery and a staircase, I kept my workshop of filthy creation", he continues, "the dissecting

room and the slaughter-houses furnished many of my materials; and often did my human nature turn with loathing from my occupation" (Shelley 34), we can imagine that the creature is the result of work amid these awful circumstances of an alienated man. Like Walton who believed that the route to the lands of eternal light must pass through the lands of frost and desolation, Victor believed that he should examine the conditions of death to find the source of life. the bourgeoise's life did not amuse victor, he sought to grasp glory which necessarily demanded more risky work than becoming a public man of the state. Victor wanted to be recognised as higher than all his peers i.e. his friend Henry who wanted to be a tradesman just like his father, while Victor's sought to be referred to as a God (33).

When he finished his work, Victor sickened and was found by Henry in a very wretched condition (37). Henry attended him and brought him to life again and connected him to his family and normal life after he secluded himself for the sake of his study, Victor remembers, "study had before secluded me from the intercourse of my fellow-creatures, and rendered me unsocial, but Clerval called the better feelings of my heart" (Shelley 45). Victor understood the importance of companionship only after he was brought back to life by Henry, yet he did not think of the isolation and pain in the creature that he created when he abandoned him just hours after his birth.

On the other hand, we find that his father is wondering whether Victor still care about his family pain, he wonders, "absence cannot have rendered you callous to our joys and grieves, and how shall I inflict pain on an absent child?" (Shelley 46). His father suspects that Victor would be affected when he hears of his brother's death because it has been long time since he has left them, moreover, he does not console him, he just tells him what happened (46). After the death of William and the trial of Justine, Victor's seclusion transformed from being a plague to becoming a remedy needed to heal him from feeling shame and pain being the source and the author of the evils which haunted his family, he exposes, "solitude was my only consolation, deep, dark, death-like solitude" (Shelley 61). Victor realised that he created a monster that cannot fit in the society of men; however, he admits that the creature belongs to him and he had a duty towards it, he says, "for the first time, also, I felt what the duties of a creator towards his creature were, and that I ought to render him happy before I complained of his wickedness" (Shelley 70).

The death of Elisabeth affected Victor severely where he lost control of himself and people thought that he lost his mind, therefore he was put in prison. Linking madness to the

metaphorical alienation of the prison condemns both Victor and the social institutions. The creature was prisoned from the human contact not because he was mad but because he was ugly, although ugliness is not dangerous, while Victor was free even though his work brought a disaster to his family. However, Victor was thrown in prison when he started revealing his secret about the monster, because his story sounds unbelievable, he says, "for they had called me mad, and during many months, as I understood, a solitary cell had been my habitation" (Shelley 143). This is a mockery of social injustice, that people are judged based on their appearance, social class, and position in society not on what they commit, moreover, truth is relative and depend on who said it. Nobody wants to hear or believe the monster even though he says the truth about his goodness, on the contrary, nobody believes that Victor is the murderer and he, ironically, is not put in prison for admitting his crimes, but for saying a truth that sounded nonsense. After losing his family, Victor decides to go after the monster towards the north pole and kill him to avenge the murder of his family and his friend (145). Victor wanted to eradicate the monster because it was the reason behind his losses and misery.

Victor did not value his familial and social connections until they were taken from him on the hands of his creature. By killing and alienating the monster, Victor was punishing himself for his unfitting ambition. Victor himself was not an outsider in society, but he was alienated and enslaved by an unhealthy obsession that caused the birth of a creature that was unallowed to belong or integrate in the society.

5.4.3 The Creature

The creature had been alienated since birth or even before that; one can argue that he had been alienated since he was an odd idea in the head of Victor, because the idea of creating a creature from collected parts of dead bodies was unfamiliar and unacceptable. Furthermore, his alienation stims from being a bastard result of illegal curiosity. The creature was unlike victor, a Genevese by birth, nor like Robert, an upper-class English sailor who seeks individual fame and writes letters to his sister in England. The creature did not have an identity, a language, a name, or a family. The word creature is not a proper name; it is a word that refers to a living thing, real or imaginary, and can move, according to the Oxford Dictionary. The purpose of his creation was to prove his creator ingenuity and to emphasize his creator's supremacy, Victor recalls, "a new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent

natures would owe their being to me" (Shelley 33). Even his appearance was formed in a specific way to satisfy Victor's aesthetic taste, the parts that coined the creature were chosen according to Victor's preference, Victor says, "and I had selected his features as beautiful!" (Shelley 35). The primary reason for the abandonment of the creature by Victor was that he looked ugly and hideous after he started moving (35). Anyway, the ugliness of creature was not the fault of the creature himself, but according to Chris Baldick, because Victor collected him from different bodies, Baldick says, "the monstrosity of the creature is clearly enough the consequence of its assembly from different parts" (qtd. In Shelley 173). The creature in the beginning was judged based on his appearance; Victor was shocked that the result of his work looked ugly and he could not stand looking at it therefore he neglected and run away of it, Victor says, "unable to endure the aspect of the being I had created, I rushed out of the room, and continued a long time traversing my bed chamber, unable to compose my mind to sleep" (Shelley 36). According to Anne Mellor, the creature's appearance; his yellow skin and watery eyes suggests that he is of different race, and that is another reason why people did not embrace him, Mellor says, "The Creature then, is not an European, not Caucasian, but of some other race, like those found by Captain James Cook in his famous recent voyages to the Pacific Islands or by the East India Company's trading ships sailing among the spice islands in the Indian Ocean" (Mellor 2). The creature was banished because of his race. From the early beginning in the novel, Walton describes him as, "A savage inhabitant of some undiscovered land" (Shelley 14). This description establishes a binary opposition between Europeans/humans and the undiscovered lands and its savage inhabitants.

The creature was not just separated from his maker, but he was cursed, humiliated, and called a monster even before he does anything or utter a word, Victor called him a wretch, a miserable monster, and an ugly creature (36). Victor stigmatises his creature and exludes him, initially, by expecting that no human being will be able to embrace him because the creature looks ugly and different, he says, "oh! No mortal could support the horror of that countenance. A mummy again endued with animation could not be so hideous as that wretch" (Shelley 36). Victor did not leave a chance for the creature to present himself, he influences the way the creature would be judged by others. When listeners and readers hear or read Victor's description of the creature, they will detest him before they see him. Victor plays the role of a communication medium in demonising his creature, and he evidences his allegation by claiming that as much as the creature was horrible, he saw him in his dream and could not sleep because of that (36). Moreover, Victor demonises the creature by contrasting his presence by

the presence of Henry, Victor negates the humane characteristics of the creature by intensifying the effect of Henry presence on him, he says when he meets Henry, "I grasped his hand and in a moment forgot my horror and misfortune; I felt suddenly, and for the first time during months calm and serene joy" (Shelley 37). The communication with Henry, a human being and a friend of Victor, brought Victor back from his alienation to where he belongs, and distanced and estranged the creature from mankind as he seemed an outsider, alien and not belonging to humans. It is important to notice that how victor links ugliness to wickedness from the beginning. We can understand that the creature was hideous, but it is unexplained why Victor accuses the creature of being an evil. Victor founded the differences and then the enmity between him and his creature long before the creature turns to a monster and starts his killing series, when Victor returns to his room with Henry for the first time after the creature's birth, he says, "when I became assured that my enemy had indeed fled, I clapped my hands for joy" (Shelley 38). Later, when Victor came back to his family, he saw the creature around the murder site of his brother, then he immediately accused him of being the murderer with no evidence except for being the creature is an outsider, he says, "nothing in human shape could have destroyed that fair child. He was the murderer!" (Shelley 50). The lack of evidence in Victor's accusation reveals the prejudice and discrimination against the creature and reinforces his otherness and not belonging to the human society, Victor repents, "I should have thought such a creature unfit to remain in the society of men" (Shelley 63). After the double crime of the monster, Victor realised that the result of his enterprise had been turned to become such an uncontrolled evil, yet this perception is incomplete according to Sir Walter Scott because the monstrosity of the creature was a consequence of a long journey of abandonment, exile and mistreatment, he argues, "the result is, this monster, who was at first, according to his own account, but a harmless monster, becomes a ferocious and malignant, in consequence of finding all his approaches to human society repelled with injurious violence and offensive marks of disgust" (qtd. In Shelley 227). However, when the monster meets Victor for the first time, the monster seems very aware that he is unwelcomed and hated, therefore he did not come to ask for unification with his creator as one can imagine, but he had some demands and wanted Victor to admit his responsibility towards him and respond to his demands or he will continue his revenge, the monster threatens, "if you comply with my conditions, I will leave them and you at peace; but if you refuse, I will glut the maw of death, until it be satiated with the blood of your remaining friends" (Shelley 68). The monstrosity of the creature was a result of his exclusion of human contact and the bad treatment that he got of people he dealt with, he says, "I was benevolent; my soul glowed with love and humanity; but am I not alone, miserably

alone? You my creator abhor me, what hope can I gather from your fellow-creatures, who owe me nothing?" (Shelley 68). Percy Shelley argued in his review on Frankenstein that when you exclude someone of human contact and scorn him, the result would be an angry and malevolent monster, Shelley says, "treat a person ill, and he will be wicked" (qtd. in Shelley 214), Shelley concludes that refusing people and dividing them based on their kind will generate exclusion and disintegration (214). Furthermore, the monster's reaction towards people's hatred and mistreatment sounds logical and normal, as he hates people because they hate him and want to kill him, so he has no reason to stay good and kind (69).

The monster's trip was like that of an emigrant who found himself in a new land where he knew nobody and could not speak any language of that place. He suffered hunger, thirst, cold and loneliness, and had to educate himself and experience the world with self-guidance (72). The monster's ignorance of the social system, besides his appearance led to the first clash and refusal of his presence in the first village he arrived. He directly went down to the village and tried to amuse himself with food and shelter with no permission of the owners and with no previous calculation to their respond to a stranger among them, he says, "the whole village roused; some fled, and some attacked me, until, grievously bruised by stones and many other kinds of missile weapons, I escaped to the open country, and fearfully took refuge in a low hovel" (Shelley 73). The monster was eight feet tall and was able to destroy the village, yet he did not plan to revenge and did not behave according to the principle of reciprocity. He was attacked and hit, yet all what he did was to flee and seek asylum away from "the barbarity of man" as he said. (73). These bad experiences awakened the monster and drew his attention to some differences between him and people on one hand and between people themselves on the other hand. The monster realised that his attempts to socialise with humans had failed and that people were violent and dangerous against him; not against each other, therefore he learned to hide himself whenever he see a human being. Another advantage was that he learned to watch people and perceive their shapes, manners, and modes. When he landed near the DeLacy's cottage he hid himself and watched them before he advances, he noticed that the girl was beautiful and unlike other villagers, he says, "the girl was young and of gentle demeanour, unlike what I have since found cottagers and farm-house servants to be" (Shelley 74). Add to that, when he distanced himself and watched he recognised that these people relate to each other by familial and social relationships, which he lacks and longed for, he says, "the old man walked before the cottage in the sun for few minutes, leaning on the arm of the youth. Nothing could exceed in beauty the contrast between these two excellent creatures" (Shelley 75). The

monster was amazed by the charm of the father-daughter communication, and he was so impressed of how they treated each other and how wonderful is the impact of this contact on him, he recalls, “what chiefly struck me was the gentle manners of these people; and I longed to join them but dared not” (Shelley 76). The monster envied humans for possessing something more valuable than food and shelter; they possessed communication mediums and were able to interact with each other and exchange love and kindness, he bemoans, “still more, they enjoyed one another’s company and speech, interchanging each day looks of affection and kindness” (Shelley 76). When he was affected by the amiableness of the DeLacys, the monster thought to do them something in return, the first nice act he did was to stop stealing food from their garden because that increased their misery (77). Still the discovery of the language was the most important for the monster, as he thought that his chance of integrating with the DeLacys becomes bigger if he learns to speak and understand their language, he says, “I ought not make the attempt until I had first become master of their language, which knowledge might enable me to make them overlook the deformity of my figure” (Shelley 78). He thought that the DeLacys would prefer a communicative monster is who uses his skills to interact better than a strong unspeakable monster in their neighbourhood. Anne McWhir argues that the creature’s problem was that people did not accept him because he is different not because he cannot read, though learning to read did not fix the problem of acceptance and integration, on the contrary, it made the monster realise his difference and his seclusion, McWhir writes,

> The creature's dilemma is that he can be educated as civil man but that he cannot be accepted as such by society -- or even by himself once he has learned certain social attitudes. The social skills he acquires, including knowledge of language, can lead only to consciousness of exclusion. He is therefore the victim of a compelling ethnocentrism, a revulsion based on recognition of something sufficiently like one's self to be disturbing. Significantly, the creature does not shrink from his own image until after he has accepted the perfect forms of his cottagers as normative. (McWhir 80)

We see how amid his joy of discovering mediums that could connect him to his neighbours, the monster was shocked to see his ugly face in a transparent pool (78). The monster was terrified of seeing his image and could not believe that the reflexed image was of him, because nothing indicated or implied that he has such a hideous appearance. The monster’s conception of beauty was not of his own preference. When he saw the DeLacys he decided that they were beautiful and gentle. He himself was tried to be gentle and stop stealing their food, but when

he saw himself, he did not look like them and he was depressed that he has such an ugly appearance. The monster decided that he is ugly compared to the beauty of the DeLacys.

