

# **Wild Witches of the Globe: Putting Arthur Miller's The Crucible in Context in Hijabi Prosecution Post 9/11**

**Aamir Aziz, Farah Iqbal**

Institute of English Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

**Abstract:** This paper contends that the Hijabi prosecution post 9/11 is an example of repetitive cultural practice within American and British socio-cultural space. A hijabi is defined as a Muslim woman who wears a headscarf or veil by prescribed Islamic laws (Mansoor, [1] "Since I became a "hijabi:" What it means to wear a Muslim headscarf"). The term Hijabi prosecution is coined specifically within the framework of this research as lawsuits involving hijab-practicing Muslim women and multinational corporations or individuals. The *Crucible* by Arthur Miller has been used as the primary text whereby the witch trials present the main model of prosecution fueled by inflexible dogmas, fear, and injustice against which, contemporary issues of stigmatization and discrimination have been juxtaposed and scrutinized. Furthermore, the research paper scrutinizes whether media forums and legislature could potentially serve as catalytic agents for instigating prosecution against Muslim women who wear hijab. The theory of cultural transmission has been employed to analyze the repetition of cultural practices while transnational feminism provides the parameter for examining responses to Hijabi prosecution post 9/11.

**Keywords:** Hijabi Prosecution, Witch Trials, Cultural Persistence, Transnational Feminism, Post 9/11

**Email:** [aamir.english@pu.edu.pk](mailto:aamir.english@pu.edu.pk)

## **1. Introduction**

Ute Schönpflug defines cultural transmission as "a transfer process" whereby "cultural information" is conveyed "from one generation to the next, and from one group to the next" [2]. Cultural transmission examines the methods in which "contents of culture – explicit and implicit, objective and subjective – are transmitted to members of a cultural group" as it seeks to establish "linkages between culture as a macro-level, social construct, and individual-level psychological process" (Schönpflug xi). Schönpflug further elucidates that in cultural transmission the "contents of culture are translated and communicated" in a manner that emphasizes "the close bonds that are formed between individuals and the societies and cultures in which they live" (xii). Schönpflug views cultural transmission as opposed to

biological transmission where genetics are involved in transferring human data. For him, the term cultural refers to a "nongenetic transmission" of "traits" that are "acquired" through "imprinting, conditioning, observation, imitation, or as a result of direct teaching" (Schönpflug [2]). Cultural transmission is propounded to be a "universal process" whereby "knowledge" is transmitted across and beyond spatial and temporal parameters (Schönpflug [2]). Moreover, Schönpflug views cultural "persistence" or repetition as a quintessential aspect of transmission, of "passing on information" [2]. Schönpflug proposes two distinct consequences dependent on the method of receiving cultural transmission; societies that insist on preserving "homogeneous" cultural values eventually collapse whereas, societies that foster "heterogeneity" and embrace "diversity" in their cultural norms tend to facilitate their survival (4).

Boyd and Richerson [3] also expostulate that culture is a "transmission of knowledge, values, and other factors that influence behavior from one generation to the next"<sup>2</sup> (qt. in Schönpflug [2]). Both further identify two functioning relationships for cultural transmission as "vertical" and "horizontal" Schönpflug [2]. The former comprises familial units where the older influences the younger and vice versa whereas, the latter constitutes social groups or "peers" Schönpflug [2]. "Horizontal" relationships of cultural transmission are "advantageous" in "rapidly changing, spatially heterogeneous environments" while "vertical" relationships serve the purpose of "spreading less primitive cultural units" Schönpflug [2].

Additionally, Berry and Georgas [4] establish a third type of relationship for cultural transmission that functions through socio-cultural institutions present outside the individual's immediate cultural periphery (95). "Oblique" relationships in cultural transmission involve both, influences propagated and spread through mass media and various forms of social instruction Berry and Georgas [4]. Berry and Georgas [4] further propose a more consolidated differentiation between "vertical", "horizontal" and "oblique" cultural transmissions based on biological linkage<sup>3</sup> present in the first type that is absent of others (102). However, for both Berry and Georgas [4] the developing individual assimilates all three types of cultural transmission thereby performing more competently within a particular socio-cultural space (103-4).

