1-1-2007

Transnational resistance or cultural exotica? : interrogating the multicultural accommodation of the Kufiya

Nashwa Salem
Ryerson University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations>

Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salem, Nashwa, "Transnational resistance or cultural exotica? : interrogating the multicultural accommodation of the Kufiya" (2007).
Theses and dissertations. Paper 265.

617959123

ET
1480
.P19
S25
2007

TRANSNATIONAL RESISTANCE OR CULTURAL EXOTICA?: INTERROGATING THE MULTICULTURAL
ACCOMMODATION OF THE KUFİYA

by

Nashwa Salem, B.Ed Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, 2005
BA Hons., York University, 2004

A Major Research Paper
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2007

© Nashwa Salem 2007

PROPERTY OF
RYERSON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

UMI Number: EC53670

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC53670

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signature

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signature

TRANSNATIONAL RESISTANCE OR CULTURAL EXOTICA?: INTERROGATING THE MULTICULTURAL ACCOMMODATION OF THE KUFUYA

© Nashwa Salem, 2007

Master of Arts
Immigration and Settlement Studies
Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

The paper focuses on the incorporation of *kufiya* in Canada as a case study to argue that the coded aesthetics of dress is a salient non-verbal political signifier that marks transnational identities of resistance. However, its resistive communication is ruptured and dehistoricized by its incorporation into the hegemonic zone of multicultural Canada. Paradoxically, multiculturalism's disembodied production of the *kufiya* is further appropriated and commodified by mainstream countercultures as exotic chic through an Orientalist frame.

The paper analyzes the cultural appropriation of the *kufiya* as a political practice whereby it concurrently operates within and naturalizes unequal power and social relationships. The processes that enable dominant groups to access, possess and (re)define cultural productions of marginal social groups are interrogated. This examination is extended to assessing the implications cultural appropriation has on the *kufiya* as well as appropriated communities of resistance.

Key words:

Transnational identities; visual symbolism; multiculturalism; race; racialization; counter-cultures; resistance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: CODING RESISTANCE: DRESS AS REPRESENTATIONAL SOCIAL PRACTICE.....	6
Sec 1.1: (Un)Dressing Power: Historical Usages of Dress as Counter-Hegemonic Practice.....	8
Sec 1.2: Historicizing the <i>Kufiya</i>	10
Sec 1.3: Re:Locating the <i>Kufiya</i> and Representational Practices.....	12
Sec 1.4: Challenging Dominant Representations of ‘Otherness’.....	15
CHAPTER 2: TRANSNATIONAL SYSTEMS OF REPRESENTATION.....	21
Sec 2.1: (Re)Conceptualizing Local Subjectivities: The Transnationalization of the <i>Kufiya</i>	24
Sec 2.2: Contradictory Encounters with Transnationalism: Multiculturalism’s Signifying Practices.....	30
CHAPTER 3: (RE)APPROPRIATIONS OF THE <i>KUFIYA</i> : FROM A CULTURE OF RESISTANCE TO ‘MILITANT CHIC’.....	40
Sec 3.1: Re:Mapping Cultures of Resistance.....	42
Sec 3.2: Competing Discourses of Resistance: Contradictions of the Transnational <i>Kufiya</i>	45
Sec 3.3: The Hyperpoliticization of the <i>Kufiya</i>	48
Sec 3.4: Appropriation of the <i>Kufiya</i> by Countercultural Hipsters.....	49
Sec 3.5: The Allure of the <i>Kufiya</i>	53
Sec. 3.6: The Politics of Naming and Colour-Coding.....	54
Sec. 3.7: Popular Commentaries: From “What’s it Called Again?” to “Terrorist Chic”.....	58
CONCLUSION.....	63
REFERENCES.....	80

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Appropriation as Resistance 1	68
FIGURE 2: Appropriation as Resistance 2	68
FIGURE 3: Appropriation as Resistance 3	68
FIGURE 4: Appropriation as Resistance 4	68
FIGURE 5: Appropriation as Resistance 5	69
FIGURE 6: Appropriation as Resistance 6	69
FIGURE 7: Appropriation as Resistance 7	69
FIGURE 8: Appropriation as Resistance 8	71
FIGURE 9: Countercultural Appropriation 1	71
FIGURE 10: Countercultural Appropriation 2	71
FIGURE 11: Countercultural Appropriation 3	71
FIGURE 12: Appropriation as Resistance 9	72
FIGURE 13: Countercultural Appropriation 4	72
FIGURE 14: Appropriation as Resistance 10	72
FIGURE 15: Countercultural Appropriation 5	72
FIGURE 16: Countercultural Appropriation 6	73
FIGURE 17: Countercultural Appropriation 7	73
FIGURE 18: Countercultural Appropriation 8	74
FIGURE 19: Countercultural Appropriation 9	74
FIGURE 20: Countercultural Appropriation 10	74
FIGURE 21: Countercultural Appropriation 11	74
FIGURE 22: Hyperpoliticized Production of the <i>Kufiya</i> 1	75
FIGURE 23: Hyperpoliticized Production of the <i>Kufiya</i> 2	75
FIGURE 24: Countercultural Appropriation 12	75
FIGURE 25: Countercultural Appropriation 13	75
FIGURE 26: Countercultural Appropriation 14	75
FIGURE 27: Hyperpoliticized Production of the <i>Kufiya</i> 3	76
FIGURE 28: Countercultural Appropriation 15	77

Introduction

The above constellation of contradictory images reflects recent observations of multifarious social bodies linked by the elusive threads of a checkered scarf. How can a single object be iconized as resistance, hyperpoliticized as terror and epitomize fashion? These observations have incited extensive reflection upon the intersections between dress and identity as well as their configuration into a politics of representation within larger structures of western hegemony and imperial domination. Evidently much lies beyond the denoted materiality of a simple scarf. Consequently, I am interested in interrogating the contradictory articulations of *kufiya*ⁱⁱ in Canada. In particular, I am interested in exploring how my understanding of the *kufiya*, rooted in anticolonial resistance, becomes encroached upon within the commodified realm of cosmopolitan chic fashion.

The traditional use of the *kufiya* in Palestine as a headscarf emerged as a national symbol of resistance through confrontation with brutal colonial relations, occupation and the denial of self-determination. As such, the localization of the *kufiya* outside of Palestine demonstrates its power of marking transnational identities of resistance. The *kufiya*'s resistive longevity is attributed to social memory, thought and knowledge - the recreation of coded sentiments of anti-colonialism that have traversed national boundaries. However, the transnational journey of the *kufiya* and its coded expressions of resistive consciousness have become transformatively ruptured through its multicultural accommodation in Canada. Hence, by traversing territorial boundaries into Canada, the *kufiya* has been transformed from a powerful symbol of resistance into an object of Orientalist discourse – Canada's essentialized multicultural character fragmentatively consumes and deploys the *kufiya* as a mysterious product of the Orient: exotic, primitive, and dangerous.

Deconstructing the (mis)appropriation of the *kufiya* requires exploring the following: What are the underlying connotative meanings of the *kufiya* in the west? How do these connotations inform an allure to appropriate the *kufiya*? What is the relationship between diverse *kufiya*-wearers and the notion of *resistance*? Finally, what connections can be drawn between the fetishized commodification in the west and its socio-historical emergence in the Middle-East? These questions are posed in acknowledgement of the power of visual cultural production and the codification of aesthetic dress as strategies of communication and representational practice.

Coded dress is deployed to visually stimulate, mediate and organize understandings of reality and imagination – it is an integral component to a politics of representation.

However, meanings of dress codes are negotiated in relation to the surrounding social environment in which it is deployed. As in the case of the *kufiya*, this dynamic can fundamentally disrupt *intended* and *produced* meanings of the scarf between ‘author’ and ‘reader.’

The images above illustrate that the *kufiya* is an aesthetic means of communicating a desired form of representation; moreover, they depict how the *kufiya* interacts with different social spaces in order to produce various contradictory meanings. For instance, in images of protest, the *kufiya* conjures a sentiment of resistance. Where some see hyperpoliticized images of the *kufiya* as hate and terror, others as associate them with a narrative of struggle for freedom and self-determination. More recently the *kufiya* appears draped around the necks of trendy urbanites. Fashion articles label the *kufiya* as ‘global chic,’ ‘militant chic,’ an ‘anti-war’ scarf or a product of a broader ‘Islamization’ of fashion subcultures. Such categorizations imply the opportunity for mainstream hipsters to forge an ‘identity of difference’ through its appropriation. I am particularly interested in exploring this latter form of cultural appropriation, relating the seemingly innocent act of wearing a ‘scarf’ to reflecting hegemonic practices of dominant Canadian culture. Consequently, exploring the ambivalence of the *kufiya* will help to elucidate its coded expression as a counter-hegemonic practice versus its appropriation as an instrument of hegemony.

In this essay I will use the *kufiya* as a case study to argue that the coded aesthetics of dress is a salient non-verbal political signifier that marks transnational identities of resistance. However, its resistive communication is ruptured and dehistoricized by its incorporation into the hegemonic zone of multicultural Canada. Paradoxically, multiculturalism's disembodied production of the *kufiya* is further appropriated and commodified by mainstream countercultures as exotic chic through an Orientalist frame.