The monster found his paradise in the neighbourhood of the DeLacy family. He lived in the margin of their small society and started learning their language and be acquainted with the system of their life because he liked them. He used to call them "my protectors" because the one-way contact, he found in their neighbourhood dragged him to the zone of social inclusivity (82). To prove his ability to learn and integrate the monster claimed that he was smarter than the other outsider, the Arabian, in acquiring the language, he says, "my days were spent in close attention, that I might more speedily master the language; and I may boast that I improved more rapidly than the Arabian, who understood very little, and conversed in broken accents" (Shelley 82). The more he integrated, the more he was tormented because he lived in shadow, he was unseen and unallowed to come out of his hideout, because he feared rejection (84). The monster was enlightened at the hands of the DeLacys. He learnt their language, morals, and their social values; and he was born intellectually. This enlightenment renewed his dilemma, as he recognised that he is of different creation. Comparing himself to humans, he found that they were created by God and their God had duties and responsibilities that link him to his creatures, while he was alone and abandoned, he wonders, "like Adam I was created apparently untied by no link to any other being in existence; but his state was far different from mine in every other respect. He had come forth from the hands of God a perfect creature, happy and prosperous, guarded by the special care of his creator", he continues, "but I was wretched, helpless, and alone" (Shelley 90). The monster's loneliness, not deformity, agonised him the most. He was able to get over his ugliness by mastering language and the desire to communicate and be accepted, but loneliness was irreparable. His creator did not create a degraded version of Adam, but a degraded version of Satan, as he was not only banished and secluded but hated and unaccepted by humans, he laments, "Satan had his companions, fellow devils, to admire and encourage him, but I am solitary and detested" (Shelley 91). Anyway, the virtues of the DeLacy's society encouraged him to seek communication with them. He chose to speak to the blind man separately as he was unable to see his ugliness, then he could sympathise with him and be his mediator to the rest of the family (92). Blindness resembles social tolerance and turning a blind eye to differences between members of society. The blind man listened to him he even, he thought that the monster was just a stranger like any other stranger, he noticed the similarities more than the differences, the old man asks, "by your language, stranger, I suppose you are my countryman; are you French?" (Shelley 93). This was expected from a man who

can not see you as a different and feared other or enemy, but a man who can just listen to you and communicate with you without any prejudices. This is the only moment where the creature could be in intimacy or peace near humans. This intimacy is a result of the positive side of blindness. The old DeLacy was unable to see the differences between him and the monster; not his yellow skin, watery eyes, big size nor hideous face. The old DeLacy and the creature could live in peace with each other and communicate with each other, only after turning a blind eye to each other's defects and differences. This figurative blindness is the key for better integration of refugees in the West nowadays. Westerners and new-comers need to turn a blind eye to each other's differences, ways of lives, traditions and convictions, unless these differences are a source of threat towards a peaceful coexistence. Opening the borders is great, but it does not mean acceptance. Acceptance means that we live side by side, yet we need to respect each other and turn a blind eye to the things we do not like about the other. Conflicts arises from attacking the other because we only see him as intruder. This is similar to what Zizek called for in his search for solutions to the refugee's crisis, as I have shown in the third chapter. He called for taking ourselves out of each other's lives, having a proper distance from each other, and being polite toward each other. We see how the younger DeLacy's attacked the creature the moment they saw him sitting beside their father; started hitting him immediately without saying a word, because they saw in him the idea of a possible enemy, a monster who can hurt and kill. The idea of fearing and attacking strange creatures is socially and culturally constructed; we are brought up to fear creatures of odd and giant forms, learnt to link hideousness to criminality, and to sympathise with those of beautiful appearances.

The failure in gaining sympathy and social acceptance changed him to an angry and violent creature; therefore, he felt the need to avenge those who excluded him and attacked him, thus he declared the war on all humans, he declares, "from that moment I declared everlasting war against the species, and more than all, against him who had formed me, and sent me forth to this insupportable misery" (Shelley 95). The crime series started by burning the cottage of DeLacy's which witnessed the birth of hopes in integration and inclusion to rouse his rage and his sense of revenge. After that, on his way to Geneve looking for victor, he saw the girl drowning and saved her because his goodness overcome his rage, yet he was shot by a man who took him wrong for hurting her, and the monster reaction concluded his disappointment of humans, he says, "This was then the reward of my benevolence" (Shelley 99). The reason he was attacked is not only his hideousness, but maybe the lack of communication and understanding of the man that he was there to help, not to hurt. After that, he saw Victor's little

brother, and thought that, this is a little boy and maybe he is not prejudiced and I can make him a companion and a friend, but the little boy resisted and threatened him by his father, Mr. Frankenstein, and then the monster killed him (100). Killing William was not premeditated, the monster just wanted a companion, but the kid threatened him and said that he relates to the enemy, so the monster could not control himself, he says, "I grasped his throat to silence him, and in a moment he lay dead at my feet" (Shelley 100). This final incident was the straw that broke the camel's back; the monster understood that it is impossible to coexist with humans and changed his plans from integrating with humans to integrating with a creature just like him, which he thought that Victor must create for him, he says, "man will not associate with me, but one as deformed and horrible as myself would not deny herself to me" (Shelley 101). Mellor argues that victor's refusal had turned the creature into a violent monster, she says, "Only when Victor Frankenstein refuses to provide a family for his creature, does the creature become vengeful and violent" (Mellor 22). According to Percy Shelley, the monstrous situation of the monster and being a social outcast turned him from a good creature to a violent monster, Shelley says, "yet the circumstances of his existence are so monstrous and uncommon, that, when the consequences of them became developed in action, his original goodness was gradually turned into inextinguishable misanthropy and revenge" (qtd. In Shelley 214). This what the monster confirms when he tries to convince Victor to create a female creature for him, he says, "my vices are the children of a forced solitude that I abhor; and my virtues will necessarily arise when I live in communion with an equal. I shall feel the affection of a sensitive being and become linked to the chain of existence and events, from which I am now excluded" (Shelley 104). The monster explains that he was radicalised when he was tortured by alienation and exclusion of social contact, and his pains will be soothed if he becomes included in the circle of social communion. Anyway, these hopes have soon vanished when Victor changed his mind and destroyed the female monster (119). Losing all hopes of communion and feeling betrayed by Victor and banished from society, the monster had gone completely mad and declared war on all the human kind and decided to start with Victor's friend and wife, to let Victor experience of losing best ones and let him suffer loss and loneliness, he threatens, "shall each man," cried he "find a wife for his bosom, and each beast have his mate, and I be alone" (Shelley 120). The monster felt the injustice of humans, so to speak, he thought, if I am to suffer, I shall not suffer alone.

The monster is a creature that was born to an irresponsible father in an intolerant society. The monster is an illegal baby that was neglected by his family and left behind in a society that

did not welcome illegal babies; a society that refused the association of a new member because he looked ugly, and excluded him from social intercourse and fellowship of man. Monstrosity was an angry reaction and an ultimate consequence of betrayal, humiliation, and exclusion. The monster tried every possible way to be nice, beneficial, and benevolent towards the old, the young, the blind, and towards neighbours, strangers, and relatives, yet he failed to gain sympathy, friendship, or communion. The monster wanted to let those who banished him and made him suffer to experience what it means to be alone and separated and deprived from communication and belonging. His crimes were his last attempt to change the society that judged him based on his appearance and did not give him a chance to integrate and coexist with others.

6 HOME FIRE

Home Fire is a post-9/11 novel that deals with the predicament of Muslim communities in Britain in times of the rise of islamophobia and the war against the so-called Islamic terrorism. The anti-immigrant laws and the strict procedures imposed on Muslim communities in Britain had isolated and stigmatised Muslim minorities much like the ostracization of the creature in *Frankenstein*. Westerners and Westernised Muslims raised questions about the Muslim citizenry's loyalty, identity and belonging to the British society. The novel depicts the struggle of young Muslims trying to find their path in British society, resisting the unfriendly and exclusive political and social powers that try to alienate them. *Home Fire* investigates the consequences of the exclusive policies on minorities and how they can drive individuals to adopt violence against the state and the rest of society as a way of change. In their study of *Home Fire*, Lisa Lau and Ana Cristina Mendes warn that isolationist discourses in our post-9/11 world, would push Muslim minorities to the extreme, they write, "The banalization of a populist, anti-immigrant discourse positions Muslim communities, and particularly the Muslim male youth, in a space of Orientalist, radical difference to the West" (Lau and Mendes 56). However, there is another view suggesting that these discourses fall within the context of preserving security in the times of the war on terror. Marcela Santos Brigida writes, "Throughout *Home Fire*, we learn that the reason why Isma Pasha was held at the airport was not exclusively related to her Pakistani-British identity or to the fact she was a Muslim. It was precipitated by her complicated family history" (Brigida 156). While Rehana Ahmed explains that the unknowability of Muslim community represents a challenge to the state in which it works to decipher through surveillance of Muslims. Rehana uses Yegenoglou's example of the veiled woman, Ahmed writes, "For Yeğenoğlou it is precisely the assumed unknowability of the veiled woman that threatens the viewer's command of knowledge and elicits their need to decipher her (Rehana 6). Notwithstanding the argument of including these policies in a counter-terrorism plan in order to protect society, I content that society is harmed when policies meant to protect cause radicalisation. Claire Champers points out to the role of the political circumstances in radicalising Young Muslims. Champers argues that Parvaiz's experience with the British Police had pushed him to violence, she says, "He has been stopped and searched twice for purely Islamophobic reasons by British police officers, and is regularly treated with suspicion as a young Muslim man in Britain" (Champers 207).

Home Fire follows two British Muslim families of Pakistani descent; the first is the Pasha family, a conservative Muslim family, who became alienated from society because of their

father's history and their sticking to their Muslim values, and the second is Karamat Lone's family, the new British Home Secretary, who cuts himself from his mother community and alienates his children from their Muslim Pakistani background to show loyalty and belonging to the British society. Each of them is longing for inclusion, to be British like the rest of society.

6.1 Father's Legacy

"Home Fire is about the myths that sons tell themselves about their fathers, and the damage that fathers pass down to their sons" (Felsenthal).

Home Fire has a thematic similarity with Frankenstein. One of the main themes in the novel is the legacy of the fathers and its role and impact on children's inclusion and participation within society. Adel Pasha, a young British Pakistani of Muslim background, after drifting from one career to another without being able to get a permanent job during his stay in the UK, abandoned his family and travelled to fight injustice and oppression of his people in different lands around the globe (48). In so doing, he winds up inflicting on his family the pains of prosecution. This comes in form of harassment by the British authorities and passing on a stigma and a burden to his children. Unlike the feelings of his younger children, for Isma, his oldest daughter, Adel Pasha is an absentee father who did not do his part in raising his kids (47), and an irresponsible man who slid into extremism, leaving his family to endure the hardships of abandonment, surveillance, and social exclusion. The first time Isma refers to her father is when criticising her little brother's behaviour when taking irresponsible decisions, she says, "his father's son, a fecklessness in the gene pool" (Shamsie 26). It is no surprise that Isma recalls her father's memory just to point at him as guilty. Isma and her twin siblings witnessed how their father's absence had killed their mother who died of sorrow not so long after their grandmother's death (39). Because of the absence of her father and the death of her mother and grandmother, Isma became responsible for raising her siblings when she was only 21 when her twin siblings, Parvaiz and Aneeka, were 12 years old (4). Taking the role of her parents, Isma had to dedicate her life for the upbringing of her siblings and she had to defer her study and work to help her family, a mission which took a decade from Isma's life and dreams, until she thought that her siblings were able to stand on their own, Aneeka tells Isma, "stop worrying about me. Go live your life now – I really want you to" (Shamsie 8). Although Isma was loving, caring and responsible, yet her suffering of her father's abandonment made her intolerant towards any careless and irresponsible ventures of her siblings. When Parvaiz travels to Syria to join ISIS after Isma leaves, Isma alerts the authorities to avoid any further suspicion or

prosecution, facing her sister's resentment, she justifies what she did by saying that "we are in no position to let the state question our loyalties. Don't you understand that? If you co-operate, it makes a difference. I was not going to let him make you suffer for the choices he'd made" (Shamsie 42). Isma do not want her sister to suffer from the mistakes her brother did as she suffered from the mistakes of her father in the past. Both of them can be accused of being accomplice with him, which means tighter control on their lives and movements, that which they already experienced because of their father's former activities and reputation as an enemy of the state.

So much traumatized them. While Adel Pasha was fighting in Afghanistan, the police came and searched his family house, his family did not dare ask about him because of the rumours that those who sympathise with the terrorist would lose their rights in the government assistance, Isma says, "one of my grandmother's friends said the British government would withdraw all the benefits of the welfare state – including state school and the NHS – from any family it suspected of siding with the terrorists" (Shamsie 49). The Pashas were recommended by the MP not to ask about their father because he was considered an enemy of the state, a terrorist. They were told, "they are better off without him" (Shamsie 50). Isma got fed up with these feckless men in her family, and she could not allow any further thoughtless episodes to take place. She explains, "he did that, not me. When they treat us this way the only thing we can do for our own sanity is let them go" (Shamsie 42). Here, Isma is recalling how she was treated by her father. She was the only child he knew of his children but he did not have any feelings toward her, the last time he called he wanted to hear his boy's voice, his successor, but not any of his daughters. Isma says, "he wanted to speak to his mother, and also to hear his son's voice (Shamsie 48). This, too, is Adel Pasha's legacy, and it went a long way toward perpetuating sense of responsibility for their heritage and their people in his son.