Cultural transmission is not a process that filters information before reception; subsequently, "ethnocentrism, xenophobia, social prejudices, and stereotypes" that develop within a particular society affect the individual since they create it in the first place Six 371 [5]. Six, Geppert [5] and Schönpflug further expound the possibility of the individual acquiring "a relatively fixed pattern of discrimination against those who are not members of their in-group

and who may therefore become potential targets of their violence-prone activities” (371). Xenophobia is defined as not “a general hostility toward strangers or foreigners” but, a rather focused stigmatization “toward groups and individuals who are perceived as threatening” (Six 372) [5]. Furthermore, xenophobia develops within the society prone to processing “beliefs, values, attitudes, and motives in a specific way” (Kuczynski qt. in Six 372) [5]. Thus, Six, Geppert, and Schönpflug propose the model of cultural transmission as “reciprocal or bidirectional” where social institutions disseminate information created by the very individual who is a part of it (371). For Six, Geppert and Schönpflug the “unidirectional” does not suffice as a model for cultural transmission (371).

Similarly, Uslucan [6] and Fuhrer also expostulate that violence flourishes and is tolerated in “cultural contexts” as “an appropriate method of conflict resolution” in societies that reject or resist “interpersonal interaction” (392).

Nauck [7] identifies “discrimination” as a major factor that disrupts and inhibits cultural transmission thereby restricting the social integration of the individual in society (161). Allen [8] argues that post 9/11 “manifestations of anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic expression become more extreme, explicit, and widely tolerated” thereby effectively leading Muslims, particularly women to become “targets for discrimination, abuse, violence, and aggression” (5). Allen [8] further determines hijab, beards, and “physical entities” such as mosques, cultural centers, and schools as “visual identifiers” that provide “a seemingly societal stimulant” that serves as “an outlet for the venting of rage, revenge, or any other denigratory sentiment or action” against what is deemed to be associated with “Muslims or a material entity” symbolic of or linked with “Islam” (4-5). Moreover, Allen [8] views “negative or discriminatory” actions against Muslims in post 9/11 context as “retaliatory” or reactive (4) that stem from an atmosphere of “fear and threat” prevalent after the 9/11 incident where a “demarcation” based on “difference” further cleaves the society into groups categorized as “us” and “them” (11).

Abbas [9] defines “Islamophobia” as the “fear or dread of Islam or Muslims” propagated based on stigmatizing the Muslim populace as “other” (28) where media portrayal and representation renders Muslims as “barbaric, ignorant, closed-minded semi-citizens, maddened terrorists, or intolerant religious zealots” (Esposito qtd. in Abbas 28) [9]. According to Abbas [9] the portrayal of Muslims as different on multiple levels in socio-cultural contexts serves “to aggrandize the established powers and thereby legitimize existing systems of domination and subordination” (29).

While Abbas [9] places his research in the British socio-cultural context, Yenigun [10] offers an alternative portrayal of Muslims through American media. Yenigun [10] suggests a marked “departure from the monolithic representation of Muslims”<sup>5</sup> (46) in the American media; while he agrees that “Islamic fundamentalism was essentialized, and an image of its monolithic nature without any internal contradictions was created” (56) initially, soon enough remedies were sought and employed that could repudiate this conceptualization. For Yenigun, [10] the American media created space for representation that accommodated a more moderate viewpoint for Islam; Muslim scholars, journalists, and leaders began “appearing on television programs”, and wrote news articles and analyses for post-9/11 scenarios thereby adding their voice<sup>6</sup> to the mainstream (57).

Padilla [11] proposes “biculturalism” as a possible counterpoint response to discrimination. Being a “member of two cultures” simultaneously offers “an adaptive strategy for coping with discriminatory practices... than alienation from the society to which one belongs as a birthright but where discrimination may occur because of skin color and phenotype” (201). For Padilla biculturalism “incorporates more than just knowledge of culture from one generation to the next” in “that [it] also prepares [individuals] for prejudice and discrimination” (201) thereby enabling them to receive cultural transmissions from various sources positively (190).

Transnational feminism also formulates the responses to media representation and legislature all over the globe. Tohidi [12] describes transnational feminism as an all-inclusive feminism that is “more directly connected to the processes of globalization” thereby going well beyond national and international levels of concern (Tohidi, [12] “Transnational Feminism: A Range of Disciplinary Perspectives”). Tohidi [12] views transnational feminism as different from the concept of “global sisterhood”<sup>7</sup> in that it addresses issues concerning “race, class, sexuality, nationality” (“Transnational Feminism: A Range of Disciplinary Perspectives”).