This paper is split into the following chapters. First, I will examine representational practices displayed through coded forms of dress. This discussion will also illustrate the historical embodiment of the *kufiya*, which illustrates its transnational power to mark identities of resistance. I will utilize Ted Swedenburg's analysis of the politicization of the *kufiya* in both Palestinian and American contexts as a catalyst for discussing Canadian usages of the scarf. My work departs from Swedenburg in suggesting that important changes in geopolitical climate of the westⁱⁱⁱ has had significant impact on (re)defining meanings and usages of the *kufiya* in Canada. Second, I will interrogate the limits of transnationalism by discussing various modes of mapping the *kufiya* as a communicative form of resistance. The forging of extraterritorial solidarities will be put into this conversation, as will the implications of the hegemonic multicultural incorporation of racialized markers of identity. This analysis must assess the processes whereby dominant groups are able to access, possess and (re)define cultural forms of marginal groups. The theoretical frameworks of Roland Barthes, Stuart Hall and Dick Hebdige will be utilized to assess the implications cultural appropriation has on the *kufiya* as well as the cultures of resistance that strategically deploy the symbol as a form of

political resistance. The processes suggest that transnational racialized regimes of representation are managed and fundamentally altered through western hegemonic incorporation. In the final chapter, I will focus on the appropriation and deployment of the *kufiya* in the Canadian context. This analysis will explore a case study of the commercialization of the *kufiya* as ‘fashion.’ I will also reflect upon Edward Said’s *Orientalism* to explore the specific implications that relate to western cultural productions of the *kufiya* as it relates to its Arab cultural origin and the vilification of Arab and Muslim identities in the west. The *situated* transnational political usage of the *kufiya* will be juxtaposed against its dominant cultural appropriation.

(1) Coding Resistance: Dress as Representational Social Practice

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce dress as a mode of representational practice. Clothing is a mode through which a social agent may express a visual adaption or distinction from their social surroundings. Accordingly deploying certain types of dress is a powerful vehicle for communicating and representing sites of contestation and resistance. As such I will draw upon previous social movements that deployed the aesthetics of coded dress to express resistance. Extending this discussion will be an exploration into the coded resistance of the *kufiya* and its emergence as an anti-colonial symbol in Palestine. I will then end the chapter with a critical interrogation of its resistive communicative capacity through its transnational production and interaction within a politic of Canadian commercialism.

Exploring style and clothing as text reveals the complexities of how subjects deploy aesthetic mode of dress as a social marker and political signifier. Indeed visual imagery is a powerful form of communication that can transmit implicit knowledge that resists verbal expression (Belova 2006: 38). My interest lies in the discursive inscription of identity through embodied markers of dress – specifically exploring the appropriation of the *kufiya* in Canada as a form of localizing the Palestinian resistance movement. In this light I am not suggesting that the *kufiya* reflects a fixed representation of the Palestinian struggle. Rather it represents a multi-vocal embodiment of resistance encoded with meaning through its emergence as a political symbol over time in Palestine. In this sense it acts as a tool of performance, activated by bodies that become marked in social and political ways. Consequently my intention is not to interrogate potential limits in its

replication of Palestinian nationalist narratives but rather suggest that the political appropriation of the scarf is a site of social practice – a mode of inventing resistive social subjectivities and political identities within Canada and the forging of links to extraterritorial social movements within a larger global environment (Bannerji 2002: 4).

Deploying the *kufiya* in this sense demonstrates the potential of dress to act as a vehicle of expression constituted within larger social and political surroundings (Calefato 2004). See Figures 1-4 for instance, where the *kufiya* is deployed as one constitutive element of a broader movement calling for Canadians to divest and boycott Chapters/Indigo Bookstore who contribute portions of their profits to support ‘lone soldiers’ in the Israeli military. The *kufiya* as a coded narrative of an ongoing Palestinian struggle is linked to the daily activities of Canadians and potential complicity in contributing to Palestinian oppression by shopping at this particular bookstore. Consequently the deployment of the *kufiya* in this particular space of contestation evokes particular reactions or connotative meanings to the ‘author’ and ‘reader’. The *kufiya* is one element among many (signs, flags, crowd of bodies, etc.) indicating resistance. I am interested in exploring the connotative meanings of the *kufiya* alone as a transnational symbol of resistance. If Figures 1-4 displayed the image of individuals wearing a *kufiya* removed from the overt space of a protest would it conjure similar readings of resistance? Would the integrity of its transnational embodiment still be maintained? These questions reflect semiotic ruptures of the connotative meaning of the *kufiya* caused through the processes of transnationalism. Accordingly *the kufiya* becomes localized within the structures of western hegemony. Insofar as systems of identity representation configure into an

unequal social framework this can reveal a renewal of imperialist cultural tasks in its potential to manage and (re)define connotative meanings of the *kufiya*. In the third chapter this idea will be put into conversation with a case study of mainstream commercialization of the *kufiya* as ‘fashion’ fundamentally altering the capacity of the symbol to mark transnational identities of resistance.

Himani Bannerji’s *Inventing Subjects* (2002) explores how social subjects invent themselves in interesting ways constituted within particular social and temporal contexts but also how their subjectivities also risk becoming reinvented through dominant cultural and ideological discourse (3). This relates to the above discussion in problematizing the transnational incorporation of the *kufiya* as an identifiable marker of anticolonial resistance and subsequent sanitization of meaning through dominant accommodation and consumption. The latter contradiction will be explored in the following chapter, relating the interaction of the transnational character of the *kufiya* with its accommodation within metanarratives of Canadian nationalist discourse. First I will explore the possibility of inventing the self through embodied signs of aesthetic dress.

1.1 (Un)Dressing Power: Historical Usages of Dress as Counter-Hegemonic Practice

Historical examples of the deployment of dress in challenging the foundations of oppressive power relations may be easily drawn. The most widely cited examples reflect the reclaiming indigenous or non-western modes of dress in rejection of western imperialism, domination and/or colonial rule^{iv}. M.K. Gandhi’s rejection of the European suit and adoption of the loincloth echoed India’s plight for independence from British

colonial rule (Tarlo 1996: 62). Another example is the *hijab*, despite its monolithic projection as the locus of oppression of women in western ideology. In certain historical contexts, it reveals an important site of empowerment and resistance. The veil as a symbol of revolutionary struggles was adopted in Algeria as a national symbol of French resistance in the 1950s; as an anti-imperialist symbol in Egypt in the 1970s; and in Morocco in the 1980s and 1990s (Bullock 2002: 91). In the late 1970s Iranian women similarly adopted the veil in resisting westernization and modernization projects of the repressive Shah Mohammed Reza (Bullock 2002: 90-91). The hijab continues to be adopted by women in Canada as a means of affirming Muslim identity in the west – as a construction of identity in contrast to the majority ‘other’ and/or an anti-imperialist statement challenging the naturalization of western culture as a standard of normalcy (Alvi, Hoodfar et al. 2003: 75; Kawaja, Brand et al. 1999). This demonstrates that historically dress has played a salient role in representing movements of resistance at particular socio-historical moments. This element of resistance movements is often elided from our understanding of how opposition is forged and marked at the level of the individual.

Indeed the *kufiya* has also emerged as a political symbol through Palestinian history. Coded with expressions of consciousness it is a multi-vocal symbol deployed to narrate a confrontation with oppressive structures of colonialism and occupation as well as an imagined future of self-determination, sovereignty and justice. Therefore, dress in this instance reveals a powerful non-verbal form of ideological communication. It will be

useful to look at a historical genealogy of the *kufiya* in order to elucidate its role in helping to constitute resistive subjectivities.

1.2 Historicizing the Kufiya

Ted Swedenburg (1992, 1995) traces the emergence of the *kufiya* as a symbol of Palestinian resistance. Initially, it acted as a signifier of class appropriated by rural peasantry in opposition to elitist *tarbush*-garbed ‘Ottoman’ Turks. The *kufiya* at this time was only used as headdress reserved for the use of men. In this usage the *kufiya* embodied class-based distinctions intimately connected to further regional and sectarian differences. The 1936 Palestinian uprising against the British marked a rearticulation of its meaning in order to represent a nationalist sentiment and reject elitist colonial sympathizers adorning the *tarbush*. This uprising not only marked a significant moment in historicizing Palestinian resistance but represents an important alteration in the signification of the *kufiya*. In its embodiment and codification of ‘Palestinianness’ it erased internal differences previously demarcated by its usage, turning it into a national symbol. Additionally, as a badge of identification (representing allegiance, belonging, solidarity) it served as a visual indicator of political representation. Swedenburg also notes that distinction in colour as denoting resistance. Variable colour combinations are used throughout the Middle East as a cultural headdress; however, politically, mainly the black and white checkered pattern – and sometimes red and white variations were used as communicative symbols of resistance in Palestine (Swedenburg 1995:35). Black and white is more generally associated with Palestinian nationalism, while red and white reflect the color scheme of the communist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

It is also important to note at this point the usage changed from solely being used as a headscarf by men to also being adorned as a shoulder scarf by men and women alike. It is at this point – through the appropriation as headdress to neckscarf – it became symbolically charged as political. Swedenburg notes the renewal of the *kufiya* as a national symbol in particular historical moments: after *Al-Nakbah* (Arabic for "The Catastrophe") in 1967 and in the 1980s during the first intifada. Its renewal in contestation of the advent of the Zionist enterprise reflects a continuum of counter-hegemonic narrative in which the Palestinian imaginary becomes realized and the sites of its denial are contested.