The novel juxtaposes Isma and her family with the children of the British Home Secretary in charge of hunting terrorists down and bringing them to justice. He, too, is Muslim of Pakistani descent, who has raised his son Emmon to be thoroughly Western, and unlike Adel's message to Parvaiz, Karamat allowed his son to be irresponsible and self-seeking, a very Western live and let live way of being. When Isma noticed the gentlemanly upbringing of Emmon, she thought, "someone raised him the way I tried to raise Parvaiz" (19), that was not her rule for sure, but she knew what is the right thing to do and she tried to give her brother a good parenting, but it seems that there was something he inherited from his father that she was not able to prevent. Despite her abhorrence of Emmon's father, she could not hide her

admiration of Emmon's good manners and the way he was brought up by his father, she wonders, "she experienced a brief moment of wonder that a father who had not taught his son basic Urdu had still thought to teach him this word" (Shamsie 29). When asked by Emmon about her father, Isma finds it difficult to talk about him because, he disappeared very early then reappeared to impregnate his wife and leave again and forever (48), and this was the only thing he was good at according to Isma who disregards the personal and political circumstances that pushed Adel Pasha to leave Britain. Isma says, "he tried his hand at many things in his life – guitarist, salesman, gambler, con man, jihadi – but he was most consistent in the role of absentee father" (Shamsie 47). She is unlike Emmon, does not see her father as perfect, on the contrary she describes him as he is, she says, "boys are different to us, they see what they want through tunnel vision" (Shamsie 26). According to Isma, boy's limited view of the world is because they see it through their fathers' belief system. In the case of Parvaiz, it is loyalty and fighting for his people, for Emmon, it is non-violence and ensuring the good treatment of Muslims living in Britain.

As for Parvaiz, the boy who used to live in the shadow of his sisters, his father's legacy led to fatal consequences, and ultimately like the creature, his tragic downfall. Parvaiz drifted to his father's path when he felt that he was betrayed by his two sisters, the ones he used to get support from. Shamsie describes Parvaiz as, "the weaker, sicklier twin, was the one who suckled their mother's breast (she produced only enough milk for one) and cried unless she was the one to tend to him" (Shamsie 13). Parvaiz used to get everything he needed from his sisters, he used to get his sister's share of milk and tenderness, but also like the creature, British society treated him with much less care. At the age of 19, Parvaiz, was working as a greengrocer's assistant, a career that did not earn him enough income if he wanted to continue living in his family house after his sister's leaving according to Isma, "the mortgage alone would become impossible" (Shamsie 119). Isma, the leader of the house, the one who is tired of the men of her family and just let them go, used her superiority and decided that it is time for Parvaiz to grow up, be responsible, and leave. Parvaiz the "handsome Londoner with strong family ties" according to Aneeka, found out that his strong family ties were much less important than his sister's individual future plans (Shamsie 117). When Isma was asked by Dr Shah to apply for the PhD programme, Parvaiz asked, "what is the point?" (Shamsie 118). He did not expect that the Americans, who tortured his father to death, would grant his sister a visa because she was the daughter of the terrorist. His father's history has put a limit to his expectations. He has never imagined that he or his sisters would be granted visas or admission

in Britain or in the USA. Even when Aneeka told him that she has got a scholarship to study Law, he replied, "they only gave you a scholarship because you tick their inclusive and diverse boxes" (Shamsie 132). Parvaiz believed that he and his Muslim community are excluded from society and only used for the sake of diversity quotas. Parvaiz felt himself totally alone, nobody wanted to stay with him, as both of his siters had already set their plans for the future and for him to stand on his own, a reality he could not accept, reacting in an emotional way, saying, "traitor", and preparing himself to leave the house to the streets, while in fact wishing somebody to tell him to stay (120).

Shamsie suggests other Muslims in London also contributed in Parvaiz's decision. After leaving the house, Parvaiz fell in the hands of US THUGZ gang, or the Preston street "morality police", a bunch of Muslim guys used to hung around the neighbourhood and ordered Muslims to commit to the Islamic laws, like when they told Isma that, "sisters should cover up more" (Shamsie122). The US THUGZ boys imitate the morality police that was founded by ISIS in their areas of control in Syria and Iraq, US THUGZ is "A shortened form of the *Astaghfirullah* in Arabic" (Shamsie 122). The phrase is said when seeing something wrong according to their beliefs, and it means forgive me my lord, (they believe that they should ask Allah for forgiveness of sins other do, and because consider themselves the men of God, they had to order peoples to adhere to Allah's Sharia and not commit sins). In this confrontation with the US THUGZ, for the first time in his life, Parvaiz felt completely alone with no help or protection from anybody, therefore Parvaiz was vulnerable to believe in the myth of his father's heroism and cling to it to protect himself and numb his insecurities.

Later, Parvaiz finds security in his father. In the next morning, when Farooq came to apologize to him, Farooq said, "my kutta cousin took something of yours. I apologise. He did not know who you are" (Shamsie 123). There were two of "who you are"; the first one is Parvaiz the boy who did not know anything about his father and this identification cannot protect him, while the second one which Farooq meant is Parvaiz the son of the great hero Adil Pasha who fought injustice and was killed by the British, and this identity which can protect Parvaiz and make him respected. Farooq identifies Parvaiz as the son of Abu Parvaiz, but Parvaiz replies, "I am Parvaiz, I don't know any Abu Parvaiz" (Shamsie 124). Parvaiz did not really know his father, he was alienated from his legacy by society and family, he was not told about him, and was not allowed to ask about him either, and was not even allowed to see his pictures because they were taken away by the police (124). What he knew was that his father

was named as a terrorist, a traitor, and an enemy of the state. Parvaiz did not know his father because his father was excluded from the house, was muted, and his memory was omitted being the source of shame and fear to the family, this is why Parvaiz repeats, "I never knew my father" (Shamsie 125). According to Lau and Mendes, British Muslims were subdivided into good Muslims and bad Muslims, and the good ones were forced to renounce their relations with their loved ones in order to prove their allegiance to the state, they say, "in order for some to feel safe in Western host countries, by denying and refusing their kin and community, in a public demonstration of embracing new loyalties" (Lau and Mendes 65). Adel pasha was silenced because he resembles the bad Muslim and his name was a threat to his family's integration. Champers argues that Parvaiz's search for a connection with his muted father made him fall in Farooq's net. She says, "This is something that Farooq knows about and plays upon, telling the son about his father's bravery under torture at Bagram air base" (Champers 207). Farooq is like a trapper who try to recreate Adil Pasha the hero in order to catch his son, he says, he fought with my father; I heard all the stories of the great warrior Abu Parvaiz" (Shamsie 125). Farooq brings an alternative version of that shameful secret of Adil Pasha, a version that called for pride, not shame, a hero who was silenced and exiled from the memory by his women and by the state, a version of paternal legacy that can protect the weak Parvaiz from loss and from the supremacy of Isma. Farooq resumes, "your dad. When he entered the fight for justice he called himself Father of Parvaiz. That was the way of keeping you close. So anytime someone said his name – his enemies with fear, his brothers with love, his comrades with honours – they were saying your name too" (Shamsie 125), Farooq wants to create a connection between Parvaiz and his father and to convince Parvaiz that he was already a part of his father's case and fight, he is making a new memory for Parvaiz, he tells him, you were there all the way in the fight for justice in different places in the world with your father between men and weapons, there you belong not here in Preston Road among women. After this motivation, Parvaiz fell easy prey to his recruiter, a lost boy who wanted guidance and protection had found a refuge in the figure of his dead father, Farooq tells him, "I am glad I found you, brother" (Shamsie 126). According to Champers, Parvaiz was attracted to Farooq because of Farooq's skilfulness in listening and communicating with him, she says" His transformation from a bookish, family oriented young man into a jihadist is a narrative arc wherein the topoi of sound and fury need to be highlighted, because he finds an attentive "listener" in the fold of Farooq's friendship instead of among his sisters" (Champers 207). Farooq's narrative about the heroism of Adil Pasha has met Parvaiz need for a shadow and a role model and muted his fears and suspicions about his father's identity and belonging; he was

told that his father was not a terrorist or an irresponsible father but he was a man who, “fought beyond the lie of national boundaries”, a man who “understood the world as it is” and “having seen it, he understood a man has larger responsibilities than the ones his wife and mother want to chain him to” (Shamsie 128). Adel Pasha is presented by Farooq as a moral person who realised that his role in life is to fight for the liberty of man and achieve justice in the world, and when he saw the oppression and injustice in the world, he decided to change it through fight to establish a utopian world. Adel Pasha realised that his higher responsibilities toward the world is more worthy than his belonging to the family and Preston street and Britain. No wonder that these stories had got full attention of Parvaiz, because it answered Parvaiz’s questions about his father’s history and why his father abandoned his family. He knew that his family would become harassed and excluded if they do not exclude their father from their lives, thus the speaking of the father became a taboo. Although Parvaiz had a good relation with his twin Aneeka, he longed for a male who can teach him about his maleness and about boy’s stuff, Shamsie says, “as the years passed and the world of girls and boys grew more and more separate, so there were times he was not a twin to a twin but rather the only male in the house that knew all the secrets that women shared with one another but none that fathers taught their sons” (Shamsie 127). This separation and the lack of the male presence in Parvaiz’s life made Parvaiz feel secluded from the world of men and prisoned in the world of women who were superior to him; this sense of inferiority towards his sister’s and his permanent need for their protection (Aneeka) and material support (Isma) made Parvaiz vulnerable to drift and revolt against his alienating circumstances. Farooq summarises all that by saying, “It is your sister’s fault” (Shamsie 129), he continues, “so they’ve tried to keep you a boy, a child in need of a mother” (Shamsie 130), Farooq succeeded at creating two worlds for Parvaiz: the world of men and the world of women. This is where Parvaiz became convinced that he does not belong. That not belonging is the reason behind his oppressed masculinity and isolation.

Shamsie illustrates the role of a would-be mentor in Parvaiz’s decision. Farooq could have been a father figure to Parvaiz and introduced him into proper society had he cultivated it himself and taken the young man under his wing. Instead, to fire up Parvaiz’s desire for revenge, and allow him to fulfil his desire to become his father, Farooq the same torture techniques that was used done to his father in the prison, Farooq tells him, “they did this to your father for months” (Shamsie 138). Parvaiz was crying and screaming during the whole session of torture, yet after he was released and the pain started to fade away, he discovered that he became united with his father for the first time ever, he says, “I am you, for the first

time" (Shamsie 140). I am you in your alienation, I am you in your revolt, and I am you in your pain; this is why Parvaiz comes back to Farooq's apartment the other day and asks him to torture him more, he says, "tie me again. I want to feel my father's pain" (Shamsie 141); through torture and pain, connection and unity between the father and the son was achieved. Farooq convinced Parvaiz that his father was killed on the hands of the British and the Americans and showed him evidence about the British M15 collaboration in all the practices in Bagram; moreover, Farooq told him that the British government knew about the torture and killing in the prison and did not play its role toward its people as it claims (148). After revealing to Parvaiz the circumstances of his father's death, he is incited by Farooq to prove his devotion to his father's blood and leave the society of his enemies, Farooq says to him, "how can you live in this place accepting, after all that you now know? How can you live in this mirage of democracy and freedom? What kind of man are you, what kind of son are you?" (Shamsie 148). While Farooq tarnishes the image of the West, he creates a parallel of a better world where there is real democracy and real freedom, the World of the brothers who bear their fathers' names proudly. Parvaiz started to think of everything around him in terms of the us/them, men/women, Muslim/ Christian, and loyal/traitor binary oppositions that Farooq succeeded to put in his head; he started to see Isma as a traitor being going to study in America "the nation that killed her father and hundreds of thousands of other Muslim fathers" (Shamsie 148). All of this correlates to the moment the creature turns inward and gives himself over to revenge against those who failed him, only for the creature, there was already a realization that his 'father' Victor had neglected proper introduction and integration to society. Parvaiz would soon have that realization in Raqqa.

In Raqqa, Parvaiz was named Mohammad Bin Bagram, to be a reminder for him of his father's death. Few days after his arrival, Isma called him and said that men of the M15 came to ask about him, then Farooq took the phone from him and said addressing the men of the M15, "I will plant the flag of the caliphate on Buckingham Palace myself" (Shamsie 163). After this call, feelings of regret invaded Parvaiz who realized that he was betrayed and deceived by Farooq and that he will cause troubles to his sister's. He started identifying himself with his father again; not the hero father, but with the feckless, irresponsible father who abandoned his family and brought shame and troubles to his home and children, he found out that the image of his father was fake because all the other warriors who fought with his father went home in winter to visit their families except Adil Pasha, Shamsie says, "that piece of information had made him blubber into his pillow at night, not because it made him understand

that his father had never loved him(though he did understand that) but because he finally saw that he was his father's son in his abandonment of a family who had always deserved better than him" (Shamsie 167). Parvaiz did not just identify himself with his father but predicted his father's fate as well, he knew that he made a mistake (171), and knew that if he goes back home he would be killed because they used to kill enemies as in Bagram (175). In London, Parvaiz found out that his connection to his father demands him to leave the society that killed his father and did not treat him fairly, and in Raqqa, Parvaiz found out that what connects him to the State was a lie and he needed to leave the place because he did not belong there. Parvaiz found himself stuck between two fates, both of them would get him killed. The first fate is that he would be tortured and killed in the prison because he was the terrorist son of the terrorist father, and the second one was that he gets killed by ISIS because he could not become like his father and betrayed his father's legacy, and that what happened at the end. Aamer Shaheen et al. discuss that Parvaiz and his sisters were victims of the state's wrong discourses towards families of jihadis, they say, "the children of the jihadis need to be dealt with compassion: not through othering surveillance but through an integrating Islamophiliac social sentiment to keep them tied to the warmth of home fire in the first place" (Shaheen et al. 163).