Tohidi [12] defines transnational feminism as a form of “alliance, subversion, and complicity operating in a privileged in-between space where asymmetries and inequalities between women can be acknowledged, sustained” that facilitate their space and identity “to be critically deconstructed” (Kaplan and Grewal qt. [13] in Tohidi, “Transnational Feminism: A Range of Disciplinary Perspectives”).

Inderpal Grewal [13] scrutinizes transnational feminism in the context of post-9/11 America. For Grewal “gendered and racialized subjects” do not remain “as autonomous projects of resistance” but, “as subjects that develop about modern regulative and disciplinary institutions” (197). Grewal [13] proposes race and gender as “modes of knowledge” that pose

potential “threat and risk” to the emerging concept of security post 9/11(202). The state, therefore, seeks to subdue possible threats associated with race and gender discourses that acknowledge it thereby ensuring the sustainability of their national security (203). Moreover, Grewal indicates a surge towards constructing a unified American national identity that removes racial and ethnic barriers to effectively generate a sense of assimilation of those who were regarded as “others” (212-13).

Criticism of *The Crucible* focuses on the concept of differentiation between individuals though, it is intrinsically entrenched in religious dogmas operated through state apparatuses such as law and governance. Christopher Bigsby [14] critiques Miller’s play *The Crucible* against the socio-political context of Salem in 1692 (147). Bigsby [14] analyzes, from Miller’s viewpoint, the individual’s relationship with society, self, and most importantly the subsequent action guided by conscience that succeeds the intent (155). Bigsby [14] further comments on the kind of “social responsibility” Miller felt after he visited Salem that prompted him to construct the play in balanced counterparts; hysteria is juxtaposed with “calculated interventions” (157), power and politics stand in contrast with and contest personal ethics (154) while the opposing roles of seducer and seducee (151) create tension within the performance of the play. The Salem Witch trials do not represent class struggle (though land ownership does figure as a motivating force for persecution) rather, they function as a manifestation of power (Bigsby 154) [14]. Furthermore, McCarthyism also forms the socio-political context of the play during the 1950s instigating a deeper into how language wields power; Miller’s use of the courtroom setting, and immense emphasis on achieving “justice” in society through language all reflect the new wave of stigmatization that ultimately “condemns difference” (Bigsby 163-4) [14].

Bovard analyzes the functioning of gender dynamics within the play where women were treated as material possessions (qt. in Bloom 71). Moreover, gender and race are interlinked according to Bovard; for her Tituba represents the “other” who is naturally “accused first” of witchcraft because of her “powerlessness” in a foreign land (qt. in Bloom 70-1).

Prior research on *The Crucible* focuses on the Salem Witch Trials, gender discrimination, and socio-political contexts. This research places the contemporary practice of Hijabi prosecution post 9/11 as a parallel to witch trials as seen in *The Crucible*. Thus the research explores the cultural practice of discrimination and prosecution as a facet of persistent cultural transmission where “biculturalism”<sup>4</sup> fails to reconcile socio-cultural discord emerging post 9/11 in America and Britain. Moreover, this research has not scrutinized France as a potential

prosecution arena for Hijabis due to word constraints. This facet also indicates the possible analysis gap for future research in the context of this paper's contention.

The research paper has been organized systematically; the introduction is followed by a comprehensive literature review, discussion, and conclusion. The research is qualitative and textual for the primary source. Close reading of the text forms the basis of the model of prosecution against which, contemporary prosecution of Hijabi women has been juxtaposed. Secondary research data has been gathered through various newspaper articles, journals, reports, blogs, and magazines, both print and electronic.