Historicizing the *kufiya* reveals it as a counter-hegemonic political symbol embedded with sentiments of anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggle evolving through oppressive power structures. Accordingly, the emergence and ascendance of Zionist ideology has situated Palestinian people within an oppressive matrix of experiences including mass displacement; the destruction of Palestinian towns and villages; the systematic denial of the right of return; military occupation of the West Bank and Gaza; and the continued expansion and expropriation of Palestinian property for the exclusive use of Jewish settlers^v. Moreover, as Joseph Massad illustrates in *The Ends of Zionism* (2003) those Palestinians remaining in Israel have not been the beneficiaries of ostensive *Israeli democracy*, but rather are subjected to a “civilian Jewish supremacist system of discrimination”(441). Under such circumstances plural manifestations of counter-hegemonic resistance, including the *kufiya*, has emerged.

In this sense the *kufiya* becomes encoded with a narrative of Palestinian consciousness. Indeed the deployment of the *kufiya* has – and continues to represent an important signifier of allegiance, collective struggle and solidarity. This relates to Swiss linguist Saussure’s seminal analysis of the ‘sign,’ and the capacity for those to adopt signs – such as the *kufiya* – to reproduce coded meanings and demarcating ‘difference’ (Hall 1997: 31). Though the *kufiya* has no fixed essentialized meaning transferable to its wearers, its symbolic deployment at particular historical moments has encoded it politically as a marker that can be appropriated by social subjects to invent themselves in similar political and social realms. The possibilities for inventing the self relates to embodied meanings of the black-and-white (or red-and-white) checkered headscarf, reappropriated as neckscarf (distinguishing between cultural and political usages), and appropriated again to interpellate an identity of resistance. This resistance relates to the counter-hegemonic embodiment of the *kufiya* as political in imagining Palestinian national narratives in the face of its denial. Accordingly, this imaginary marked through the symbolism of the scarf similarly embodies the continuing struggles of Palestinians supported through western hegemony^{vi}. Thus its resistive capacity articulates resistance not only to Israeli occupying forces, but is also intimately connected to western support of the occupation.

1.3 Re:Locating the Kufiya and Representational Practices

The embodied deployment of the *kufiya* as a form of representational practice demonstrates the act of clothing as a politicized practice of the everyday (Subbaraman 1999: 575). Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson’s (1976) analysis of youth subcultures in post-

war Britain similarly situate clothing as a mode of resistance for working-class youth, suggesting that clothing can be used to create spaces of expression and resolve in symbolic and imaginary ways what remain unresolved materially (47-48). Accordingly, the situated knowledge of the *kufiya* and its coded expressions of consciousness have been appropriated and redeployed by transnational cultures of resistance to reflect what Arjun Appadurai (1996) refers to as collective culturalist ‘community sentiment’ (14). In this light solidarities are forged, renewed and represented by marked individual agents. Appadurai similarly suggests that the marking of these bodies as different are,

“...in the service of a larger national or transnational politics. It is frequently associated with extraterritorial histories and memories, sometimes with refugee status and exile, and almost always with struggles for stronger recognition from existing nation-states or from various transnational bodies,” (Appadurai 1996: 14-15).

The fluidity of the politically-embodied and historically-charged symbol to criss-cross nation-state borders localizes the ongoing struggles in Palestine. At the same time this process of localization situates the sign within the diaspora to reflect other forms of resistance, for instance towards Canadian foreign policy and support of the occupation. This inevitably alters possible connotative meanings – again a symbol, image, word etc. are never fixed or immune to changes in meaning. Yet there is a connection retained through its travels and codedness of colour, name and aesthetic styling. Thus the signifier scarf becomes signified further through these elements. Rather, in reflecting a sentiment of resistance there is an expansion of its symbolic significance to configure into the matrix of power relations in which it’s being deployed. When theorizing the political

appropriation of the *kufiya* in the Canadian context my intention is not to essentialize it in possible meanings produced or reasons for its adoption. I would rather argue that individual subjects negotiate their identities in plural contexts. For instance, Palestinian diasporic communities may appropriate the *kufiya* as a form of long-distance nationalism or transborder membership. It provides an intimate political connection between émigrés, exiles, descendants and those living under occupation^{vii}. This reflects a paradoxical process of global localization. One facet of this process involves the daily-lived reality of immigrant community's dialectical relationship to clothing as markers of cultural citizenship in this global/local landscape.

Ted Swedenburg's (1992) analysis of the emergence of the *kufiya* in the U.S. cites it as expressing: (1) political solidarity or romantic alignment with the Palestinian struggle; (2) a critique of official U.S. policy (and therefore deployed at anti-war rallies in contestation to the states multiple imperialist endeavours); (3) a "quotation" with a whiff of danger; (4) exoticism (572). As I have suggested the transnationalization of the *kufiya* indeed depicts an imagined solidarity with the Palestinian struggle. Swedenburg's second finding encapsulates how meanings and modes of adoption reflect the situated context of the society in which it is being expressed. I think that this is particularly relevant in its deployment as a counter-hegemonic symbol from the so-called 'Orient' in the post 9-11 'west'.

1.4 Challenging Dominant Representations of 'Otherness'

Sedef Arat-Koç (2005) explores a reconfiguration of 'clash of civilizations' framework and 're-whitening' of Canadian identity in post-9/11 Canada (32). I would argue that the *kufiya* provides a renewed potential of not only aligning the self with struggles in Palestine but more loosely in contestation of Canada's renewed membership with the west (34). The repercussions of this renewed membership and civilizational divide implied within it extends to asserting cultural superiority over homogenized 'Mulism' and 'Arab' worlds as well as over 'Muslim/Arab' articulations within Canada. As an overt symbol of difference and a convoluted signifier of Muslim and Arab identities, the *kufiya* presents interesting potential in forging an oppositional identity. This process is exacerbated by the deployment in dominant discourses of 'clash of civilizations' framework through which whiteness constitutes the Arab/Muslim 'other' as its binary, to emphasize 'their' purported incivility, primitiveness, hypermasculinity, hyperdangerousness, etc. These constructions are almost always portrayed through the frighteningly decontextualized and dehistoricized images of the 'terrorist' 'extremist' 'suicide bomber' – often donning a *kufiya* himself (see Figures 23 and 26). Deploying the *kufiya* in this context articulates a resistance to hegemonic culturalist discourse by contesting hegemonic identity production from *within*. Stuart Hall (1997) refers to this as trans-coding, contesting a negative stereotype by redeploying and thus challenging fixed racial assumptions and connotations (274). Deploying the *kufiya* in this way is concerned with challenging and disrupting racialized connotations of the symbol.

On the other hand, there are also different observable adoptions of the *kufiya*. Returning briefly to Swedenburg's observations of the meanings of the *kufiya* in the U.S., I would conflate his latter two annotations: utilizing the scarf as a "*quotation*" with a *whiff of danger*; or (4) *exoticism*. Rather I think the two are intimately connected and may be categorized under the thematic of cultural appropriation. Both forms of appropriation – as 'dangerously different' or 'exotic' – operate along an opportunity to the temporarily redefine and perform an identity other than 'the dominant body.' In other words, different desires of distinction lead to dialectical interactions motivating adoption of the *kufiya*. Moreover, the media's *hyperpoliticized* coverage of the western 'war on terror' implicitly associates the *kufiya* as an icon of Arab/Muslim identity (again there is a presumed inextricability between the two). As a constitutive emblem of Oriental identity the *kufiya* also becomes encoded with *hyperpoliticized* connotations. This attracts dominant bodies to appropriate the *kufiya* and imaginatively embody elements of its danger and exoticized production. This works to naturalize representations of supposedly 'fixed' differences by allowing the dominant body to appropriate fantasized elements of 'danger' as intrinsically connected to the 'other' and beyond the margins of normalcy. As suggested by Huggan in *The Postcolonial Exotic* (2001), cultural appropriation motivated by the pursuit of exotification "...posits the lure of difference while protecting its practitioners from close involvement," (50). This notion of 'close involvement' relates to the privileges of dominant bodies to appropriate cultural productions of the 'other' while remaining distant from process of racialization implicitly associated with bodies marked by race. This is similar to what Meyda Yeğenoğlu says about the western fascination with Orientalist construction of the *hijab*. "The veil is one of those tropes through which

western fantasies of penetration into the mysteries of the Orient and access to the interiority of the other are fantasmatically achieved” (1998: 39). Similar articulations present themselves through the allure and appropriation of the *kufiya* into the domain of ethnic chic contrary to its vilification by mainstream media apparatus. This form of reappropriation leads to an insidious depoliticization of the scarf by sanitizing previous encodings of political resistance. As such (re)defining the *kufiya* as ‘fashionable’ is a form of *repoliticization* in that interplay of complex powers are able to easily reconfigure a political symbol that has evolved over generations. The potential for such changes in meaning relate to the incorporation of the *kufiya* within the framework of consumerist capitalist politics. Sivagami Subbaraman (1999) illustrates how the fetishization of cultural identities commodifies fragments of identity – originally espoused by diasporic communities seeking to assert their identities. When applied to the case of the *kufiya*, this commodification has the power to erase the brutal colonial relations and oppressive historical social contexts in which the *kufiya* emerged. Integrating the scarf in such a way – while maintaining sign indicators of colour and style – locates the *kufiya* within a neutral space around the necks of an oscillating public busily in search of the next fashionable culture to consume (585).