Parvaiz's situation differs from the creature's in that the "father" did not withhold proper status in society, he was a double victim of his father's ignoble history and a victim of the circumstances that his father's abandonment and irresponsibility had created to him and to his sisters. It can be said that the third betrayal comes in the form of Farooq's lies. The creature is more responsible for his monstrous deeds in Frankenstein; he chooses revenge. But Parvaiz was enticed and coerced to a great degree.

In addition, Parvaiz's father's legacy is unnecessarily a burden as it was for Victor in *Frankenstein*, because Adil Pasha is a terrorist. However, *Home Fire* demonstrates that it could be a burden as well even when the father is a superstar politician like the Home Secretary, Karamat Lone. Karamat Lone is an opportunist who used his Muslim background to build a successful career and turned his back to his background when it collided with his political future (35). While Karamat saw in the Islamic precepts and Muslims' traditions an obstacle to their integration in the British society (59); he had an excessive admiration of the British values and believed that integration demands the disposal of the Muslim identity, though he got married to an Irish American girl of a wealthy family to reflex his integration and called his first son Emmon to show that he had integrated, Isma explains, "an Irish spelling to disguise a

Muslim name – Ayman became Emmon so that people would know that the father had integrated" (Shamsie 16). Karamat became known for his enmity to Muslim community and sought to impose strict policies on British Muslims, especially those who were involved or suspected to be sympathised with terrorist activities (50). When he became the British Home Secretary, Karamat issued a decision to denaturalise dual nationalities of their British passport when involved to terrorist groups like ISIS. Karamat's alienating policies toward family and toward his Muslim background had a catastrophic consequence on both people of the Muslim community like the Pashas, and on him personally by losing his son, Emmon.

Emmon Lone, the oldest son of Karamat Lone, had heard his mother's advice that work deprives people of their social life and that he can find meaning in life through other ways than work (32). Emmon's search for the meaning of life encouraged him to quit his job in management consultancy because he wanted to "live life beyond office walls" (Shamsie 18). While visiting his grandparents in Amherst, Massachusetts, Emmon meets Isma Pasha, who reveals to him stories about his father that will influence his entire life. Isma notices that Emmon's manners and education reflects his Britishness and high class upbringing but not his Muslim Pakistani background, she wonders, "a father who had not taught his son basic Urdu had still thought to teach him this word" (Shamsie 29). Karamat's attitude toward his native community is reflected through his son's upbringing; Emmon had not been taught his father's mother language nor culture, and all what he remember about the Pakistani community in Wembley where his father belonged, is just few blurry images from childhood during his rare visits in Eid day (29). Emmon, in the beginning, seemed very impressed and proud of his father and tried to present her an image of his father that is quite different from what she already knew about him (33). Isma suspects that Emmon tried to create this new image of his father to conceal his true one, she thinks, "she wondered if the whole thing were an elaborate fiction to disguise the truth about his father" (Shamsie 33). An explanation of Emmon's impression of his father is that he is totally excluded from his father's personal and political relationships, and so he really ignores his father's policies and reputation, or he knows and feels shame about them therefore he tried to hide them, he says, "I hate all the old muck they scrape up about him every time he is in the headlines" (Shamsie 34). Emmon, who hates his life behind walls, seems trapped within the walls of his father's professional success and power and burdens himself with expectations of himself that meet his ambitious father' limits, he says to Isma, "we want to be like them; we want to be better than them. We want to be the only people in the world who are allowed to be better than them" (Shamsie 35). Knowing the history of his father, Isma

surprises Emmon by assuring him that he is much better than his father despite of the later success, she says, “that is not true, you are much better person than he is” (Shamsie 36). Emmon respond to this revelation of Isma by accusing her of being one of the Muslims who hate Karamat (36); his response reveals his suffering due to his father’s reputation being hated by his own people, Shamsie describes, “gone was the friendly, considerate boy and in his place a man carrying all the wounds that his father was almost certainly too thick-skinned to feel anything more than pinpricks” (Shamsie 36). Emmon is embarrassed of his father’s bad reputation among his own people and tries to defend his father’s wrong choices by claiming that they were necessary to put him in the position he occupies now (50). This is where the novel implicates British society to a degree that demanded such levels of integration in the same way the Alphonso was made to be hyperaware of his family name. However, Isma thinks that sons will never condemn their father’s actions whatever they had done, she says, “there he sat, his father’s son. It did not matter if they were on this or that side of the political spectrum, or whether the fathers were absent or present, or if somebody loved them better, loved them more: in the end they were always their fathers’ sons” (Shamsie 51). Isma thinks that Emmon’s inevitable response and defence to his father’s practices stems from his belonging to his father whatever their relationship looks like. This admission shines a light on Parvais as much as Emmon and he becomes one of the things that separates Aneeka and Emmon whereas Isma and Emmon were separated by the history of their fathers (58); all of them had paid the price of their father’s attitudes.

To save his career, Karamat cut his connection to his mother community and this part of his life stayed so mysterious to Emmon, Shamsie says, “the distance between his father’s life and his own revealed itself here more acutely than it did in West London” (Shamsie 60). Emmon was estranged from his father’s history, community, and culture, and his Englishness was one of the choices his father had made and regretted sometimes, Emmon remarks, “he assumed all this affection and generosity of her welcome was just the famed Pakistani hospitality, which his father sometimes sighingly spoke of when regretting how “English” his children’s lives had turned out” (Shamsie 63). The walls that Emmon wanted to escape from, reappeared again when he fell in love with Aneeka Pasha who asks him to keep their relationship secret in order to survive his father’s refusal (73). Emmon on the other hand thinks that his father will not refuse Aneeka because of her father’s history, he says, “he says you are what you make of yourself” he raised and lowered his shoulders. “unless you are his son. Then he indulges you even if you do not make anything of yourself” (Shamsie 79). This assurance of Emmon

includes a painful insult from his father, which is that Emmon gets indulgence because he is seen as feckless son whose ambitions, unlike his sister, were less than his father's expectation, he says, "my sister is like him so she gets all the expectation. I get the pampering and the free passes" (Shamsie 79). Emmon's assurances hold also an indication of his father's manipulation, he says, "he is one kind of person as a politician. Another kind as a father. There is nothing he would not do for me" (Shamsie 80). Ironically, this declaration about his confidence of his father's acceptance includes his father's refusal at the same time; this relationship between Emmon and Aneeka carries a threat to Karamat's political career, and though it will be refused by Karamat the politician. Since one could argue that Emmon and Aneeka go to radical extremes, Emmon's expectations of his father's attitude about his relationship with Aneeka, is much like that of the creature when he imagined that Victor would listen to his pleading and create him a female monster for him to be his companion, but was confronted with Victor's refusal. They do not join ISIS or become monstrous and violent like Parvaiz, however.

Emmon's personal and professional relationships were bound by those of his father; and the plague of his father's achievements was that they were inevitably measured by the success of his father, therefore, the distance between Emmon and Karamat widened with the rise of later; the more Karamat outshined, the more his son's failures became apparent, Shamsie says, "his feeling of failure exacerbated by his father's continued conquest of the world" (Shamsie 81). When Emmon describes Aneeka's views on religious practices and her sexual preferences, his father rejoices that they will not collide with his opinions as a political figure, he says, "those could be useful in Parliament, thank you. So, she is not a halibut. Glad to hear it" (Shamsie 106). Anyway, when Karamat knew that Aneeka was Parvaiz's Pasha twin, his whole attitude toward her and toward his son changed; it is no more his lovely son proposing to a Muslim girl, rather it is his stupid boy being allured and trapped by a hooker, a sister of a terrorist, this was his political person who spoke not the father, Karamat orders Emmon, "you will have no contact with this girl. I am setting up a security detail for you" (Shamsie 109). Karamat had never given any value nor respect to his son's skills or abilities, he blames himself for his son's failure, he thinks that Emmon's naïve personality and his lack of ambition were his fault of being so permissive toward him and did not teach him how to become independent person; the same fault was made by Alphonso who was so tolerable with Victor's obsession with non-useful and outdated knowledge and left him without guidance or observation. (110). Instead of listening to Emmon thoughtfully, Karamat keeps insulting Emmon by saying that his reckless

and childish person was not the reason why Aneeka fell in love with him but it was his father's position, he says, "why a girl like that would have time for a schoolboy who lives off his mother because he can and who has no ambition beyond beating his own high score in computer games" (Shamsie 110). Whilst Karamat wants Emmon to have his Western value of ambition, he keeps creating circles in which he isolates and shuns the Pashas and their community in the Other zone not allowing them to belong to the Western society.

We see the destructive consequences of the exclusive policies, once again, on the other side of the scene, not among the excluded but among the Westerners themselves. Emmon solidarity with the excluded leads him to his self-destruction. When Karamat bans the Pasha sisters from bringing their brother's body home to bury, Emmon advises him to allow the corpse comes home to avoid being presented as a heartless in the media, Emmon does that to save his father's reputation, he says, "I am saying this because your reputation matters to me. More than you know" (Shamsie 218). While Emmon is still about his father's reputation, Karamat resumes his disregard of his son's feelings and keep belittling and insulting him, he mocks Emmon's relationship by saying, "did she give your first really great blow job, Emmon? Is that what she is about? Because trust me, there are better ones out there" (Shamsie 218). Karamat, this time, did not just insult his son, but his son's love, his son's girlfriend as well. The insult this time is so offensive and humiliating; it came off as an insult from a man to a man rather than a man scolding to his son, and it was too way sore to tolerate thus Emmon replies, "I think you are done here, Father" (Shamsie 218). Emmon's threat can be understood as a rebellion for the first time against his father's walls and roles; you are done as a father, as a limit and role model, you are done as a person I used to belong to. Karamat sends Emmon to Normandy and puts him under surveillance to prevent him from taking contact with the Pashas, but Emmon manages to escape to Pakistan following Aneeka and releases a video refuting his father's version about the Pashas and attributing his father's refusal to a "personal animus" (245). Karamat can understand that his son may challenge him and follow his girlfriend, but what he calls a betrayal is his son's accusation of having personal animus in the case, this was meant to hurt him and damage his political future, he thinks, "that was an arrow dipped in a poison that only those closest to him could know to use" (Shamsie 245). Emmon recognised the brutality of his father's policies, the man who was able not only to separate two lovers or two brothers, but to exclude and stigmatise a full part of society, thus his son rebelled to eliminate his father's evil as the only solution to achieve justice and unity and give meaning to life beyond walls, but he was killed by his father's enemies paying his life a price for his father's faults.

6.2 Practices of Alienation in *Home Fire*:

One of the most prominent practices of alienation in *Home Fire* is stereotyping. When we stereotype somebody, we alienate him in his category, group, religion etc. Stereotyping in the novel is not just a mean to alienate individuals and groups but sometimes it is a consequence of alienation. Isma is aware that she is stereotyped, therefore she avoids packing things that may draw her alienator's attention, Shamsie says, "she made sure not to pack anything that would invite comment or question – no Quran, no family pictures, no books on her areas of academic interest" (Shamsie 3). Zachary Vincent Bordas argues that Isma avoids to pack things that might cause her to be stopped because she knows that she is stereotyped, yet she is stopped and interrogated because of her appearance. Bordas says, "She has no records (outside her father) that should flag her for an extra selective search; instead, her appearance, versus suspicious behaviour, subjects her to biased screening. She is categorized by a system outside her control" (Bordas 127). Isma as an individual is alienated from/by the officers at the airport because of her family history, her hijab, her religion, her passport, etc. they do not know her personally and they judge her based on what they know about her. Isma, other than being a daughter of a former terrorist, her hijab and passport indicate that she is a Muslim, middle eastern woman and it is enough to have expectations about her because this group Isma adheres to is stereotyped as terrorist, therefore she does not hold items which can prove those expectations to avoid being stopped or interrogated at the airport. Anyway, Isma's precautions did not work, and her luggage had been inspected by the officer who checked the items one by one until she found something she thought was at odds with Isma's type, an expensive jacket, the officer asked, "this is not yours, she said and Isma was sure she did not mean because it is at least a size too large but rather it is too nice for someone like you" (Shamsie 3). Isma is looked at as somebody who should not own expensive items, either because people of her group are usually portrayed as poor/unemployed, mean or any other reason that serves the purpose of stereotyping. When Isma explains that she got the jacket from her work-place, she was automatically suspected of stealing the jacket, the officer asks, "does the manager know you took it?" (Shamsie 3). Stealing is the only option for Isma to own something nice according to her alienator, while all the other options were excluded. Isma does not seem offended by the accusation because she also has expectations about how she was looked at as I mentioned earlier, though she simply replies, "I was the manager" (Shamsie 3). The officer, on the other hand, seems shocked that Isma is the manger in her work-place and she is at a PhD programme at the same time, she asks, "and how could that happen" (Shamsie 4). This question reveals the

extent of alienation between British and British Muslims. The officer is totally ignorant of how this group of people live; do they buy high quality items? Do they work? Do they study like other people? She asked how did that happen because she looked at the portrait, the stereotype, not the individual, and she became confused because what she saw of Isma is contrary to her expectations. The interrogation shifts from Isma's possessions to Isma's loyalty as another officer enter the room carrying Isma's passport and asks, "do you consider yourself British?" (Shamsie 5). One's passport is an enough proof to one's nationality, but the question here wants to reconfirm Isma's feeling because she falls within a stereotyped group; a group that is suspected of being sympathised with enemies of Britain. The question, "do you consider yourself Britain?" conceals a set of discriminatory questions such as do you really belong to Britain? Do you belong somewhere else? Do you have sympathies with our enemies? Can you prove that you are not on of them? How can we make sure that you are not going to blow up the place? The Britishness test is what alienates Isma and her Muslim background; Muslims are tested because they are looked at as disloyal, and do not belong to Britain. Shamsie uses imagery to describe Isma's feeling toward her feeling of estrangement, she says, "the weight of snow pressing familiarity out of the objects, so that the glove placed beside its former pair looked no more than a distance relative. And what, then, do you know? Throw away both gloves, or wear them mismatched to acknowledge the miracle of their reunion?" (Shamsie 10). The snow stands for the expectations which are made about Isma and people of her group, and these expectations are the walls that separate them from the rest of the society, and the miracle of reunion between parts of society can only be achieved through destroying these separation walls.