Arthur Miller [15] clarifies in his note “on the historical accuracy of the play” that the play's account of history is not to be taken in the strict factual sense of an academic (12) rather, this becomes indicative of the fact that this text is open to interpretation of history as representation. As such, the historical representation of the prosecution of the witches renders themselves a poignant model against which contemporary Hijabi prosecution has been juxtaposed. Miller's prosecution model functions based on fear of "persecution" (13). Persecution functions both ways; the plaintiff either feels threatened by the power position held by the defendant or uses the civil lawsuit as a means of fulfilling greed for owning land and incurring personal vendetta over grievances that have occurred long ago. Reverend Parris fears he will be persecuted (24) as he fosters paranoia over the possibility of losing his job. Thomas Putnam too holds multiple grudges against the people of the town and uses the witch trials as a mode for fulfilling his vindication against those who have offended him (24-5). Abigail Williams illustrates both the fear of persecution and the persecution itself; she pretends to name innocent people as witches for the mere fact that they've potentially done her wrong or that they will pose threats in the future (as in the case of John and Elizabeth Proctor). Likewise, the defendants fear persecution based on injustice and false testimony and evidence of indulging in “heathen” practices (14). Moreover, the state appears to be actively involved in actions that encourage suspicion which further feeds the fear of persecution; within Salem, the governing bodies appoint "magistrates" that conduct surveillance and patrol activities to apprehend individuals shirking religious duties that serve as the tenement for the town's dogmatic environment (14).

Persecution also stems within the town of Salem from the fear of losing "freedom" of their own "sect"; the people feel threatened by the possibility of becoming “defiled and corrupted by wrong ways and deceitful ideas” (15) whereby, they assume the safety and survival of their community in unity of purpose (14). Within the model of prosecution (in witch trials) the unity of common purpose was to safeguard and maintain the belief that the self's values

appear as “positive” attributes whereas, the others represent “evil” and “negative” traits (37). Thus, “others” (referred to as witches) become an emblem of socio-cultural aberration that has to be eradicated. Furthermore, widespread “fear” generates justification for actions that have been disguised as a mission to encourage the greater good of the community (88).

The prosecution model of the witch trials functions within the parameters of “good purposes” that have been deemed “necessary” to uphold the higher principle of keeping the state and its apparatuses intact and away from dysfunction (16). The “good purpose” itself creates the “idea of exclusivity” which, instigates spatial politics and power struggle since two (seemingly) opposing “objects cannot occupy the same space” (16). One of the first accused within Salem is Tituba, a woman who is, a slave possessing a racially different ethnicity; therefore, everyone (including herself) naturally assumes she is a witch, an “other” (17-20). The community’s deeply steeped sense of discrimination bares itself since their “parochial snobbery” puts them above the “sect of fanatics” inhabiting the “barbaric frontier” (13).

A fundamental characteristic of the prosecution model of the witch trials is the “perverse manifestation of panic which set in among all classes when the balance began to turn toward greater individual freedom” (16). Within the periphery of state-dictated, dogma-riddled laws the town and the prosecution model followed become “autocratic” (15) in nature as the freedom of the individual is comprised and quelled for preserving prejudiced interests.

The prosecution model of the witch trials results in outcomes congruent with the socio-cultural practice of discrimination in that it ostracizes the individual from the mainstream. Furthermore, the prosecution model illustrates a dysfunctional state where violence is advocated by the state apparatuses as an appropriate method of administering justice. The prosecution model of the witch trials also becomes a concrete example of Uslucan [6] and Fuhrer’s proposition of cultural transmission of aggression and violence in societies that discard “interpersonal interactions” (392) as a result of pervasive fear and threat. Moreover, the prosecution model of the witch trials is propagated through “horizontal” (Schönpflug 3) and “oblique” cultural transmission (Berry and Georgas 95) [4] where Abigail and the rest of the girls become the social groups that transfer discrimination, stigmatization and bigotry to other individuals within the town. Since “vertical” (Berry and Georgas 103-4) [4] cultural transmission relationship is missing within the Salem community, it ultimately collapses on its own, failing to sustain itself or the individuals that comprised it. Within the text of the play, social disorder is explicit as injustice prevails; both, Danforth and Hawthorne fail to recognize Abigail and the girls’ pretense (101-5) thereby facilitating (unknowingly of course) their escape without bringing them to court for trial over their crimes. On the other hand,

innocents like John Proctor and Rebecca Nurse face death as punishment (125-6) after being accused of witchcraft on the mere testimony of Abigail and the other girls.