Subbaraman states that clothing is a site of production and performance of highly contested racial, political, sexual and class-based identities. Moreover, these contested identities and their relation to fashion are embedded within capitalist and colonial/neocolonial relations and as such clothing is not merely “fashion” but what he characterizes as “a politicized practice of everyday life” (575). Subbaraman’s insights

undermine the perpetual 'innocence' of the hegemonic accommodation of the *kufiya*. Instead the repoliticization of the *kufiya* as fashion and subsequent mass consumption reveal a complicated imperialist frame of power at work. In this sense the *kufiya* is not merely a piece of fashion that is disconnected from power-relations, but is part of a highly politicized ongoing articulation of identity formation. Consequently, Subbaraman suggests that clothing forces a reconceptualized notion of the human body: more than a biological entity. The body then becomes situated in space and time, an organism in culture – as a biological cultural artifact with multiple meanings. Moreover, the body becomes a frontier between the self, the self in relation to the other, and the self in relation to a particular social context.

In this vein, the *kufiya* becomes bounded in a highly politicized field in which the body becomes a frontier. Meaning production and performing resistance becomes disrupted through cultural appropriation configuring into hegemonic ideological productions of capitalist *desire*. Though Hall (1993) contends the meaning of symbolic text is always negotiated through producer and reader, readings and interpretations are always constituted through larger social and political surroundings. So, as the *kufiya* becomes hegemonically commodified as a consumable ethnic scarf underpinned by Orientalist connotations or accommodated as a spectre of multicultural difference (this concept will be explored further in the following chapter) resistive connotative meanings of the scarf and interpellation of appropriating subjectivities become increasingly difficult to read.

I am not suggesting that connotative meanings of the *kufiya* as anti-colonial resistance are wholly subverted but rather are severely disrupted by the appropriation of the *kufiya* into dominant spheres of commercialization and multiculturalism. This complication results in multiple other signifiers to map meanings of the *kufiya* as resistance. The *kufiya* as a communicative form of resistance is reduced to a possibility, contingent upon other overt indicators of contestation. This brings us back to the question posed earlier investigating the semiotic ruptures caused by western hegemonic accommodation of the *kufiya* (see discussion on Figure 1-4). Once removed from complimenting elements of ‘resistance’ the *kufiya* represents an ambiguous and fragmented symbol of difference. Albeit still retains its capacity to articulate a dialectal engagement; however, appropriating under pretenses of commercial commodification or multicultural production threatens its capacity to voice resistance.

As a result, I am suggesting that resistive expressions of the *kufiya* are mediated and articulated within larger hegemonic structures only to the extent that they can be controlled in locations of time and space (overt spaces easily identifiable as ‘resistance’). This concept epitomizes Bannerji’s tension between the *inventing* and *invented* subject within the boundaries of the Canadian nation-state – representing the ‘self’ as resistant vs. being interpellated as resistant. This also reveals the broader ideological imperatives of mediating significations through myth-making (117) as suggested by Roland Barthes in his text *Mythologies* (1993). In this sense, the accommodation of the *kufiya* as a symbol of ethnic difference attests to Canadian mythologized multicultural nationalist narratives. Moreover, ideological apparatus’ implicit naturalization of Orientalist mediations of the

scarf submerge transnational meanings as anti-colonial resistance. Competing discourses intersect with unequal power relations altering potential interpretations or decodings when deployed by particular social subjects (Hall 1997: 42). In other words, deploying the *kufiya* as a social practice inevitably intersects with competing forms of social knowledge which have the potential to (re)define meanings inferred from its usage.

It is in this realm of competing discourses that I will turn to the next chapter, in order to elucidate the syncretic interactions between the *kufiya* and the ostensibly multicultural Canadian state. Consequently, these interactions result in multicultural hegemonic accommodation which has subversive implications for the transnationalization and historical genealogy of the *kufiya* and its connection to Palestinian anticolonial formations.

(2) Transnational Systems of Representation

This chapter will extend the coding of dress as a form of representational social practice by exploring its intersection with transnational movements of resistance. First I will draw upon examples of transnational modes of organizing in contestation of western hegemonic thought and practice. This will explicate how extraterritorial solidarities link heterogeneous socio-political 'locations'. Secondly the concept of 'location' will be interrogated. Working off of Arjun Appadurai, new insights into extending the concept to reflect wider social meanings will be offered in conceptualizing the transnational potential of the *kufiya*. Finally I will continue previous discussions on the hegemonic accommodation of the *kufiya* and its interaction with multicultural ideology.

Analyzing transnational forms of resistance demonstrate how bodies residing along social, economic and political peripheries challenge structures of hegemony through global-local practices. Conventional research on transnationalism is saturated with exploring the migratory experiences of marginal bodies; however broadening the scope of transnational experiences to reveal the spread of counter-hegemonic narratives reveals an interesting terrain of exploration.

Over time multiple revolutionary transnational resistance movements emerged in response to the insidious growth of western hegemonic thought. An emerging non-aligned consciousness throughout the so-called third world and constitutive subjugated subjectivities reflect growing forms of solidarity and mobilization in rejecting and contesting hegemonic ideological practices. For instance, the negritude and Pan-

Africanism movement; Indigenous rights movements; third wave transnational feminist organizing; religious ‘fundamentalisms’; transnational environmental justice movements and anti-globalization organizing are examples of movements resisting western domination and hegemonic ideological thought and practice. Though some of these movements entail problematic forms of essentialism and specific forms of hierarchical relations, they often deploy strategic methods – both in symbolic forms and action-based – to create multi-vocal modes of resistance. Indeed the strategic essentialism and deployment of a uniform Africanness through Pan-Africanism as integral to the linking and uniting black diasporic communities across the Americas, Caribbean, Africa, Europe and beyond; global support of the boycott and divestment campaigns against apartheid South Africa; the strategic deployment by Muslim women of the veil in decolonisation efforts and anti-imperial resistance represent counter-hegemonic forms of organization and practice. The commonalities of these movements lie in being constituted through the imposition of western ideological practices. They link multiple heterogeneous spaces through multi-faceted networks of communication and support underpinned by a common consciousness. Accordingly various modes of resistance were deployed ranging from: foreign policy modifications and restrictions; armed resistance; economic sanctions and divestment campaigns, to symbolic communicative interactions (signs and symbols providing overt representations of resistance).

The historical and political deployment of the *kufiya* represents a particular site of symbolism that has traversed multiples boundaries of space and time to communicate a powerful symbol of resistance. Vocalized in particular socio-political moments in

Palestinian history such as the organized uprising against British colonial rule, the first and second *intifada* and general rejection of Zionist enterprise demonstrate that the symbolism of the material object signifies important Palestinian nationalist narratives. Indeed a continuum of communicative and social networks reflect a similar deployment of the *kufiya* in the western context: anti-war demonstrations, protests against western invasions in the Middle East, vocal resistance against western securitization discourse and concomitant racial profiling of Arab and Muslim bodies; spiritual alignment with Palestinian struggle.

In this light I wish to explore further how the multi-vocal symbol of the *kufiya* as resistance is accommodated into Canadian nationalism. I will argue that this interaction produces a contradictory terrain of meanings insofar as the transnationalization and activation of political and historical meaning of resistance from Palestine becomes compromised through its appropriation into the realm of cosmopolitan ethnic chic. This process is part in parcel to multiculturalism's managing of meaningless floating signifiers of 'otherness.' Moreover this reflects the complex interaction of fluid disembodied symbols of resistance with western hegemonic structures of power. This complex dynamic represents a dimension of structures of hegemony in its accommodation – through subversion and alteration – of voices of dissent. Though this is demonstrated at a symbolic level this reveals structures of power in altering and managing bodies in the underexamined sphere of everyday interactions. This terrain of power/resistance is facilitated through the enhanced fluidity and mobility of bodies, information, symbols that characterize the contemporary global moment. This moment is marked by an

increased expansion of forms of communications, mass movement of people and the locating of multiply-located subjects in various social and political spheres.

My analysis of the transnationalization of the *kufiya* will, therefore, not be limited to exploring it as a production of diasporic loyalty, affirmation or representation of a cultural affinity – though I recognize that it may be taken up in these terms. Even when taken up in these realms wearing the *kufiya* represents a dialectical production of difference that ties into wide social and political meanings of identity, belonging, allegiance and so forth. However for the purposes of this work, I intend on exploring how transnational markers of resistance – espoused to produce ambivalent meanings of counter-hegemonic production: solidarity, resistance, alliance against western hegemony, domination and imperialism – are used to locate subjectivities in transnational social and political spaces. Thereafter I will explore how these markers have been insidiously accommodated - through sanitization, alteration and appropriation – in this multicultural polity.

2.1(Re)Conceptualizing Local Subjectivities: The Transnationalization of the Kufiya

Analyzing the transnationalization of the *kufiya* as a form of social practice offers important insights into how symbolic forms of communication move across nation-state borders and diasporic locations to mark bodies of resistance. This is a particularly interesting area of analysis as it reveals how bodies produce meaning everyday to challenge or ascribe to dominant ideological practices. Additionally it reveals how nation-state boundaries are being usurped by other systems of representation to forge a

sense of self and belonging in the current global climate. Though forms of resistance are no doubt conceived and organized through complex subjective encounters with multiple social and political forces, the purpose of this section is to offer some analysis into conceptualizing the transnationalization of the *kufiya* as a symbolic form of resistance. It also sheds light on how forms of resistance, embodied and imagined, intersect with concepts of space, place, race and consciousness relating to a politics of belonging in Canada. Analyzing the journey of the *kufiya* reveals multiple possible meanings inferred through its deployment. For instance the *kufiya* as representational practice may perform a re-creation and re-localization of social memory and historical systems of thought and knowledge; it may reflect an expression of existential nationhood; a site of dissent; connote a paradigm of anti-imperialist and/or anti-racist thought, and so forth. These representations demonstrate the power of symbols as text in communicating transnational social narratives.