Isma's sexuality is viewed as being framed and conducted by her faith. Speculations about Isma's sexual life are made based on her way of dressing. When Isma was planning to date Emmon, she was advised by Dr Shah to "reconsider her hijab" because according to Dr Shah, "it might be keeping your man at a distance. He will read things into what it means" (Shamsie 40). Isma's hijab is a code that may be read by Emmon as a reference to conservative women who only have sex within marriage. Even though Isma is a practicing Muslim who reads Quran, prays, and wears hijab, yet unlike her first boyfriend, Mo who did not want sex outside marriage because he feared the eternal damnation, Isma's refusal to the idea stems from her belief that having sex is something very profound and should be done with somebody she could think of as a husband (40). When Isma meets Karamat, he judges her based on her Islamic costume, he thinks that a girl with hijab who "made no effort to look anything but plain" is "probably a

virgin" (Shamsie 234). Karamat thinks of Isma as a type not as an individual, he judges her unfairly based on her belonging to a Muslim background.

Remarkably, the expectations people make about Isma does not fit in the case of Aneeka, the beautiful girl who wears hijab and prays every morning but at the same time is more open about her sexuality; she wears makeup and has no problem to date, Isma describes her as, "Aneeka had always been someone boys looked at, and who looked back, more than looked" (Shamsie 23). After Aneeka had sex with Emmon, he was confused seeing her praying, he asks, "what are you praying for?", and she replies, "prayer is not about transaction, Mr Capitalist, it is about starting the day right" (Shamsie 70), she wanted to say that you and your society have no idea why people like me pray so do not judge me. According to Ahmed, Aneeka intended to break the image of the Muslim woman in Emmon's head, she says," The fact that her apparent elusiveness is in reality an intentional act partly dismantles the stereotype of the inscrutable Muslim woman with which Eamonn fixes her" (Ahmed 5). For Emmon, Aneeka was doing two contradictory things; he did not understand her choices about her faith and sexual life because her behaviour did not match his expectations, he asks again about the hijab, "why'd you have to do that?" (Shamsie 72). Aneeka's purpose of wearing hijab is not following religious instructions, rather it is her choice about how much she wants to protect her body, she says, "I get to choose which parts of me I want strangers to look at, and which are for you" (Shamsie 73). Manneka Budiman et al. argue that Shamsie tries to deconstruct the Western representation of the veiled woman through Aneeka, they says, "Through Aneeka, Shamsie also criticizes prejudice toward hijab as inferior and backwardness. For Aneeka, hijab become political instrument, especially for her body experience" (Budiman et al. 966). The image of the veiled woman in the west is linked to conservatism and backwardness, Shamsie shakes this image and pulls the veiled woman out of its this western frame.

Aneeka and people like her in *Home Fire* are framed, stigmatised, and alienated because of their faith and their way of dressing without consideration to any individual beliefs or choices. Framing people prevents us to see outside of the image contours. When we listen to the Home Secretary speech when addressing Muslims, he stigmatises Muslims and gives an official permission to enmity and exclusion of them who do not conform to his instructions, he says, "do not set yourselves apart in the way you dress, the way you think, the outdated codes of behaviour you cling to, the ideologies to which you attach your loyalties" (Shamsie 87). Immediately after the speech, Aneeka experiences a racist attitude while on the metro, she says,

"Some guy spat at me on the Tube" (Shamsie 90). Aneeka's hijab is looked at as a code which marked her nonconformity to the Britishness that the Home Secretary had called to. When the relationship between Emmon and Aneeka was revealed, a newspaper posted an article titled as "Hojabi" and wrote "Pervy Pasha twin sister engineered sex trysts with Home Secretary's son" (Shamsie 204). Aneeka was called "knickers" in the article and was accused of being an accomplice of her brother who used her body and sexual life to brainwash Emmon. The word Hojabi, probably a blend of hooker and hijabi, aimed to demonise hijabis like Aneeka who may use their bodies to recruit young people.

Parvaiz also was stereotyped and was presented by the British media as a terrorist who was killed while trying to get into the British consulate (188). By ignoring the real story of Parvaiz, the individual, the media portrays Parvaiz as a type and reinforces what the public already believe of his Muslim background, a news network says, "Wembley-born Pervys Pasha, the latest name in a string of Muslims from Britain who have joined ISIS" (Shamsie 188). Parvaiz was accused of betraying Britain by joining its enemies, therefore he was denaturalised and deprived from his right to be buried at home, the Home Secretary says, "we will not let those who turn against the soil of Britain in their lifetime sully that very soil in death" (Shamsie 188). Nobody wants to hear the truth about Parvaiz, no one will believe that Parvaiz did not fight with the jihadis, and he was killed because he regrated his mistake and wanted to come back home. Mrs Gladys, the Pasha's British neighbour who knows Parvaiz well, defends him and refute the accusation of Parvaiz as a terrorist and an enemy of Britain, she says, "he was a beautiful, gentle boy. Do not try to tell me who he was. I knew him from the day he was born. Shame on you, Mr Home Secretary. Give us our boy to bury" (Shamsie 191). The truth, Gladys was defending represents Parvaiz the self and the individual, against the fake stereotype which was presented by the media.

6.3 Repercussions of Alienation in *Home Fire*:

The rise of Islamic terrorist groups and its carrying out attacks against western targets, had split Muslims in the west into two groups; the conservative practicing Muslims who became more excluded and marked by extremism being a potential environment for terrorism, and the westernised who found that their Muslimness is an obstacle to their assimilation into society whereas conformity to British values and Christian conventions is the only way to refute the

stigma of extremism and gain respect and acceptance of the non-Muslim majority. According to Lisa Lau and Ana Cristina, the division within Muslim communities in the West was a result of the pressure on these communities to express their loyalties to the West, they say, “This underlines how, post-9/11, Muslim communities have been forced to subdivide amongst themselves, to create categories of Muslims and "other Muslims," "good" Muslims distinct from "bad" Muslims, in order for some to feel safe in Western host countries, by denying and refusing their kin and community, in a public demonstration of embracing new loyalties” (Lau 65). In *Home Fire*, Kamila Shamsie shows how British practicing Muslims like the Pasha family experience exclusion and prosecution because of sticking to their Muslim identity, while assimilated British Muslims like the Lone family spared themselves the tension between Britishness and Muslimness by renouncing their Muslim identity, abandoning their Muslim conventions and adopting the British values and sticking to it.

Isma Pasha’s British passport did not spare the long hours of interrogation at Heathrow airport causing her to miss her flight, Shamsie says, “she had expected the interrogation, but not the hours of waiting that would precede it, nor that it would feel so humiliating to have the contents of her suitcase inspected” (Shamsie 3). Isma expected that she would be stopped and asked about her trip because of being Muslim from a family that was marked as conservative, but she did not imagine how disrespectful man feel to have his luggage checked out as if he is an enemy of his own homeland. There are multiple reasons why man could be stopped at the airport, but when it comes to Muslims, every item could be an excuse to get you interrogated, Shamsie notes about Isma, “she had made sure not to pack anything that would invite comment or questions – no Quran, no family pictures, no books on her areas of academic interest – but, even though the officer took hold of every item of Isma’s clothing and ran it between her thumb and fingers” (Shamsie 3). Isma understands that carrying Islamic items like Quran make man more suspicious because it indicates that its holder is a practicing Muslim. As a Muslim wearing hijab, Isma’s Britishness becomes mistrusted and in need to be inspected as well, the officer asks Isma, “do you consider yourself British?" (Shamsie 5). Britishness of Muslims cannot be approved through holding a British passport, but through passing the Britishness test which scrutinises people’s thoughts on several issues to validate their conformity to the British ideals, the officer asks Isma about her opinions about, “Shias, homosexuals, the Queen, democracy, the Great British Bake Off, the invasion of Iraq, Israel, suicide bombers, dating websites” (Shamsie 5). What matters in the Britishness test is that the suspect’s personal opinions should correspond to those of the white majority and must not go against the British

official position in order to evidence his or her loyalty to the state. Right away in the first chapter, there is evidence of alienation on account of difference of the kind the creature first experiences in the village.

Next, we meet Emmon Lone, a second-generation assimilated Muslim, ignores completely what a head cover of a Muslim woman means, he asks Isma, "the turban. Is that a style thing or a Muslim thing?" (Shamsie 21). What Emmon knew about Muslimness is just the dark image that his father distanced himself from when he chose him an Irish name and an Irish mother, Isma recalls, "an Irish spelling to disguise a Muslim name – Ayman became Emmon so that people would know that the father had integrated. His Irish-American wife was seen as another indicator of this integrationist posing rather than an explanation for the son's name" (Shamsie 16). The deep level of assimilation of the Lone family was at the expense of the deterioration of their Muslim identity, so that not only they changed their names but it they became ignorant of the mother culture of their parents; Emmon wonders whether people considered Islam more dangerous than cancer nowadays, he tells Isma, "I meant, it must be difficult to be Muslim in the world these days" (Shamsie 21). For Isma, it is not difficult to be Muslim unless you perceive Muslimness as a crisis that you should escape from, abandoning your identity and your belonging to conform to the non-Muslim majority, she tells Emmon, "I'd find it more difficult to not be Muslim" (Shamsie 21). When a photo of the Muslim member of the parliament Karamat Lone entering the local mosque was leaked, he was accused of being promoting extremism (35). Karamat had to explain that the picture was taken during his uncle funeral prayer and expressed disrespectful personal opinions of Muslimness, followed that by pictures of him and his wife inside a church (35). According to Isma, Karamat turned his political crisis to a gain by insulting his own people, she says, "Karamat lone had precisely calculated the short-term losses and long-term gains of showing such contempt for the conventions of a mosque" (Shamsie 35). Even though Karamat entered the Parliament as a representative of the British Muslims in the beginning, he turned against Muslims once he realised that he cannot safe his career unless he relinquishes his Muslim identity and assimilate to the British values, Isma recalls, "the accompanying article described the newly elevated minister as a man from a Muslim background, which is what they always said about him, as though Muslimness was something he had boldly stridden away from" (Shamsie 33). Karamat was appointed as the British Home Secretary because of his abandonment to his Muslim background and his tough stances on Muslimness, Aneeka says, "it is all going to get worse. He has to prove that he is one of them not one of us, does not he? As if he has not already. I

hate this country" (Shamsie 34). Karamat's demonstration of his Britishness cannot be approved without adopting strict policies toward his Muslim community, he did not want to lose his job, become stigmatised and excluded from the rest of society, but these gains unfortunately cannot be attained without denying his belonging to his mother culture and converting from the targeted environment to the line of the dominant force in society. Karamat did not go against his own people because he is just an opportunist and a traitor, his queuing in line with the British values came as a result of being threatened and put under attack by the opposing dominant majority, Emmon says, "it is harder for him because of his background. Early on, in particular, he had to be more careful than any other MP, and at times that meant doing things he regretted" (Shamsie 51). Even as a member of the parliament Karamat had to be careful because he is unlike others, he is mistrusted because of his Muslim background which makes his Britishness less than other members. The level of Britishness is proportionate to the extent of man's adherence and submission to the British values and his desertion to his Muslim identity, when a British citizen engage in a terrorist attack he is still a British citizen, while when a British Muslim engages in a terrorist attack he becomes deprived of his right of belonging to his nation and be made unBritish according to Isma, she says to Dr Shah, "even when the word British was used it was always "British of Pakistani descent" or "British Muslim" or, my favourite, "British passport-holders", always something interposed between their Britishness and terrorism" (Shamsie 38). The inequality and injustice practiced by the British government toward British Muslims and non-British Muslims enhances social alienation and division between these communities and deprive Muslims from their rights of belonging to the British society and identification with their British identity. When the Pasha's went to ask Karamat Lone, the Muslim MP, about Adil Pasha, Karamat told them, "they're better off without him" (Shamsie 50), they are better off without their father because he was made unBritish and if they want to continue as British, they should neglect their father. The sense of inequality and injustice among British Muslims is what pushes British Muslims to go against their country, they are arrested and interrogated because of their faith, they become accused of extremism if they go their mosques, they are under surveillance, and they are not allowed to have answers about their loved ones when they are tortured and killed, this is why Aneeka hates this country (34), and this is why Adil Pasha had left Britain; he wanted to fight against injustice and the oppression of people in Muslim countries (48). In *Frankenstein*, Victor refused to create a female monster for fear of conflict between monsters in case of the female monster will not be able to be the male monster because she sees him ugly. In contrast, Karamat

resembles a monster who did not like other monsters because he thinks they were ugly, and he started a conflict against them, not against the creator of the whole monster's ancestry.