John Proctor initially responds to the injustice of his wife being arrested under the accusation of being a witch by presenting his case against Abigail in the court (80-99); however, he soon realizes that truth cannot be made clear in a society prone to catering to vested interests of maintaining and exercising power through religious ideology. He along with Rebecca Nurse and others, employs silence as resistance towards state injustice, choosing not to compromise their “name” and dignity for freedom (124). The prosecution model of witch trials ultimately succeeds in the indictment of individuals as perpetrators of witchcraft despite the defendants being innocent of the crimes with which they were charged.

The Hijabi prosecution model post 9/11 emerges as a repetitive cultural practice (Schönplflug 2) that has been transferred through intergenerational spatial and temporal paradigms due to cultural transmission. Though both men and women were prosecuted, this research will focus exclusively on Hijabis since the majority of the victims of the witch trials in *The Crucible* were women.

The Hijabi prosecution model is based on persecution of the individual not necessarily by the state but, also by the multinational corporations and individuals. The persecution stems from “hijab” or the Muslim headscarf being employed as a “visual identifier” (Allen 4-5) for Muslim cultural identity (Morey and Yaqin 41) [16]. In the manner that the prosecution model for witch trials considers witchcraft “ipso facto” (Miller 90), wearing the “hijab” becomes indicative of Muslim identity thereby, inviting unwarranted persecution through discrimination and stigmatization. Modood identifies the emergence of “new racism” that is “based on cultivation rather than biological factors” (qt. in Morey and Yaqin 41) [16]; thus, the “hijab” being a cultural symbol for Muslim identity of women inevitably becomes the target for persecution. Furthermore, Tony Blair’s speech in March 2006 indicates a decisive divide between “us” and “them” with the use of the word “modernity”; the Muslim cultural identity is automatically relegated to primitive ranks in socio-cultural space as Blair calls for British Muslims to join the turn of changing times (Morey and Yaqin 41) [16]. More recently Melchior [17] quoted Elisabeth Becker, “a scholar of European Muslim communities comparing a burqa or niqab to other Islamic women’s attire [to] foot-binding and high heels” (“Why is Donald Trump Defending Burqas?”). Moreover, Melchoir views the burqa, niqab, or hijab as “oppressive” since it erases the wearer’s identity (“Why is Donald Trump Defending Burqas?”). The article provides two insights into the manner of persecution, one of which is congruent with Blair’s remarks; firstly, that since the hijab is ancient and



primitive attire therefore, those women who choose to wear it would eventually be discriminated against for not being modern enough. Secondly, instead of functioning as a "visual identifier" (Allen 4-5) for Muslim cultural identity, it obliterates it. In the first instance, persecution is based on discrimination against cultural practice that is perceived as the act of the "other" thereby, stemming from widespread "islamophobia" (Abbas 28) [9]. Fear and threat are represented in the image of the hijab and the Hijabi since they are viewed as potential contenders to the power struggle (Abbas 29) [9] that could lead to the dissolution of the freedom possessed by the dominant socio-cultural group. Persecution in the second latter instance functions through stigmatization where individuals are excluded from the mainstream socio-cultural space. Persecution here stems from fear and panic that consequently pervades the society due to the portrayal and representation of the Hijabi woman as akin to others, a wild witch practicing her otherness like witchcraft.

Persecution does not necessarily stem from media forums but, how electronic and print sources are employed by individuals puts a constraint on the treatment and representation of Muslim women. Alsultany [18] refers to Beyer's article as an example of how "journalists use simplified complex representational strategies while advancing a monolithic image of Islam as brutal, violent, and oppressive" (76). Moreover, Alsultany [18] presents further evidence to consolidate this viewpoint by analyzing the October 2002, airing of the Oprah Winfrey Show that was devoted to Amina Lawal's<sup>9</sup> case (87); Winfrey implied through the show broadcast that violence exists beyond American borders (91), a statement that was met with responses from viewers that "criticize[d] the monolithic indictment of Islam and the absence of a comparison with violence against women in the United States" (97). Like the prosecution models of witch trials in Miller's *The Crucible*, this particular idea of violence is suggestive of oppression and subjugation of freedom of the "other"; however, there is a complete subversion in this instance of contemporary persecution since the freedom of the other is at stake rather than the mainstream society.