Conceptualizing the *kufiya* as a social practice related to an expansion of social and political networks demonstrates how it allows for the reproduction of counter-hegemonic narratives and political organization across space (Smith and Guarnizo 1998: 4). This reproduction creates spaces for the forging of dialectical counter-hegemonic sites of opposition and resistance reflecting some form of connection, whether real or imagined with Palestinian liberation struggles. As mentioned previously these linkages need not necessarily be rooted in a direct spatial linkage with another in Palestine – but rather in the contemporary climate be forged through virtual networks via increasing channels of communication and knowledge formed to contest deleterious forms of oppression and

state-sponsored terror in the region. Moreover such linkages may be forged among disparately located oppressed peoples and collectivities who in advocating change for themselves resist similar systems of domination elsewhere. Additionally kinship networks, émigrés from Palestine and subsequent generations of these populations have indeed deployed the scarf as an overt reclamation of Palestinian identity and resistance to ongoing atrocities facing them, their families and relatives on a more personal level.

Sara Ahmed, Claudia Castañeda et. al. (2003) encourage a deepened analysis of, "...the variegated texture of habitation and migration in transnational circuits of exchange and power." (3). This is offered in efforts to destabilize conventional definitions of 'belonging' beyond concepts of location, community and nation to reflect a multiplicity of practices used to situate a structure of feeling. Accordingly the emergence of political usages of the *kufiya* did not emerge here independently from a particular or socio-political context. Rather its materialization in Canada reflects a continuum of situated meanings rooted in Palestine and deployed to mark a continuum of feeling in this context (in its potential to contest oppressive power structures). This also reflects Arjun Appadurai's analysis of contemporary migration and immigrant metropolises as spaces that are "...socialized and localized through complex and deliberative practices of performance, representation, and action"(Appadurai 1995: 206).

Analyzing the transnationalization of the *kufiya* also relates to how solidarities are forged among transnational actors engaging in the Palestinian resistance movement. Though there is an obvious difference among those 'on the ground' facing the imminent

consequences of the occupation versus those advocating change in symbolic modes from the outside – the desire to display overt signs of political resistance is an important realm of observing how subjectivities become agents in marking themselves according to their social surroundings. In this way the *kufiya* is an inter-discursive, cross-border site of counter-hegemonic social and ideological reproduction.

Arjun Appadurai (1996) describes the connections between mass migration marking the contemporary global world, notions of imagined subjects working off of Benedict Anderson's (1991)^{viii} ideas, and the production of modern subjectivities/collectives through mediated imagery (3). Appadurai argues that the concept of imagination is integral to understanding dynamics of the contemporary global conditions in that it evokes, "...a space of contestation in which individuals and groups seek to annex the global into their own practices of the modern," (1996: 4). In this way individual subjects express resistance vis-à-vis specific markers of contestation produced relationally in accordance to the specific contexts in which they exist. Thus markers of contestation – often borrowed from and manifested through mediated images – not only articulate principles of self-identity and the exercising of agency but also signal larger social projects based on collective desires, consciousness and solidarities transcending the confines national and territorial spaces. Accordingly the *kufiya* may be seen as an optic to understand forged spaces and identities marking a transnational sentiment of resistance and struggle for the self-determination of Palestinian peoples: exiled, displaced, occupied, second and third generation refugees and so forth. The *kufiya* becomes a symbolic representation of a collective sentiment based on multifarious sentiments of

hope, despair, struggle, justice, power and the right to self-determination mediated and politicized historically through its deployment in Palestine. Figures 1-7 demonstrate such representational practices of the *kufiya* in the Canadian context. The *kufiya* in addition to multiple other markers elucidate the power of visual symbolism as a powerful form of communication. The deployment of such markers demonstrates a reconfiguration of the concept of locality – conventionally defined in relation to physical boundaries – to define social and political boundaries of representation, allegiance and affiliation. Consequently expanding our understanding of location as a socially determined and negotiated process reveals how adopting the *kufiya* becomes more than a material object but also encompasses a structure of feeling, social practice, and means of situating politics.

Deploying the historically charged and politicized symbol of the *kufiya* here represents a collective imagining and culture of resistance. The communicative value of the *kufiya* as resistance is largely mediated through historical productions of it as resistance. Therefore interacting in the context in which it is being deployed may expand its meaning/production as not only a site advocating for the self-determination of Palestinian people, but also reflect implications of Canadian foreign policy as in for instance the desired disengagement of support with the Israeli government and Zionist enterprise.

In this vein the deployment of the *kufiya* visually activates political and social meanings into everyday subjectivities based on *real* and *imaginary* personal attachments to the Palestinian resistance movement^{ix} (Appadurai 1996: 10). This concept of the imaginary is important as its multifarious manifestations of representation mark an important site of

agency for individual subjects. Appadurai describes at length the power in understanding the imagination as social practice:

“No longer mere fantasy (opium for the masses whose real work is elsewhere), no longer simple escape (from a world defined principally by more concrete purposes and structures), no longer elite pastime (thus not relevant to the lives of ordinary people), and no longer mere contemplation (irrelevant for new forms of desire and subjectivity), the imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility,” (1996: 31).

This means that the imagination is an active means of producing spaces of racialized resistance within structures of hegemony. Reappropriating the *kufiya* in this realm reflect a critical problematization of global systems of oppression. The material object of the *kufiya* embodied through localized experiences of Palestinian contestation of imperialist and colonial rule is reappropriated extraterritorially. Symbolic narratives of resistance become reactivated through its localization in multifarious global contexts. This may simultaneously reflect solidarity with Palestinian struggle and a form of representational social practice constituted within specific socio-political locales.

Stein and Swedenburg (2005) forward the concept of *transnational relationality* that is useful in exploring the transnationality of the *kufiya* and its emergence in Canada. They

espouse the term in relation to, "...forms of contact, community, and mutual contingency that span checkpoints, walls, histories of interstate enmity and that circulate...through increasingly global channels of commerce and culture," (Stein and Swedenburg, 2005: 10). Its usage extends conventional understandings of transnationalism as situated beyond the boundaries of a nation-state. However the context in which this is stated suggest that a contradiction is produced between the *kufiya* as an extraterritorial embodiment of resistance and message that is territory specific. I think we must be cognizant of the context in which the symbol emerges as a sign of resistance. It is being constituted through a highly oppressive context of territorial encroachment – and so maintains a voice of resistance calling for tangible change defying simple notions of territory. Calls for justice continue to be a point of disagreement among Palestinians, sympathizers and supporters alike (one state vs. two state, territorial restitution, right of return, etc.). Importantly these calls are rooted in desire for social justice and rejection of imperial domination.

2.2 Contradictory Encounters with Transnationalism: Multiculturalism's Signifying Practices

For the purposes of my research Appadurai's conception of 'location' as a social construct is particularly useful in demonstrating the agency of subjectivities in marking self-identities. This notion accurately reflects the matrix of relations social subjects negotiate themselves in relation to inciting plural sites of belonging, contestation, affirmation and expansive forms of attachment traversing nation-state boundaries. However, I disagree with his characterization of such productions of location as proof of the withering away of the nation-states into the realm of a postnational global future. This

is a severe underestimation of the power of nation-states to rupture – through managed accommodation – transnational networks or as reflected through the *kufiya*, translocal cultures of resistance. Indeed Gramsci would suggest that allowing forms of controlled resistance, plural belongings and transnational networks are part in parcel to the façade of consent and hegemonic structures of power. Bannerji (2002) extends this notion in relation to exploring tropes of racialized regimes of representation,

“If certain *content* or particular ideas provide class subjects with their sense of selves, ways to organize and interpret their world and the ideological hegemony of their classes, then we need to explore the knowledge producing devices that allow them to come to life. If ruling or exploitation is accomplished through these devices and ideas which produce consent, absorption or cooptation, or create absences and occlusions of social realities, we may say that both ideological practices and their ideational content are themselves social relations of exploitation...” (12, emphasis in original).

Thus representational practices involve agents inventing themselves as objects of a liberal nationalist project. Metanarratives of official multiculturalism manage expressions of plural attachments as a legitimizing feature of diversity discourse. ‘Popular consensus’ and state legitimacy is maintained through the seemingly uninterrupted flow of transnational networks and attachments; however, as suggested by Bannerji, we must not gloss over how these attachments are taken up and signified here – ultimately accommodated within existing ideological frameworks.

A critical glimpse at multiculturalism would reveal a lens of analysis through which the *kufiya* becomes managed as disembodied symbol of otherness. Though embodied as resistance through local imaginings of the subject, the interaction between the transnationalization of the *kufiya* and multiculturalism produces a complex terrain of meaning-making.