British Muslims' fear of becoming stigmatised leads some of them to turn to the other camp to defend their Britishness, this is what happened to the British Muslim MP, Karamat Lone, who avoided nearing the mosque during his rare visits to his parents' house, Emmon recalls, "everyone always went on about the racism his father had had to face when a section of the press tried to brand him an extremist" (Shamsie 59). In contrast, this defection of Karamat had urged his Muslim constituency to vote him out and brand him as a traitor because of his renunciation to his Muslim identity and queuing against them. In his attempt to distance himself from Muslimness, Karamat turned to the other extreme; from being oppressed and alienated to practicing the role of the oppressor and the alienator himself, he advises Muslims to, "lift themselves out of the Dark Ages if they wanted the rest of the nation to treat them with respect" (Shamsie 59). Syrrina Ali argues that Karamat's adherence to the British dominant culture gave him a chance to practice suppression on his minority, she writes, "By accepting this White British culture, he considers himself as a part of dominate class who controls the social matters of lower classes. He enjoys his supremacy against the other classes of that society" (Ali 7935). However, Emmon Lone as a second-generation assimilated British Muslim experiences the consequences of his father's extreme integration when he meets people from Preston Street, his father's childhood area, he feels that, "the distance between his father's life and his own revealed itself here more than it did in west London" (Shamsie 60), unlike the Pashas children, Emmon dangles between two worlds, he feels estranged from his father's Muslim-Pakistani background; he had not been taught to speak Urdu, he was brought up as an English person not as an English-Pakistani and finds himself swaying between his mother's religion, Christianity, and atheism, while Islam, his father's religion, stayed totally muted. Karamat's version of Britishness has its demands, but also has its prospects, he says addressing a group of British Muslim students, "there is nothing this country won't allow you to achieve – Olympic medals, captaincy of the cricket team, pop stardom, reality TV crowns, and if none of these works out, you can settle for being Home Secretary" (Shamsie 87). At the same time, this country does not allow you the freedom of speech, the freedom of faith, you cannot practice your faith without becoming branded by extremism, judge you based on what other Muslims had done, and if you do not conform to all these you would be made unBritish and become deprived you from your right of citizenship. Karamat and his government fight extremism by obliging people to abandon their identity and resort to the other extreme, he wants to protect people from

exclusion and discrimination by insulting their loyalties and threatening them of becoming marked and alienated, he continues, "but for those who are in doubt about it, let me say this; don not set yourself apart in the way you dress, the way you think, the outdated codes of behaviour you cling to, the ideologies to which you attach your loyalties. Because if you do, you will be treated differently – not because of racism, though that does still exist, but because you insist on your difference from everyone else in this multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multitudinous United Kingdom of ours" (Shamsie 87). According to Debjani Banerjee, the Home Secretary speech resembles the British government's arbitrary policies in facing multiculturalism, she says,

> His stance on identity is clear; assimilation is the way to success. Culturally marked immigrants or their children are less likely to succeed. Lone's opinions act as the eco chambers of Britain which has been moving away from an earlier reluctant multiculturalism to the imposition of a homogeneous British identity. (Banerjee 292)

Banerjee argues that these policies do not just fail to establish harmonious society with equal opportunities for all, but it widens the differences and lead to more separation, she says, "This managed assimilation creates good and bad Muslims. The good Muslim is completely assimilated, does not identify as Muslim but is the true bearer of the faith; the bad Muslim is culturally marked and can be an extremist" (Banerjee 292). Karamat finds a direct line between Muslimness and extremism. There is no grey area; either assimilated cute Muslims, or alienated bad Muslims.

Emmon who used to believe in his father's view of the world, had awakened after he fell in love with Aneeka, "he had learnt to listen to the sounds of the world" (Shamsie 89). Emmon's relationship with Aneeka took him over the broken bridges of his father's hate speech to listen to the other world, the world of Aneeka and her people, there he had sensed the danger of his father's discriminatory discourses and started to see the consequences of discrimination and exclusion, Aneeka tells him, "I wasn't showering because I got caught in the rain. Some guy spat at me on the Tube" (Shamsie 90). According to Aneeka, what Muslims really struggle for is the British justice; Muslims are treated unfairly by their government which promotes hostility among its people by accusing Muslim community of having tendencies for separatism, while it disregards how Muslims are actually treated, she says commenting on the Home Secretary speech, "why did not you mention that among the things this country will let you achieve if you are Muslim is torture, rendition, detention without trial, airport interrogations, spies in your

mosques, teachers reporting your children to the authorities for wanting a world without British injustice?" (Shamsie 90). *Home Fire* shows how these acts are practices systematically by the British government against non-assimilated Muslims according to Benjaree, she says,

> Shamsie's text points out the ways in which the equation between non assimilation and radicalization can be played out to victimize common people like the Pashas who had no connection with the state, whose father's body was lying in an unmarked grave, and who easily stood out amongst the majority population for their faith based practices. (Benjaree 295)

The state does not consider non-assimilated Muslims as British, the following dialogue between Emmon and his father talking about Aneeka shows how people from the Muslim neighbourhoods are looked at, Emmon says, "she is not like the others". "How so?". "for starters, she is not from around here". "she is not British?". "she is not West London" (Shamsie 105). Non-assimilated Muslims are not considered British, or they are less British than other British, Karamat asks about the level of Muslimness of Aneeka, "how well-Muslim exactly?" (Shamsie 106). The level of Muslimness and assimilation of a Muslim is weighed through Muslims sticking to a set of religious markers and practices i.e., sexual life, wearing hijab, reading Quran, and fasting Ramadan etc, Emmon mentions, "she prays. Not five times a day, but every morning, first thing. Does not drink or eat pork. She fasts during Ramazan. Wears a hijab" (Shamsie 106). Muslimness markers has a retrospective impact on the Muslim acceptance by the dominant culture; the Home Secretary himself was raised as a Muslim and he reveals to Emmon that in times of stress he recites some verses from Quran, but he dares not reveals that because of his position, he says, "I'd be nervous about a Home Secretary who's spoken openly about his atheism but secretly recites Muslim prayers. Wouldn't you?" (Shamsie 107). Karamat accentuates his conformity by subjecting other Muslims like Aneeka to the acculturalisation system, he wonders if Aneeka will accept to take off her hijab, he says, "if she is only nineteen, I suspect she can be persuaded out of the hijab in time. Get your sister to take her off to the hair salon next time she comes to visit" (Shamsie 107). For Aneeka the hijab is a symbol of resistance to the British assimilation discourses, Aneeka and Isma defend their identities by wearing hijab, they refuse being under surveillance and want to decide themselves which parts they show and which they want to hide, Aneeka told Emmon, "I get to choose which parts of me I want strangers to look at, and which are for you" (Shamsie 72).

As Britishness discourses has its requirements and its prospects and it is purposed to create harmonious society which guarantee equal opportunities for all, becoming an extremist or fundamentalist like Farooq has its requirements and its prospects as well. Radicalisation discourses has a purpose also which is fight against western injustice and the oppression of Muslims in the world. One of these requirements for new recruits is to change their names, for example, which is the first thing Parvaiz does when he arrives at Istanbul, Parvaiz says to Farooq, "I am not Parvaiz anymore" (Shamsie 116). Usually new jihadis choose themselves a Muslim name that has a reference to the golden ages of the Islamic caliphate or a name of a former jihadi, this makes them feel more belonged to the project they were recruited for. Other benefits of the new names; they hide their identities from the authorities, the new homogeneous names give them a sense of equality and harmony, there nobody can refer to your name and guess where you come from as it is in Britain for example (Emmon). Parvaiz's nom de guerre was Mohamed bin Bagram, "it was both a reminder of what his father had suffered and an acknowledgment that this new Parvaiz was born out of vengeance and justice" (Shamsie 158). Parvaiz was brainwashed by Farooq, who convinced him that he needs to rebel against his abusive situation. The first time he met Farooq, Parvaiz was scolded for introducing himself as "Aneeka's brother", the way he used to introduce himself to the older boys, Farooq tells him off, "what are sisters to do with me? I know of Abu Parvaiz" (Shamsie 124). Farooq wanted Parvaiz to identify himself with his father, the warrior who fought against western oppression and injustice, not with his sisters who conform to the British values and oppress the masculinity of Parvaiz to keep him under their supremacy (131). Farooq, an ISIS jihadi and an expert recruiter, touches upon his prey's sense of loss and oppression according to Shaheen, Farooq played on Parvaiz's weaknesses by highlighting the dark image of the west in Parvaiz's head, Shaheen writes, "

> Farooq rekindles Parvaiz' slumbering ambers of frustration with a racist and Islamophobic state and brainwashes his musical and peace loving self. His images, of an Islamophobic England with its compromises upon its identity as welfare state, become a cinema screen for Parvaiz, playing in his mind, at loop, all the images of racism and 'Othering' that he has suffered throughout his life till now. (Shaheen, et al. 163)

Farooq explains to Parvaiz that his father fight was to regain the Muslim supremacy which was taken down at the hands of the Christians who want to keep Muslims powerless and

undeveloped (129). In a study of more than 400 jihadist in the USA, Khaleel Mohammed reports that the common reason behind their radicalisation is alienation according to the FBI news radio, Mohammed says, "Although American, they felt alienated from the society at large and they sought identity through group cohesiveness" (Mohammed 383). Mohammed adds that the jihadist joined fundamentalist groups to fight against the western interventions in the Islamic world and to restore the Islamic supremacy, he says, "They were told that corruption in the Muslim world was due to Western interference and immorality and that they had to retrieve this lost glory by assisting their oppressed coreligionists" (Mohammed 383). Much like Farooq's way in recruiting Parvaiz; benefitting from young Muslim's anger and frustration, being excluded and marginalised, and creating them an imaginary enemy to fight against. Farooq tells Parvaiz that the Islamic state will offer equal chances to all its inhabitants, unlike Britain which is no more a welfare state as it used to be in the past according to Farooq, he recalls, "when it saw migrants as people to be welcomed not turned back" (Shamsie 144). Britain used to be a great country before it imposes naturalisation discourses on migrants and punishes its Muslim inhabitants if they practice their religion and stick to their values. Farooq tells Parvaiz that the Islamic state is the place where migrants feel most welcomed, he says, "a place where migrants coming to join are treated like kings, given more in benefits than the locals to acknowledge all they have given up to reach there. A place where skin colour does not matter" (Shamsie 144). Farooq persuades Parvaiz that if he wants to be a part of the Islamic state then he should do what his father had started before and protect it from its enemies, the West (147). In *Frankenstein*, the monster promised to leave Europe and travel to the far world and live in communion with other species other than humans. Farooq plays the separatist monster who dreams of establishing a state for only for monsters.

One of the main factors behind European young Muslims' joining to terrorist groups is the sense of belonging. They do not feel themselves part of the Western society, but, as we have seen, a framed and stigmatised group. Kamila Shamsie, in an interview with Vogue Magazine, said that violence makes a small part of ISIS propaganda, what attracts new recruits is the image of the harmonious society that ISIS tries to show in its propaganda, she says,

> The thing they were really pushing in their propaganda is the sense of belonging. They would give a lot of attention to things like zoos and parks and cleaning the streets and blood donation centres. I think there is often not enough awareness of the really significant difference between ISIS and other terrorist groups: ISIS really wanted a

> state. They did not just want fighters; they wanted doctors, engineers. And they were very much trading on people sense of isolation and non-belonging. (qtd. In Felsenthal)

Parvaiz did not have any terrorist motivations for joining ISIS, he asks Farooq, "so it is not true then? About all the violence?" (Shamsie 147). He was not violent, when the USTHUGZ attacked him he could not defend himself and when Farooq cousins tortured him, he could not resist, all what he wanted is a place where he would be respected, he imagines, "a land of order and beauty and life and youth" (Shamsie 147). When Parvaiz discovered that all what Farooq told him about in the Islamic state was fake, immediately he regrated his mistake and wanted to fix it, he thinks, "I made a mistake. I am prepared to face a trial if I have broken the laws. Just let me go to London" (171). He did not want to join the Sharia camp and go through military training (160). He frowned and disagreed with what Farooq said about attacking Britain (163). He detested the inequality between the locals and ISIS soldiers (172). Parvaiz realised that he did not belong there, he wanted to come back home and be Parvaiz Pasha, "the Handsome Londoner who loves his sister" (Shamsie152), but he had not been granted a chance to be that; he was killed in front of his country's consulate in Istanbul and presented by the media as a terrorist.

Immediately after his death, Parvaiz's identity had been distorted; a brief report said, "the Turkish government confirmed that the man killed in a drive-by shooting outside the British Consulate in Istanbul yesterday was Wembley-born Pervys Pasha, the latest name in the string of Muslims from Britain who have joined ISIS" (Shamsie 188). Parviaz's name had been changed into Pervys and his Muslimness had been maximised while his Britishness had been kept peripheral. Urszula Rutkowska discusses that the way Parvaiz had been viewed in the report makes of him as a potential terrorist, she says, "Parvaiz's death is interpreted as a failed terrorist attack because of this report, as it establishes that "a terror attack has not been ruled out", invoking terror when it need to be there to prompt the reader into making an assumption on their own" (Rutkowska 13). Parvaiz's citizenship had been revoked officially by The Home secretary, Karamat Lone, as a punishment for Parvaiz's leaving for Syria, the Home secretary confirms, "the day I assumed office I revoked the citizenship of all dual nationals who have left Britain to join our enemies", the reporter asks, "and Pervys Pasha was a dual national?", Karamat replies, "that is correct of Britain and Pakistan" (Shamsie 188). Banerjee argues that revoking citizenship of dual national was suggested by Lone to show his loyalty to Britain, she says, "evidently, he needs to assert his identity of the good Muslim by giving proof of his lack

of complicity" (Banerjee 297). In *Frankenstein*, the monster bargained Victor that if you accept me, I will do good to you and to all humans. Doing good includes protection. Karamat's acceptance of the majority is bargained for protecting society from other non-accepted monsters.