In the Hijabi prosecution post 9/11, the "horizontal" (Schönpflug 3) and "oblique" cultural transmission (Berry and Georgas 95) [4] are both present. Each is propagated in the American and British socio-cultural space; however, "vertical"<sup>10</sup> cultural transmission surfaces from time to time to contest and challenge both relationships of cultural knowledge transference.

The most poignant example that confirms the growing sentiment of fear or "islamophobia" is the Global Rally for Humanity that was organized and demonstrated in October 2015, just a few months after civil lawsuits involving Hijabis and other parties within the society

(although in this research paper specifically, the defendants are multinational companies in both examples cited) have been lodged and covered in various media forums (Kazem [19] “US Muslim leaders brace for protests with potentially armed demonstrators”). The anti-Islam protest confirms the growing “islamophobia” that explicitly advocates persecution against Muslims based on perceiving them as a potential threat to the state and individual security and national identity (Kazem [19] “US Muslim leaders brace for protests with potentially armed demonstrators”). Similarly, in the prosecution model of the witch trial, the people accused of witchcraft are deemed as possible threats to dogmatic state ideology hence, an open confession to the crimes by the accused like John Proctor and Rebecca Nurse (Miller 120-5) would quell any unease over them being punished for the greater good of the society. The protest too has been organized as a willful demonstration of the fact that the protesters want the Muslim community to be removed from US soil for the greater good, that is to sustain national security. Despite being bicultural, US Muslims are not exempt from persecution based on bigotry and prejudice.

There are two particular cases of Hijabi prosecution post 9/11; the first being a civil lawsuit entitled *Abercrombie & Finch versus Raghdaa Ali* (Warikoo [20] “Muslim women fight for right to wear Islamic headscarf”). The court proceedings drew a huge amount of viewership not only from the media forums but, also from the agencies involved in mainstream popular culture since this was a case of an individual fighting against a multinational corporation. Raghdaa Ali was asked to remove her hijab by the store management before being allowed to enter the premises (Warikoo [20] “Muslim women fight for the right to wear Islamic headscarves”). Ali filed a case against the company based on insult and offense she experienced despite being a US citizen where the law allows her freedom to practice her religious beliefs without any obligation or prejudiced repercussions (Warikoo [20] “Muslim women fight for the right to wear Islamic headscarf”). In this case concerning Hijabi prosecution post 9/11, the positions of the plaintiff and the defendant have been exchanged; the one who is considered as the “other” contests in the court proceedings. In the case of John Proctor’s trial, he was accused of being a practitioner of witchcraft after the trial started (100-5) not before. Ali was already considered as the “other” before the lawsuit was filed.

Another lawsuit filed in civilian courts by Samantha Elauf against Abercrombie & Finch was based on the discrimination she faced when she appeared for a job interview at the company (Jamieson [21] “Supreme Court Rules Against Abercrombie & Fitch In Discrimination Case”). The US Supreme Court ruled against Abercrombie & Finch for obvious violation of the laws and regulations set down by the US Equal Employment Opportunity Law (Jamieson

[21] “Supreme Court Rules Against Abercrombie & Fitch In Discrimination Case”). The Hijabi prosecution case here too shows that the American legislature does not incite persecution based on racial, gender, ethnic, or otherwise basis. Rather, it is the various agencies within the society that instigate persecution of the Hijabis due to discrimination and stigmatization of the women post 9/11. Ultimately, the persecution leads to prosecution as a result of the injustice accorded to the plaintiffs. John Proctor too contests the charges incriminating Elizabeth Proctor as a witch due to the injustice propagated through false accusations.

The difference between the repetitions of the cultural transmission of the model of prosecution seen in witch trials in Miller’s *The Crucible* and the Hijabi prosecution post 9/11 is the outcome. In the *Abercrombie & Finch* versus *Samantha Elauf*, the plaintiff came out of the court proceedings as victor. The court verdict on the *Raghdia Ali* case is still pending.