Official Multiculturalism operates through a mythologized discourse of tolerance, inclusion and diversity – the ‘multicultural mosaic.’ Multicultural discourse institutionally proliferates fragments of difference through easily appropriated and depoliticized symbols. Exotic objects of difference defined, deployed and celebrated through a hegemonic (white) gaze effectively work to reify the status quo, since this notion of *difference* is constituted through dominant conceptions of normalcy (Bannerji 2000; Mackey 2002). Thus multicultural discourse, part and parcel to Canada’s on-going nation-building project and envisaged national imaginary, relies upon naturalizing whiteness through diversity discourse. The reproduction of multiculturalism and diversity discourse insidiously deploy a matrix of symbolic systems as ideological tools of legitimation.

Canada’s celebrated multiculturalism conceptually encourages the production of local ‘plural-identity’ subjects. The multicultural project is contingent upon producing a spectacle of diversity. It is in the sphere of the spectacle that global markers of identity and symbolic representations of diversity are ostensibly localized. However such accommodations are made within a state framework that seeks to dehistoricize and

sanitize original meanings allowing cultural artifacts to be consumed within a multicultural polity. I wish to extend this thread to demonstrate how the *kufiya* as an embodied symbol of resistance is accommodated within multiculturalism as a fragmented object of difference, causing transformative ruptures in its symbolic significance. In elucidating upon this further it is useful to conceptualize the *kufiya* as text. Appropriated as a means of representational practice, this reveals how subjects construct and are constructed; situate and become situated within; assimilate or resist larger power structures in plural ways. Moreover analyzing this through multicultural discourse presents an interesting conflict in the capacity for peripheral subjects to articulate dialectical differences with the interpellation of social and political markers through dominant nationalist narratives. To further this analysis it is useful to draw some distinction between the *kufiya* as a transnational symbol of resistance and the *kufiya* as an accommodated symbol of multicultural difference. The former reflects an extension of networks of socio-historical knowledge. In this way the transnationalization the *kufiya* discursively re-imagines and activates the particular historical and political struggle it emerged through to mark a body of resistance in relocalized everyday interactions. This is juxtaposing against the latter paradoxical mechanisms of multiculturalism which sanitizes signifiers of difference from original meanings through its incorporation into a geography of colonialism – thus become constituted and transformed through Orientalist and racist discourses (Bannerji 2000: 9).

Official multiculturalism emerged in order to consolidate its brutal territorial conquest and emergence as a white-settler state with managing internal differences and material

needs of the nation and desire to maintain the dominance of the core culture.

Accordingly, multiculturalism cannot be taken for granted as operating from blank slate conception and appreciation for diversity. Rather, its advent reflects a continuum of state projects premised upon constructions of race, class formations and ideological and social relations that enable the maintenance and enshrinement of power by defining the 'other'.

This suggests that multiculturalism was integrated into – operates upon and inevitably reproduces – a sphere of power relations defined through white privilege (Bannerji 2000: 20). As proposed by Eva Mackey in her text *The House of Difference* (2002)

multiculturalism is deployed as an appreciation of the variegated process of identity construction in an ethno-racially diverse settler society. Yet the way in which multicultural discourse is appropriated reifies the hegemony of whiteness as Canada's core culture. Thus difference is defined in distinction from and inferior to the core identity – the power of this identity remains unmarked. This presents particular implications for racial subjectivities and a racialized regime of representational strategies that become objects of the multiculturalism paradigm. Thus representational strategies deployed by racialized social subjects – as promulgated through multicultural discourse – interact within the structures of white supremacy. Dialectal productions of identity (as encouraged through diversity discourse) become accommodated as a confluence of floating signifiers of 'otherness' – constituted as deviations in relation to an unmarked culture of normalcy defined through whiteness. As Ross Chambers (1997) suggests, "...[social structures] distribute to unmarkedness the privileges of normalcy and unexaminedness and to reserve for markedness the characteristics of derivedness, deviation, secondariness, and examinability, which function as indices of

disempowerment...” (189). Chambers is suggesting that representational displays of difference are *marked* in comparison to a singular category of normality. This works to further naturalize whiteness as reflecting the familiar – retaining power by evading examination. Moreover through producing the contrasting ‘other’ it is reinforced as an in(di)visible entity: simultaneously invisible and undivided (Chambers, 1997: 196). Therefore marking difference reifies the power of the hegemonic (white) gaze in marking categories of ‘other’. Symbolic representations of difference are removed from meaningful context and added to the spectacle Canadian multiculturalism. Bannerji (2000) reaffirms this point in forwarding the notion that “... [multiculturalism] rests on posing ‘Canadian culture’ against ‘multicultures.’ An element of whiteness quietly enters into cultural definition, marking the difference between core cultural groups and other groups who are represented as cultural fragments,” (Bannerji 2000: 10).

As such, objects of difference are used to interpellate subjectivities appropriating such markers insofar as interpellative processes are mediated through a racializing gaze. bell hooks (1988) conveys this unequal subject/object relationship as a product of ideology and domination,

“As subjects people have the right to define their own reality, establish their own identities, name their history. As objects, one’s reality is defined by others, one’s identity created by others, one’s history named only in ways that define one’s relationship to those who are subjects,” (42-43).

hooks is describing the transformative capacity of racialized regimes of representation through its interaction with western hegemonic structures of power and knowledge.

Nandita Sharma (2006) echoes and extends this sentiment in suggesting that those with the power to define otherness (in relations to themselves) do so in a way where connotative constructions of otherness are defined negatively (27). This raises additional implications for the localization of the *kufiya* in social setting where desired meanings of ‘resistance’ become convoluted through conflicting western connotative constructions of the scarf as indicative of the racialized ‘other.’

The integration of *kufiya* as a marker of an identity of resistance is complicated by Canada’s very notion of multicultural integration which operates to ‘include’ and ‘tolerate’ symbols of difference at the most superficial symbolic level. The markers of otherness are sanitized from the situatedness that gives meaning to symbols in cultural, political senses of the term (Bannerji 2000: 37). Thus the embodied transnationalization of the *kufiya* and conscious appropriation as a symbol of resistance is susceptible to subversion by dominant society. This is attributable to either its desensitization through its incorporation into a saturated spectacle of otherness or read through a dominant imperialist Orientalist narrative. To enhance our understanding of these complex processes, paralleling the case of the Muslim veil (*hijab*) will be useful. Despite the ostensible embracement of the *hijab* as emblematic of Canada’s diverse demographic and satiation of her image in public spaces attesting to the ‘value’ of racialized women – the *hijab* has prevented Muslim women from accessing any robust measure of social, political and economic equality^x. In sum multicultural discourse accommodates signifiers of difference – in this example the Muslim veil – but has done little in redressing what is signified by this symbol through discourses of white supremacy. As part of a larger

imperialist state project, multiculturalism does not address what symbols, marking bodies of difference, are being integrated into. Nor does it consider how signifiers of difference become signified – or who influences such processes of signification. The transnationalization of the *kufiya* and embracement through narratives of multiculturalism produce a contradictory terrain of symbolic meaning and communication. These contradictions disembody the *kufiya* from situated meaning and produce it as a floating signifier of otherness.

What then is produced through discursive interactions between multiculturalism and the transnationalization of the *kufiya*? Appropriating the *kufiya* here configures it into a diversity discourse saturated with superficial symbols of ethno-cultural otherness.

In this way multiculturalism commodifies the *kufiya* as signifier of difference void of its transnational meaning. Moreover productions of meaning are read through what Roland Barthes (1993) refers to as ‘meta-languages’ - multiple connotations inferred from a signifier to reflect dominant values of the social and political elite (109). Therefore dominant (re)productions and pejorative Orientalist associations supercede a genuine historical and political reading of the *kufiya* as a symbol of difference and resistance.

The transnational mobility of the *kufiya* becomes ruptured and disembodied through its interaction with multiculturalism. It becomes harder to signify intended and produced meanings of the *kufiya* as resistance without it being taken up in specific contexts: demonstrations, sit-ins, and so forth. In addition to the specificity of space and place, its deployment as resistance can only be interpellated through multiple performances to

denote resistance. In other words, other markers of representation are needed to delineate a specific signification. This reveals the interconnectedness and complex nature of how seemingly accommodating power structures respond to managing internal differences, particularly as they relate to marginal bodies. Additionally it reveals the state's desire to manage the other (resistive bodies, bodies of difference) by actively restricting spaces of resistance. Stein and Swedenburg (2005) suggest that representations of resistance configure into a terrain of power that is, "...contradictory and changeable always capable of being dearticulated and rearticulated," (7). It becomes located within broader social, political and economic forces that have the power to alter connoted meanings of appropriated signs and symbols as markers of identity. Thus the capacity for *kufiya* to be used as a site of resistance requires specific localities for its articulation – particularly when configuring into margin-centre social relationship. The *kufiya* connotes resistance when deployed by highly visible and marginal bodies in overt spaces of contestation. Such spaces are marked by multiple indicators of 'difference' (race, class, *kufiya*, pickets, etc.) constructing a theatrical production of the 'outside' and 'unfamiliar' (Burman 2001: 205). This displays a tension produced between the fragmentary accommodation of symbols of difference through liberal multiculturalism and subjectivities dialectal localization through representational practices.

Canadian multiculturalism's interaction with the *kufiya* can then be understood to be centrifugal: the state ostensibly accommodates the *kufiya*; however, state structures separate the *kufiya* into multiple fragments thereby fracturing it from its transnational genealogy. The *kufiya*'s fetishized entrance into the centrifuge of multiculturalism

inaugurates its technicolor embrace into the capitalist boutiques of mass consumption and (re)definition or conversely requires multiple additional indicators to reclaim original meaning as resistance.