Karamat wanted to reinforce his Britishness and thank Britain through protecting it from bad Muslims who do not follow his assimilation discourses, he uses the right of citizenship as a weapon to threat and supress the Muslim minority. Karamat did not want Muslims who do not conform to the British laws to stay in Britain, he wanted to send them to their forefathers' countries as long as their actions do not live up to the British values, he says, "you had to determine someone's fitness for citizenship based on their actions, not on accidents of birth" (Shamsie 214). For Karamat, when man's acts prove him inadequate to British, he loses his citizenship regardless his birth-place and this is why he stripped Parvaiz from his British identity and linked him to Pakistan not to Britain. The same thing was applied to Aneeka when she refused to comply to the British laws and insisted on justice. Karamat reported that Parvaiz's sister, Aneeka Pasha, had tried to seduce his son, Emmon, in order to help her in convincing his father allow Parvaiz comes back, an article said, "she hunted down the Home Secretary's son, Emmon, 24, and used sex to try to brainwash him" (Shamsie 204). Aneeka's identity had been distorted in the article, she was called "knickers" and was portrayed a sexual object. Aneeka insists on Parvaiz Britishness through her denial of his belonging to Pakistan, she answers the representative of the Pakistani High Commission, "you are confusing him with someone else. He is a British citizen; he has nothing to do with you" (Shamsie 187). Aneeka's citizenship had been revoked, while she was defending her brother's identity as a British citizen whose rights had been unfairly taken away, and he has the right to be buried in Britain, this is maybe not according to the law but for her it is according to justice, she says, "I am here to ask for justice. I appeal to the Prime Minister: let me take my brother home" (Shamsie 225). Aneeka's insistence on seeking justice embarrasses the Home Secretary who does not want non-compliant Muslims in Britain, he orders that she loses her right to come back home, he says, "let her continue to be British, but let her be British outside Britain" (Shamsie 230). Karamat wanted to exclude all Muslims who dared to challenge his model of the Good Muslim and turned them stateless and rightless.

While politicising identities, Karamat loses his own identity; the representative of the High Commission ridicules his inhumane attitude saying, "you are really as British as they say you

are" (Shamsie 228). Karamat's Muslim identity was the reason behind his first step into the world of politics, but his later political approach had deformed his real identity. Towards the end of the novel, it got impossible to identify Karamat; following Emmon's accusation to his father of having Personal animus towards the Pasha family or their environment, a newspaper failed to find an addressing form to call Karamat to respond to the accusation, it wrote, "working class or millionaire, Muslim or ex-Muslim, proud-son-of-Migrants or anti-Migrant, Modernist or Traditionalist? Will the real Karamat Lone please stand up?" (Shamsie 247). Building on Karamat's own precept that citizenship is not a right, but a privilege man gains or loses based on which his actions, Karamat is no longer qualified for British citizenship because of the catastrophic consequences of his policies that damaged the British society. While he was making a corpse unBritish to prevent it from entering Britain and staining the British soil, real terrorist, like Farooq, were able to enter Britain repeatedly to find new preys without being figured by Karamat's surveillance system. Karamat weaponised citizenship to protect the British society, but it turned into a tool of supress and exclusion instead.

6.4 Work:

Home Fire shows the importance of work in British Muslim's lives, and their work situations contribute to the alienation that leads Parvais towards radicalisation. Shamsie shows the way work is perceived as an indicator of Muslims' usefulness, responsibility and inclusion. Moreover, she emphasises that having a permanent job helps in building a stable and meaningful life. Depriving Muslims from good job opportunities and high incomes is an indirect result of bad inclusion policies by the government. Demonising conservative Muslims and accusing them of non-conformity to the British values create a fake image about them and present them as a burden on the state contributing negatively to isolation of Muslim minority and keeping it separate from social and material prosperity.

As a result of their exclusion, conservative Muslims are not expected to work and gain in a legal way. Isma is stopped at the airport because of having a good quality jacket. The officer accuses Isma of stealing the jacket because she does not expect a British Muslim hijabi to but such an expensive item until Isma explains that she works as a manager of a dry-cleaning shop (3). The British Home Secretary's description of Muslim's neighbourhood in Wembley as a gender-segregated space make people judge Muslim hijabis as women who do not have the

right to work or study hence unemployed and poor (35). One of the few things Shamsie told us about Adil Pasha is that he did not have a permanent job. According to Shaheen, Adel Pasha's inability to get a permanent job could be the reason behind his turning into a terrorist, he says, "Although there is less canvas given to the character of Adil Pasha and reasons for his becoming a jihadi, it can be assumed that his inability to find a permanent job, as Isma observes that "[h]e tried his hands at many things in his life guitarist, salesman, gambler, con man, jihadi- but he was most consistent in the role of absentee father" (Shamsie 47), turned him into a drifter who could not tie himself to any single thing" (Shaheen 162). One of the few things Isma remembers about her father is that he did not have a permanent job, his work's life was not stable, he tried different careers but succeeded at none, then he left the country, she says, "he tried his hand at many things in his life – guitarist, salesman, gambler, con man, jihadi – but he was most consistent in the role of absentee father" (Shamsie 47). The instability of Adil Pasha's work life reflexes his irresponsibility and maybe the difficulties that British Muslims face in the labour market. Adil Pasha was poor and that was one of the reasons behind his traveling abroad, Isma says, "this time his excuse for going was not a get-rich quick scheme but an aid convoy to Bosnia" (Shamsie 48), Adil Pasha did not have a steady income and that helped his drift to an outlawed activities to become rich quickly. Adil Pasha left Britain because he realised that the world needs change, Farooq says, "do you think he wanted the world to be as it is" (Shamsie 128). The world looked unfair to Adil Pasha, a migrant from conservative Muslim family in Britain which does not treat non-compliant migrants with respect and does not allow them to achieve anything according to its Home secretary (87). Adil Pasha understood that he has larger responsibilities toward the world than those he had toward his mother and his wife according to Farooq (128). Farooq explains to Parvaiz that warriors like him and Adil Pasha understood that the main reason behind the inequality and racism toward Muslims in the world is the demise of the Islamic Caliphate and the rise of the Western Christian imperialistic systems that want to keep the Muslim world powerless, starving and ignorant, Farooq says, "imperialism, with its racist underpinnings of a civilising mission, followed by the cruel joke of pretending to give independence when really they were merely changing economic models via the creation of client states, their nonsensical boundaries designed to cause instability" (Shamsie 129). The tendency of conservative Muslims to the golden age of the Islamic Caliphate conjures up the hostility between Muslims and Christians that counts the Western interference in the Islamic countries is the reason behind the calamities of the Muslim countries. The West helps dictatorial systems to seize the power in Muslim countries to keep it poor and instable, which push millions of Muslims to migrate looking for

better life. Farooq and Adil Pasha were convinced that their government treated them badly, migrants are no more welcomed and granted equal opportunities as in the past, Farooq says that Britain was a welfare state not so long ago, "when it understood that a welfare state was something you built up instead of tearing down, when it saw migrants as people to be welcomed not turned away" (Shamsie 144). Immigrants are turned away because of economic as we have discussed in Zizek. There is fear of the competition for job opportunities between migrants and locals, or more precisely, between refugees and European workers from Eastern European countries who occupy most jobs in agriculture and industry besides the small jobs which attracts migrants because it does not require high education.

Emmon Lone quit his job in management consultancy and he lives off his wealthy parents. The reason why Emmon left his job is that he did not find a job that makes him achieve a massive success as that of his father and was advised by his mother to take an open vacation and try to think of different things that can show him the meaning of life, Shamsie says about Emmon's mother, "she had quite easily convinced her son to try to find other ways of constructing meanings in life than via pay cheques and promotions" (Shamsie 32). Emmon's mother, Terry Lone, alludes to her husband who worshipped success and dedicated himself for his work which influenced his familial relationships. Emmon feels embarrassed of being unemployed and getting money from his mother and tries to get back to work through his ex-girlfriend, he says," I am going to get back to work soon. Alice thinks PR and I will be a good fit – she has a job waiting for me. He was not at all sure that was what he wanted to be doing, but he knew he could not turn up at Aunty Naseem's door as Aneeka's intended if he did not have a job" (Shamsie 101). Aunty Naseem was delighted by Emmon's visit and liked his story about meeting Isma in Massachusetts, but when he said he had quit his job she made "a disapproving face" (Shamsie 62). Work for migrants is something crucial, having a job is the key to establish a stable life and get married. Emmon knows that he needs to get a job and shows how responsible he is before he introduces his family to Aneeka. Terry Lone, Emmon's mother who comes from a wealthy and stable family, does not think that being unemployed is a problem as long as he did not find a job he liked; Terry's view of work is different of Karamat and other migrant's view, Terry considers work something substantial and should be enjoyable and meaningful, while for Karamat work is the key of success and stability and it gives meaning to life therefore Terry is unlike Karamat is indifferent about her son unemployment, Terry says, "well, you know my thoughts on the matter of employment for the sake of employment. But your father will be pleased" (Shamsie 101). For Karamat, man's work and usefulness is the

criteria for man's value, he suspects Aneeka's love to Emmon because Emmon is unemployed, he says, "I did not think that it would make you so sure of yourself, so entitled, that you would not stop to ask why a girl like that would have time for a schoolboy who lives off his mother because he can and who has no ambition beyond beating his own high score in computer games" (Shamsie 110). Karamat's disrespect of his son's unemployment led him to suspect Aneeka's love to Emmon and to belittle his son's person because of not being able to find a job.

The lack of future career was one of the driving forces behind Parvaiz's problems. After graduation from high school, Parvaiz did not succeed at getting a scholarship like his sisters and worked as a greengrocer assistant. When Aneeka told Parvaiz that she will post his profile on an Asian marriage websites, she teased him by saying that being a "dark-skinned is the real problem", for not having marriage proposals, while Isma commented that the reason is not skin colour but it is the lack of permanent and promising job, she says, "a total lack of career prospects is the real problem" (Shamsie 117). Isma wanted to urge him find a nice job and have a steady income in order to establish a stable life and get married. Parvaiz had a low income that was not sufficient to cover his own expenses, and this is why Isma decided to sell out the family house, she did not think that Parvaiz was able to get a better job that could help him endure the house bills, Shamsie says, "she did not believe he was good enough to find work doing what he loved" (Shamsie 119). This was the main reason why Parvaiz had turned up against his sisters, Isma and Aneeka both were able to get scholarships with stable income that can help them build promising future careers, while Parvaiz's future was vague and his earnings were too low to enable him continue living in the family house without the help of his sisters and when he was confronted with his sister's plans he felt betrayed, Shamsie says, "and anyway, in a few years, when she had her PhD and Aneeka was a lawyer, they'd be able to return back in. Ordinarily, Parvaiz would have the blade of being omitted from the conversation" (Shamsie 120). Parvaiz felt betrayed because he did not see himself in his sister's future plans; both of them will return back successfully, while he was completely excluded and excepted from returning back because of not having a future career. Parvaiz sense of loss and feelings of betrayal were crucial at falling an easy prey for Farooq. Farooq knew how to calm Parvaiz's fears and insecurities about the future by telling him that the problem is not in migrants but in Britain itself which is no more a welfare state. Farooq succeeded at convincing Parvaiz that the Islamic State in Raqqa offer its members the jobs they dream about to live with dignity, Farooq says, "where no one has to enter haram gambling shops to earn a living but can

provide for his family with dignity. Where someone like you would find himself working in a state-of-the-art studio, living like a prince. Your own villa, your own car" (Shamsie 144). Warriors like Parvaiz are not just recruited because they have extreme views but some of them are tempted by money, jobs, and positions in the new-born State.

Apparently, work is perceived differently by migrants than by locals in *Home Fire*. For locals, work should be enjoyable and helps man to construct meaning of life, while for migrants, work is a necessity, it gives meaning to our lives and makes it more stable and it reflexes the person's responsibility and usefulness. Work is an indicator to migrant's integration in Britain, because opportunities are offered just for those who believe in the British values and do not set themselves apart from the rest of society. Consequently, poverty and unemployment percentage among non-compliant migrants are high which makes them a preferable environment for extremism because of their sense of exclusion and inequality. Including refugees in the labour market is a mean for better integration in society. On the one hand, offering new-comers a chance to start off and make a new stable life, and on the other hand, benefiting from their skills and experiences in a productive way for the best of society. In the Creature's conversation with DeLacy, the creature tells that he has good dispositions, lives a harmless life and he is beneficial, but the problem is that people are prejudiced against him and see him as a hateful monster (93). New-comers should not be prejudiced against and shunned from communion because they are different, they should be listened, included and given a chance to integrate as long as they have good dispositions and they live harmless lives.