Transnational feminism has shaped the response to discrimination through persecution in mainstream advertisement media; H & M, a multinational retailer for apparel, hired *Mariah Idrissi*, [22] a hijab-practicing Muslim woman to model for their clothing line (Sarkar “H & M’s latest look: Hijab-wearing Muslim model stirs debate”). Interestingly enough as a parallel text to the anti-Islam protest rally happening mere days later, this response inculcates an all-inclusive approach mechanism closely resembles “vertical” cultural transmission in that it promotes and encourages a global fraternity agenda though, this remains pure inference. Though the mainstream nature of the action as well as the image of the Hijabi becoming the face of a multinational brand challenged and subverted the oppressed and monolithic image of Muslim women as primitive beings across the globe, the apparel retailer chose to not associate themselves or to encourage a “particular lifestyle” in response to questions regarding the choice of the model (Sarkar “H & M’s latest look: Hijab-wearing Muslim model stirs debate”). Though their neutrality is slightly off-putting to subvert the image; nevertheless, they still manage to accomplish what they have proclaimed as non-involvement and passivity towards association with socio-political activism on their part.

Another interesting response (that echoes explicitly of transnational feminist agenda) emerges from the South Asian region; with the conceptualization of a burqa-clad young Pakistani girl as a superhero (ine) and the subsequent airing of the animation series, the image of super-women changes radically (Mohsin, [23] “Meet the Burqa Avenger, a fighter for female education”). The media forum enables a “vertical” cultural transmission of the subverted notion of the monolithic and prejudiced image of Hijabi women and burqa wearers in that the knowledge transferred is open to creating an all-inclusive socio-cultural space whereby, its

instructive medium works akin to parental advice. This is especially true for children who would have access to the show.

In conclusion, the Hijabi prosecution model post 9/11 reflects the persistence of cultural transmission in its duplication of the method employed by social institutions and cultural agencies. Both prosecution models, witch trials and Hijabi trials, operate based on persecution stemming from fear of security and freedom. The “others” are persecuted on the grounds of threat perception though, that may also be a result of paranoia borne out of fear and panic. Persecution ultimately leads to prosecution; however, as seen in the contemporary issue of Hijabi prosecution post 9/11 the outcomes are promising the fact that the legislature governing the proceedings is not prejudiced and functions on upholding fair judgments unlike the convoluted practice of law that was demonstrated in the prosecutions for witch trials where, mere testimony incarcerated the accused. Moreover, the transnational feminist responses serve to globally subvert the monolithic image of the Hijabi as reflective of the practice of personal freedom of choice and its redemption from the notion of the alien other.

## 2. Notes

1. Reference to L. L. Cavalli-Sforza and M. W. Feldman’s 1981 essay entitled *Cultural transmission and evolution: A quantitative approach*. Schönpflug uses the text as the background for distinguishing the transference of traits in cultures as independent of human biology particularly genetics and heredity through DNA. Therefore, culture is acquired rather than inherent.
2. Reference to R. Boyd and P.J. Richerson’s 1985 essay entitled *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. Schönpflug provides various sources from which cultural transmission has been derived. The essay stems from research in the field of cultural anthropology.
3. Berry and Georgas refer here to “vertical” cultural transmission as a relationship present solely in between blood relations, that is, familial bonds. Both “horizontal” and “oblique” transmissions are independent of it. Also, it must be noted that biological linkage does not indicate cultural transmission through genetics rather, it is through instruction as between a parent and a child.
4. Biculturalism as defined by Padilla. See the works cited list for further details.
5. Yenigun draws heavily from Edward Said’s critical work *Orientalism* for the definition of monolithic representation.
6. Yenigun counterpoints Said’s criticism of *Orientalism*; the idea of the other as an entity that can only be represented thereby allowing the exertion of power over themselves passively.

7. Tohidi refers to Robin Morgan's coinage and conceptualization of the term "global sisterhood" in the 1980s. She views it as deprived of a transnational sense where issues of race, nationality, class, and sexuality are not considered as dividing factors in "an international network of women" (Tohidi, "Transnational Feminism: A Range of Disciplinary Perspectives").
8. Reference provided in Alsultany for Lisa Beyer's article entitled *The Women of Islam* published in *Time* magazine in November 200.
9. Reference to the case: "On March 22, 2002, a Shari'a court in northern Nigeria sentenced Amina Lawal to death by stoning for having sex and a child out of wedlock." (Alsultany 87).
10. Though Berry and Georgas define "vertical" cultural transmission as a linear familial body, I add further to the definition by suggesting that vertical in multicultural societies extends to the concept of human fraternization as demonstrated in protests that show solidarity for a community or socio-cultural group.