(3) (Re)Appropriations of the Kufiya: From a Culture of Resistance to 'Militant Chic'

This chapter seeks to explore the plural contexts in which the *kufiya* is appropriated in Canada. Further, this discussion seeks to explicate how regimes of power configure into the politics of everyday life. An empirical analysis will provide a reflection on the following: how multiculturalism converts embodied markers of identity into ambivalent objects of diversity discourse; how dominant-hegemonic cultural productions of the *kufiya* are underpinned by distinct racial categorizations; why peripheral articulations of the symbol as resistance require additional connotative indicators; how the transnationalization *kufiya* is integrated into – and thus complicit in – a ‘geography of colonialism; and finally how hegemonic cultural productions of the *kufiya* produce a fetishistic allure to mainstream countercultural formations.

Ghassan Hage (1994) critiques multiculturalism as a dominant ideology insofar as its concomitant discourse of ‘tolerance’ enables those in power to ‘tolerate’ and position ‘others’ in social space. “Others are never just present, they are positioned. Their belonging to the environment in which they come to exist is always a precarious one, for they never exist, they are allowed to exist” (Hage 1994:28). This positioning of liberal multiculturalism simultaneously incites systems of identity negotiation and representation among ‘others’ integrated into such a framework while mediating the meanings of such signifiers of representation. ‘Tolerance,’ in this sense, produces the ‘other’ for the fundamental constitution and reaffirmation of the supremacy of the ‘self’ (Hall 1997: 237). In other words, multiculturalism encourages peripheral subjectivities to articulate

‘difference’; however, productions of difference are discursively mediated through dominant notions of tolerance. Markers of ethnic, cultural, social, and political differences float amongst each other producing a spectacle of multicultural indicators. Indeed, as Guy Debord (1994) suggests, spectacles in modern states removes lived meaning from such productions allowing narratives such as multiculturalism to operate through visually seducing representations of difference (Para. 1: 12). Representations of multiculturalism through easily appropriated symbols become commodified elements of nationalist narrative. Selling ‘Multicultural Canada’ markets a globalized experience in a localized environment. Exoticized ethnic clothing, scarves, jewelry and so forth are not limited as an exchange of material objects but reflect the capacity to consume and perform an identity of difference. Reading such processes as text reveals a nexus of power-knowledge relations. The agency of social subjectivities to invent and represent themselves in symbolic ways become compromised by the power of dominant society to consume, manage, redefine and commodify markers of identity through omission (of historical meaning in the case of the *kufiya*) and misrepresentation^{xi}.

Figures 8 through 27 present a plethora of ways the *kufiya* has been appropriated or popularly constructed in the Canadian context. My interest lies in exploring how the modes and meanings of appropriation are discernable from one image to the next: What feelings is the *kufiya*-wearer attempting to communicate to his/her larger social surrounding? Stuart Hall (1993) describes images as objects of discourse, whose communicative capacity operates through a series of codes (91). Visual symbols are encoded with meaning through creation and production in particular contexts that in turn

influence readings and produced meanings by the observer (Hall 1993:98). The *kufiya* as neckscarf becomes an ambivalent symbol of difference by virtue of its accommodation and appropriation into multiple social and political realms. As previously explored, it has been deployed as an embodied transnational indicator of resistance, co-opted as a floating signifier of multicultural difference, and *hyperpoliticized* as a symbol of terror within the Orientalist imaginary. The ubiquitous symbol is most likely to be read in relation to the most dominant ideological encoding. In the Canadian context, this would parallel dominant-hegemonic cultural productions of the scarf. Conversely, peripheral meanings require additional markers of meaning to become signified differently.

Exploring the incorporation of the *kufiya* in Canada requires an in-depth understanding of what the transnational symbol is being integrated into. In other words the *kufiya*-wearer can never be detached from the nexus of power relations in which the scarf is being desired, adopted, and deployed. For instance, distinctions may be drawn between modes of appropriation: deploying the socio-historically *situated* anticolonial-coded *kufiya* vs. the commodified western *construction* of the *kufiya*. The former speaks to challenging oppressive systems of power while the latter example of hegemonically positioned *kufiya* is underpinned by distinct racial categorizations.

3.1 Re:Mapping Cultures of Resistance

As discussed earlier, transnational meanings of the *kufiya* may reflect crosscutting alliances and allegiances, expansive attachments, plural belongings, or a form of cultural affinity. Politically, it reveals the forging of a collective consciousness, solidarities –

expressions of resistance rooted in its iconic embodiment in the Palestinian struggle. Its center-margin articulation localized within the locus of Orientalist 'war on terror' securitization discourse and the re-imagining of western identities may also implicate the symbol as a form of resistance. In this sense, it is important to consider the transnationalization of the *kufiya* as integrating a subaltern marker into a white-settler state framework, post-9/11. Additionally, attention must be paid to the subversive framework of Canadian multiculturalism and its saturated spectacle of otherness. The processes inevitably require additional indicators of 'resistance' to mark a meaningful dialectical engagement of dissatisfaction, disapproval, and contestation. Additional markers of resistance cater to a white hegemonic gaze to prove that the symbol can move beyond a mere visual expression of 'difference' and embody a powerful mode of representation. For instance while searching for pictures to support the usage of the *kufiya* in its transnational sense, the most salient images found – the ones most accessible to promote understanding amongst readers – are positioned within overt spaces of resistance. Demonstrations, protests, sit-ins provide the most vocal depictions of voices of opposition (see Figures 1-8; 12; 14). Multiple signifiers of resistance satisfy the gaze of the observer that indeed deep meaningful messages are contained and purposely deployed in this particular usage of the scarf. Reading the image as text produces a theatric of disorder: enraged chanting, yelling, signs and posters provide visual depictions of resistance, flyers' scripted text critiquing the state and its responses – or lack thereof – to global disorder.

The temporary space of the protest itself offers new analysis into configurations of power and the hegemonic accommodation of voices of dissent. Not only does the signifier *kufiya* require the markings of other overt symbols and spaces to be designated as resistant, but these spaces are also restricted and temporary, reaffirming the authority of hegemonic bodies to interpellate, manage and manipulate fragments of the 'other'. Much can be said about state monitored spaces of resistance as apparatuses of hegemonic ideology. Nascent forms of resistance are co-opted in the hegemonic project through neutralization and restriction into temporary, confined spaces of 'rebellion.' In this sense, the construction of a demonstration as social space has the potential to reinforce imperial themes of knowing and defining the 'east.' For example, demonstrations contesting occupations in Palestine and Iraq; demonstrations in front of the Danish consulate in contestation of Denmark's support for the dissemination Orientalist cartoons; resisting Canada's involvement in Afghanistan, are examples of the widespread visual observance of overt transnational political usages of the *kufiya*. Though these spaces of resistance are heavily controlled and monitored by police to the larger Canadian public audience, the space is seemingly threatening, chaotic and disorderly. Contained within what is seen as a 'disruptive' space are bodies marked by multiple indicators of difference. Many are marked through signage and the donning of *kufiya*, by race and other oppositionary indicators. It is arguable how much substantive changes are incited through the productions of demonstrations and protests since they are largely symbolic spaces of resistance insofar as they are heavily regulated and monitored by state security forces, only allowing a relative form of contestation. On the other hand, the Orientalist imaginary is renewed through the gaze of a dominant audience who see resistive bodies

marked by popularly projected markers of the 'Orient' as unruly, irrational, dangerous and anarchic. Activities that interrupt 'order' of the everyday (re)situate possible meanings of the *kufiya*. When deployed by 'dangerous' bodies or in the 'threatening' space in the theatrics of a protest, the *kufiya* activates dominant sentiments pushing it to the periphery of 'tolerable' into a realm of a race-based symbol terror, hate, disorder, and so forth. In sum, Canada is not a neutral and value free geographical space upon which transnational expressions of counter-hegemony are performed. Indeed, the theatre of performative resistance integrates into existing ideological systems. Moreover the incorporation of new forms of racialized resistance into a contested terrain of power has the potential to cast an insidious shadow that envelope ongoing indigenous struggles against a white-settler state. The next section will explore how this produces competing movements of resistance creating contradictions in meaning through the global-local production of the *kufiya*.

3.2 Competing Discourses of Resistance: Contradictions of the Transnational Kufiya

An important aspect of the transnationalization of the *kufiya* is not only the unequal social framework it is being integrating into and subversion of its potentiality as resistance, but also how its embodied politicization as anti-colonial and anti-imperial effectively 'write over' similar struggles through its localization in a white settler-state. In other words, there is a dangerous irony when the *kufiya* is deployed in Canada as a symbolic form of resistance – representative of a contestation of brutal colonial relations and oppressive power structures – yet contributes to the same relations of oppression by integrating into a 'geography of colonialism' (Lawrence and Dua 2005: 122). Bonita Lawrence and

Enakshi Dua (2005) explore how racialized settlers, and anti-racist initiatives become implicated in reproducing relations of domination as they elide ongoing struggles of indigenous peoples. This reveals a dangerous and underexamined consequence of transnationalism and mass migration of racialized bodies, networks and diasporas of resistance to white-settler states.