7 CONCLUSION

> You are, we are, British. Britain accepts this. So do most of you. But for those of you who are in some doubt about it, let me say this: Don't set yourself apart in the way you dress, the way you think, the outdated codes of behaviour you cling to, the ideologies to which you attach your loyalties. Because if you do, you will be treated differently—not because of racism, though that does still exist, but because you insist on your difference from everyone else in this multi-ethnic, multireligious, multitudinous United Kingdom of ours. And look at all you miss out on because of it.
>
> (Karamt Lone, Shamsie 2017)

This thesis has been a study of themes of alienation in Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* and Kamila Shamsie's *Home Fire*, and an investigation of alienation's impact on the protagonists in both novels. This thesis has also studied the relation between alienation and radicalisation. As we have seen in the previous chapters, alienation has profound influence on the protagonist in both novels. In *Frankenstein*, we have seen how Robert's disturbed relationship with his intolerant father had pushed him to rebel against his father's will and stick to reckless dreams and get involved in a hazardous enterprise in order to achieve glory. Improper guidance and parental oppression had influenced Robert, so that he puts his crew's lives at risk in the pursuit of his egoistic dreams. Victor, as well, blames his father for his destruction. Parental indifference and lack of guidance had caused Victor to become obsessed with prohibited knowledge and to have lofty ambitions. Victor's dream of becoming a creator has overpowered him and isolated him from all people around him, this isolation had influenced his behaviour and his sense and resulted in creating a hideous creature which, in turn, has led Victor to his demise. On the other hand, we have seen that the creature was made into a violent monster, only after he was treated badly, first by his creator, Victor, then by the DeLacy family and the people he met during his stay in the woods. The creature in the beginning was peaceful being; he sought to learn, help others, and to be welcomed by people in society. The creature demanded recognition of his rights of becoming visible and live in communion with humans because he suffered from being alone and cut off from the chain of existence. The turning point of the monster towards violence was the DeLacy's rejection of him according to Ronald Britton, he says, "It was the horrified rejection of him by his ideal family when he finally plucked up courage to approach them that inflamed his anger" (Britton 7). The monster resorted to violence to torture those who made him suffer and to avenge people's discrimination against him. no body tried to look at the

Creature as a self; he was looked at as a different race. The only time we saw the Creature was able to overcome his alienation and communicate peacefully with a human being was during his short conversation with the blind old DeLacy. Blind DeLacy were not able to see that the creature was different; he listened to a stranger who was in need for help and guidance to get out of his miserable situation. If this gives insight, it tells us how important to listen to those who are in need for help and guidance, and turn a blind eye to the differences between us and them, given that being different does not mean being enemy. Zizek, in his respond to the refugee crisis, advocated that we need to stop trying to understand everything about the other. He argued that coming too close will let us perceive differences and things about the other, we may not like and thus we open the door for conflicts. Here I agree with Zizek. Refugees integration requires mutual tolerance and real acceptance of the fact that there are differences and that both parts should respect these differences. Refugees are just like Westerners; they have their own values and ways of life, and if we want them to become fully integrated we should respect their values and their ways of lives, unless they do not pose a threat to other components of society. The integration of refugees dos not mean learning the host country language and passing the naturalisation test; these cannot grant them the sense of belonging to the place they live in. The real integration, in addition to these, is respecting the differences of one's neighbours and other people in society and feeling that the other respect yours. We have seen how the creature's education increased his alienation because it awakened him to his misery. Blindness is the solution for a peaceful coexistence in a multicultural society. The society creates its own monsters through non-acceptance of others and through banishing those who look different or think different.

In my analysis of *Home Fire*, I have shown that the novel exposes alienation and radicalisation in the making. The British government, represented by the Home Secretary, Karamat Lone, alienates and radicalizes Muslim minority systematically through compelling Muslims to prove their loyalty to the state through renouncing their beliefs and altering their traditions to be in line with the British criteria of integration. The consequence of this policy is dividing Muslim community into assimilated, westernised (Good Muslims), and conservative, non-assimilated (Bad Muslims) or (Monsters), who resist and defend their identity and their Muslim background by sticking to their beliefs and their ways of life. The non-assimilated Muslims are stigmatised and excluded; they had been recognised as a threat to the British society. We have seen how the integrated, westernised Muslims find themselves obliged to oppress the conservative Muslims or the (Bad Muslims), in order to demonstrate their

allegiance to the state and preserve their positions in the British society. Furthermore, those of the British people who were compassionate towards the marginalised Muslims were silenced and not listened to such as Emmon, Terry Lone and Mrs. Gladys.

On the other hand, *Home Fire* tells us that conservative British Muslims' sense of alienation and isolation as much as their feelings of injustice as a targeted group lead them to rebel against their dominators. Kamila Shamsie expresses the frustration of young Muslims under the prejudicial policies imposed on the ground of security and fighting terrorism, she says, "If you're young, Muslim and male, and angry, then you're going to strap a bomb onto yourself" (qtd. In Currier). Young Muslims like Adel Pasha, Farooq and even Parvaiz has left Britain in their search for freedom, justice and belonging. Fundamental groups succeed at recruiting frustrated young Muslims by promising them of becoming heroes of justice who work for liberating the world from the Western imperial hegemony, and for the building of their utopian state where everyone in their group will be treated equally and fairly, Farooq describes the state as "A place where migrants coming in to join are treated like kings. A place where skin colour does not matter" (Shamsie 144). Through my analysis of the novel I have learned that the sense of not belonging, racism and exclusion are the main factors that contribute to young Muslims' anger and make them susceptible to radicalisation, while the search for equality and freedom as much as the desire to express their anger and achieve justice on their own way, are the factors that attract them to join terrorist groups like ISIS. I have found that Parvaiz is just like the French man that I talked about in the introduction and many others of angry and frustrated young men who wanted to escape their alienation and express their anger but fell in the trap of terrorist recruiters. This can inform the current societal problem of terrorist events in Europe. The tremendous efforts of the Western developed countries in dealing with the refugee crisis and receiving million of them during the current decade, have to be rewarded with a real solidarity, through integration, tolerance and acceptance for a peaceful coexistence.

However, if the novels lend any insight, I think that westernized past generations of migrants and native Europeans bear quite a lot of responsibility to change their treatment of newcomers. Like the characters in the novels, newcomers might be less likely to become radical and violent if countries would re-evaluate their cultural norms passed down from parent to child and also if they implement compassionate national policies to affirm religious and cultural identities of those they to whom to promise a good life in their countries.

Works Cited

"alienation, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, March 2021, www.oed.com/view/Entry/4999. Accessed 1 May 2021.

Ahmed, Rehana. "Towards an Ethics of Reading Muslims: Encountering Difference in Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire." Textual Practice, 2020, pp. 1–17.

Ali Haque, Syrrina Ahsan. *(PDF) PJAEE, 17 (9) (2020) LOCATING CULTURAL HEGEMONY: A ...* www.researchgate.net/publication/349695086_PJAEE_17_9_2020_LOCATING_CULTURAL_HEGEMONY_A_MARXIST_ANALYSIS_OF_HOME_FIRE_LOCATING_CULTURAL_HEGEMONY_A_MARXIST_ANALYSIS_OF_HOME_FIRE.

Baldick, Chris. "Assembling Frankenstein." *Scribd*, Scribd, www.scribd.com/presentation/111609066/Assembling-Frankenstein.

Banerjee, Debjani. "From Cheap Labor to Overlooked Citizens: Looking for British Muslim Identities in Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire." South Asian Review (South Asian Literary Association), vol. 41, no. 3-4, 2020, pp. 288–302.

Bordas, Zachary Vincent. *Constant Surveillance: Crit- Icism of a Disciplinary So ...* postcolonialinterventions.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/june-2019-constant-surveillance.pdf.

Brigida, Marcela Santos. *Necropolitics and National Identity in Kamila Shamsie's ...* www.researchgate.net/publication/333731845_Necropolitics_and_National_Identity_in_Kamila_Shamsie's_Home_Fire.

Britton, Ronald. "Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: What Made the Monster Monstrous?" Journal of Analytical Psychology, vol. 60, no. 1, 2015, pp. 1–11.

Bulajewski, Mike. *Getting a Grip on Slavoj Žižek (with Slavoj Žižek) | JSTOR ...* daily.jstor.org/getting-a-grip-on-slavoj-zizek-with-slavoj-zizek/.

Chambers, Claire. "Sound and Fury: Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire." The Massachusetts Review, vol. 59, no. 2, 2018, pp. 202–219.

Cambridge Dictionary: English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus." *Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*, dictionary.cambridge.org/.

Claridge, Laura P. "*PARENT-CHILD TENSIONS IN 'FRANKENSTEIN: THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNION*.'" *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1985, pp. 14–26. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/29532322. Accessed 23 Apr. 2021.

Currier, Cora. "Novelist Kamila Shamsie Talks About Radicalization, Citizenship, and the Link Between Violence and Masculinity." *The Intercept*, 26 Nov. 2017, theintercept.com/2017/11/26/novelist-kamila-shamsie-talks-about-radicalization-citizenship-and-the-link-between-violence-and-masculinity/.

"Destiny." *Cambridge Dictionary*, dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/destiny.

Dussinger, John A. "*KINSHIP AND GUILT IN MARY SHELLEY'S 'FRANKENSTEIN*.'" *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1976, pp. 38–55. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/29531766. Accessed 23 Apr. 2021.

Felsenthal, Julia. "Kamila Shamsie's Brilliant Novel Homefire Is a Newsy Take on an Ancient Myth." *Vogue*, www.vogue.com/article/kamila-shamsie-home-fire.

Fromm, Erich. *Marx's Concept of Man*, Open Road Media, 2013. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.uis.no/lib/uisbib/detail.action?docID=1808186.

Jeray, Celina. "Mary Shelley's Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus: Friendship, Monstrosity and Radical Otherness." Anglica (Warsaw, Poland), vol. 25, no. 1, 2016, pp. 59–71.

Josephson, Eric, and Mary Josephson. *Man Alone Alienation in Modern Society*. Laurel Edition, 1962.

Knellwolf, Christa. "Frankenstein : : the 1818 Text, Contexts, Criticism /: ..." *Colorado Mountain College*, cmc.marmot.org/Record/.b37728982.

Lau, Lisa, and Mendes, Ana Cristina. "Twenty-First-Century Antigones: The Postcolonial Woman Shaped by 9/11 in Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire." Studies in the Novel, vol. 53, no. 1, 2021, pp. 54–68.

Lew, Joseph W. "The Deceptive Other: Mary Shelley's Critique of Orientalism in 'Frankenstein.'" Studies in Romanticism, vol. 30, no. 2, 1991, pp. 255–283. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25600894. Accessed 4 May 2021.

McWhir, Anne. "Teaching the monster to read: Mary Shelley, Education and Frankenstein." The educational legacy of Romanticism (1990): 73-92.

Mellor, Anne K. "Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the Yellow Peril." Nineteenth-Century Contexts, vol. 23, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1–28.

Mészáros, István. *Marx's theory of alienation*. Aakar Books, 2006.

Miles, Chris. "*Occult Retraction: Cornelius Agrippa and the Paradox of Magical Language*." Rhetoric Society Quarterly, vol. 38, no. 4, 2008, pp. 433–456. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/40232601. Accessed 23 Apr. 2021.

Mohammed, Khaleel. "WHEN THE VICTIMS ARE NOT SO INNOCENT: Extremist Muslim Activity in Western Bloc Countries." *CrossCurrents*, vol. 65, no. 3, 2015, pp. 380–391. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/26605706. Accessed 9 May 2021.

Moretti, Franco. "'The Dialectic of Fear.'" Moretti, "The Dialectic of Fear", knarf.english.upenn.edu/Articles/moretti.html.

Ollman, Bertell. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Rivaldy, Padel Muhamad Rallie, Manneke Budiman, and Shuri Mariasih Gietty Tambunan. "MUSLIM DIASPORIC IDENTITIES IN KAMILA SHAMSIE'S HOME FIRE (2017)." International Review of Humanities Studies n. pag. Web.

Rutkowska, Urszula. "The Political Novel in Our Still-Evolving Reality: Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire and the Shamima Begum Case." Textual Practice, 2020, pp. Textual practice, 2020–11-10.

Sayers, Sean. *Marx and Alienation: Essays on Hegelian Themes*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Scott, Sir Walter. "Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine." *Romantic Circles*, Romantic Circles, 1 Mar. 1998, romantic-circles.org/reference/chronologies/mschronology/reviews/bemrev.html.

Shaheen, Aamer. "Obsessive 'Westoxification' versus the Albatross of Fundamentalism and Love as Collateral Damage in Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire." *Academia.edu*, www.academia.edu/36170983/Obsessive_Westoxification_versus_the_Albatross_of_Fundamentalism_and_Love_as_Collateral_Damage_in_Kamila_Shamsies_Home_Fire.

Shamsie, Kamila (. *Home Fire*. Bloomsbury, 2018.

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft. *Frankenstein: the 1818 Text, Contexts, Criticism*. Edited by J. Paul Hunter, W.W. Norton & Co., 2012.

Simpson, John A. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Clarendon Press, 1991.

Zimmerman, Lee. "'*Frankenstein', Invisibility, and Nameless Dread*." American Imago, vol. 60, no. 2, 2003, pp. 135–158. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26304711. Accessed 23 Apr. 2021.

Zizek, Slavoj. "Slavoj Zizek: In the Wake of Paris Attacks the Left Must Embrace Its Radical Western Roots." *In These Times*, inthesetimes.com/article/breaking-the-taboos-in-the-wake-of-paris-attacks-the-left-must-embrace-its.

Žižek Slavoj. *Against the Double Blackmail: Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with the Neighbours*. Penguin Books, 2016.

ŽIžek, Slavoj. Violence : Six Sideways Reflections. Profile Books, 2009.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Slavoj Žižek: The Cologne Attacks Were an Obscene Version of Carnival*, 13 Jan. 2016, www.newstatesman.com/world/europe/2016/01/slavoj-zizek-cologne-attacks.