## Reference

- [1]. Mansoor, Hafsa. "Since I became a "hijabi:" What it means to wear a Muslim headscarf." Occasional Planet. Wordpress, 22 April (2015). Web. 12 Mar, (2016).
- [2]. Schönplflug, Ute. ed. *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2009).
- [3]. R. Boyd and P.J. Richerson's essay entitled *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. Schönplflug provides various sources from which cultural transmission has been derived. The essay stems from research in the field of cultural anthropology, (1985).
- [4]. Berry, John W., and James Gerogas. "An Ecocultural Perspective on Cultural Transmission: The Family across Cultures." *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Ed. Ute Schönplflug. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 95-125, (2009).
- [5]. Six, Geppert, and Ute Schönplflug. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Xenophobia and Rightism in East Germany." *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Ed. Ute Schönplflug. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 370-390, (2009).
- [6]. Uslucan and Urs Fuhrer. "Intergenerational Transmission of Violence." *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Ed. Ute Schönplflug. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 391-418, (2009).
- [7]. Nauck, Bernhard. "Intergenerational Transmission, Social Capital, and Interethnic Contact in Immigrant Families." *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Ed. Ute Schönplflug. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 161-184, (2009).
- [8]. Allen, Christopher. "Justifying Islamophobia: A Post-9/11 Consideration of the European Union and British Contexts." *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*. Spec. issue of Neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia: Post-9/11 21.3 (2004): 1-25. Web. 14, Mar, (2016).

- [9]. Abbas, Tahir. "After 9/11, British South Asian Muslims, Islamophobia, Multiculturalism, and the State." *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*. Spec. issue of Neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia: Post-9/11 21.3 (2004): 28-38. 14 Mar, (2016).
- [10]. Yenigun, Halil Ibrahim. "Muslims and the Media after 9/11: A Muslim Discourse in the American Media?" *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*. Spec. issue of Neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia: Post-9/11 21.3 (2004): 39-69. Web. 14 Mar, (2016).
- [11]. Padilla, Amado M. "Developmental Processes Related to Intergenerational Transmission of Culture: Growing Up with Two Cultures." *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects*. Ed. Ute Schönplüg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 185-211, (2009).
- [12]. Tohidi, Nayereh. "Transnational Feminism: A Range of Disciplinary Perspectives." UCLA.Royce Hall, UCLA. 18 May (2005). Interview. Web. 18 Mar, (2016).
- [13]. Grewal, Inderpal. *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press, Print, (2005).
- [14]. Bigsby, Christopher. *Arthur Miller: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Print, (2005).
- [15]. Miller, Arthur. *The Crucible*. 1953. UK: Penguin Random House, Print, (2015).
- [16]. Morey and Amina Yaqin. *Framing Muslims: Stereotyping and Representation after 9/11*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Print, (2011).
- [17]. Melchior, Jillian Kay. "Why is Donald Trump Defending Burqas?" *National Review*. National Review, 27 October 2015. Web. 18 Mar, (2016).
- [18]. Alsultany, Evelyn. *Arabs and Muslims in the Media: Race and Representation after 9/11*. New York: New York University Press, 2012. Print.
- [19]. Kazem, Halima. "US Muslim leaders brace for protests with potentially armed demonstrators." *The Guardian*. The Guardian e-paper, 9 Oct 2015. Web. 13 Mar, (2016).
- [20]. Warikoo, Niraj. "Muslim women fight for the right to wear Islamic headscarf." *USA Today*. USA Today e-paper, 1 July 2015. Web. 12 Mar, (2016).
- [21]. Jamieson, Dave. "Supreme Court Rules against Abercrombie & Fitch in DiscriminationCase." *Huffington Post*. Huffington Post e-paper, 2 Jun 2015. Web. 12 Mar, (2016).
- [22]. Sarkar, Monica. "H & M's latest look: Hijab-wearing Muslim model stirs debate." *CNN*. CNN e-paper, 5 Oct 2015. Web. 13 Mar, (2016).
- [23]. Mohsin, Saima. "Meet the Burqa Avenger, a fighter for female education." *CNN*. CNNe -paper, 5 Aug 2013. Web. 13 Mar, (2016).