Appadurai (1995) explores how the production of spaces by racial subjectivities is inherently colonizing (209). As the *kufiya* localizes multiple forms of struggle and resistance, it threatens and elides the urgency of the ongoing colonization of indigenous peoples in Canada. Its embodied transnational meaning becomes contradictory when its deployment here does not address and challenge the plural forms of domination, oppression, marginalization and displacement imposed upon Aboriginal communities by the Canadian state. Sherene Razack (2004a) extends this thread in relation to racial subjectivities positioning themselves as ‘compassionate observers’ of global injustice without being sufficiently critical of how they are also implicated in structures of oppression,

“The profound emergency in the lives of racialized peoples... requires that we divest ourselves of the fantasy of the white man and his burden at both the national and international level and begin to acknowledge how we are implicated in the crises of our time,” (Razack 2004a: 14).

The cooptation of the *kufiya* into multiculturalism’s diversity discourse demonstrates how state accommodations of racial subjectivities render Aboriginal communities even more invisible and marginalized (Lawrence and Dua 2005: 135)^{xii}. This contradiction suggests

that even progressive cultures of resistance must be more critical of the implications of transnational mobilization, so as not to compromise the principles of social justice they seek to articulate. Accordingly, the *kufiya* can also feature as a threatening and possibly complicit symbol – as are other diasporic modes of organization and systems of representation – because it is deployed *within* an oppressive multicultural state framework that continues to expand and negate the self-determination of indigenous populations.

Thus far I have explored how transnational symbolic meanings of the scarf interact within the framework of multiculturalism disembodiment and requiring more signifiers to indicate its resistive capacity. We have seen how its transnational usage as resistance may be contradictory in operating in a locale where urgent struggles for indigenous sovereignty is ongoing. Moreover, we have observed how the accommodation of the *kufiya* as a signifier of otherness requires additional markers such as the salient signifier of a protest to overtly communicate it as resistance. Consequently, its usage as such within the constructed space of a protest may configure into Orientalist imaginations about the Arab ‘other’ as a fundamental detriment to ‘first world’ order (i.e. protests as disruptive to the on goings of the ‘everyday’). I will proceed to explore connections between the implicit hyperpoliticization of the *kufiya* and its dominant popular cultural production with mainstream countercultural *desire*. This discussion will explore further how such connections work to decompose and reassemble identities of resistance and result in an insidious repoliticization and dehistoricization of transnational meanings of the *kufiya*. I am suggesting that the commodification of the *kufiya* within the domain of

‘cosmopolitan’ or ‘bohemian’ chic redefines textual readings of the scarf. In turn, this form of cultural appropriation can neutralize the urgency and erase the brutal colonial relations and ongoing oppressive contexts which its symbolism seeks to articulate.

3.3 The Hyperpoliticization of the Kufiya

Clothing and style are important forms of representational practice produced within everyday interactions. As markers of social and political identities they can perform or contest power in multifarious ways. However, textual readings of elements of style are negotiated through larger power structures that they are situated within. Accordingly, the integration of the *kufiya* in the ‘west’ – as an Arab ethnic scarf – inevitably positions it as an ambivalent space within an imperialist framework. The cultural production of the *kufiya* vis-à-vis its ideological apparatus *hyperpoliticize* it as evidence of a taxonomy of racial difference^{xiii}. This process makes it possible for mainstream countercultures not marked by the connoted racial categories to appropriate the *kufiya* with embedded hyperpoliticized connotative meanings while remaining distant from the ideological construct of the Arab ‘other.’

Figures 22-23 and 26 depict the visual hyperpoliticization of the *kufiya* by the west. Such images are often accompanied by discourses attesting to the dangerousness of the ‘orient’ as the object of the ongoing ‘war on terror.’ This reveals a complex relationship of domination insofar as the so-called Orient continues to be constructed by Orientalists who deal with it by, “...making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it...” (Said, 1979: 3). Since the ‘west’ has authority

over the 'Orient' including its cultural productions, the *kufiya* can be (re)defined by the Orientalist imagination. At some points, the *kufiya* represents the fetishization of the exotic Orient; at other points, the *kufiya* is implicated with terrorism, and so on. Indeed Orientalism has been a historical process, intellectuals, artists, writers, fashion experts, etc, have all taken part in the naturalization of the 'Orient' and the appropriation of the *kufiya* is part of this larger process. Mass media productions, part and parcel to the western ideological war on terror, continuously renew demonizing depictions of the Arab and Muslim 'other' (increasingly conflated to strategically be representative and applicable to particular racialized bodies and territories at specific historical, political and geographical moments)^{xiv}. In this vein, the appropriation of the *kufiya* is part of a larger matrix of power relations that situate the Orientalist in a position of authority to *know* the 'other.' However, this is not simply a calculated nefarious western plot to strangle or hold down the "Orient." Instead, "It *is*, rather than expresses, a certain *will* or *intention* to understand, in come cases to control, manipulate, even incorporate, what is a manifestly different world." (Said, 1979:12). Accordingly, the *kufiya*, as it represents part of this "different world" or exotic otherness, brings it into the Orientalist spheres of "control, manipulate, and incorporate." Orientalist discourse elucidates how the desire and capacity to commodify the *kufiya* within the domain of fashion signals the interaction of larger power relations with regards to the 'other.'

3.4 Appropriation of the Kufiya by Countercultural Hipsters

"The more social life becomes mediated by the global marketing of styles, places and images, by international travel, and by globally networked media images and

communications systems, the more *identities* become detached— disembedded— from specific times, places, histories, and traditions, and appear ‘free-floating’. We are confronted by a range of different identities, each appealing to us, or rather to different parts of ourselves, from which it seems possible to choose. It is the spread of consumerism, whether as reality or dream, which has contributed to this ‘cultural supermarket’ effect” (Hall, 1992: 303, emphasis in original).

Commodification of the *kufiya* in the west was first noticed in the late 1960s at anti-war rallies and regained popularity in the 1980s (Swedenburg 1992: 557). Swedenburg’s analysis of the emergence of the *kufiya* as fashion traced its influence from Europe to cosmopolitan centres in the U.S. noting that its popularity paralleled increasing Arab-Israeli tensions in the Middle East (most notably the first *intifada*). Swedenburg suggests that these events gave more impetus to iconize the *kufiya* in the west as either as sign of political contestation, Palestinian solidarity or an opportunity to forge a ‘dangerous’ or ‘exotic’ identity (Swedenburg, 1992). Considering the realignment of the ‘western’ geopolitical identities in the post 9/11 period it comes as no surprise that the *kufiya* has recently become more popular in Canada. The reemergence of *the kufiya* as fashion may also be put into conversation with the increasing popularity and repetition of late 1980’s fashion. Figures 9 and 19-21 display photos borrowed from Ted Swedenburg’s blog *hawgblawg* (<http://swedenburg.blogspot.com>) showing the *kufiya* as popularly deployed by leftist punk and funk bands in the late 80’s (Figures 19 and 21) as well as by popular culture rebel identities in the present (Figures 9 and 20). This demonstrates how both

then and now the *kufiya* as accessory offers opportunity to forge a countercultural oppositional identity.

Roland Barthes (2006) explores how fashion operates to imitate what is thought to be inimitable (91). In this way artifacts not meant for fashion become appropriated within the domain of fashion to demarcate meanings disassociated with its original form. Insofar as the *kufiya* becomes commodified as fashion, it reveals covert and subtle forms of the consolidation of hegemony whereby important markers of identity become sanitized for the purposeful usage of dominant fashion countercultures. Barthes articulates this argument insofar as he critiques hippy countercultures fantasized diametrical social positioning through clothing, "...so as to transgress the *limits* of what is conventional to make this into a clear sign of transgression," (2006: 111, emphasis in original). This is achieved through overt cultural appropriation of ethnic clothing that already embody an identity of otherness. Appropriated to challenge everyday values that underpin life in the west, Barthes argues that this causes a fundamental rupture and transformation in symbolic significance, "...these symbols become, not a *game*, or a higher form of symbolic activity, but a disguise, a lower form of cultural narcissism...the context overturns the meaning, and the context here is that of economics," (Barthes 2006:113). Their diametric identities are contradictory insofar as they rely on the power to access fragments of otherness to symbolically challenge the very systems of power they themselves exercise in performing 'difference.' In other words, white middle-class countercultures are able to oscillate between privileged classes of the dominant white culture or alternatively insidiously embody racialized groups through redefinition,

reappropriation, subversion, and alteration of strategic symbols. Performing ‘otherness’ (social subjectivities maintained at the peripheries of ‘them’) often does not involve the forging of solidarities rooted in mutual understandings and empathy, but rather displays the desire for dominant subjectivities to create junctures of identification among the larger group of ‘them’.

Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (1976) extend this thread through his notion of the *negative dialectic*: middle class countercultures narcissistically deploy artifacts marked as ‘other’ to construct enclaves of opposition within the interstices of dominant culture (60). Moreover their ‘disaffiliation’ with dominant cultures is negotiated within hegemonic structures, thus reproduce cultural and ideological relations of power (Hall, 1976: 63). Dick Hebdige (1991) explores the potential of countercultural style to be an instrument of hegemony by the ways symbols of countercultures are incorporated into dominant society. Applying Hebdige’s analysis to the case of the *kufiya* is useful in explicating how its appropriation as ‘fashion’ converts it into a manifestation of hegemonic relations. Although the *kufiya* retains its ability to mark ‘an identity of difference,’ accommodating it into the realm of fashion renders the scarf public property for mass commercial consumption. This process relates to the *diffusion* of the *kufiya* to mainstream society – in commodity-form its incorporation benefit commercial and economic institutions (Hebdige 1991: 95-96). *Defusion* is the other way Hebdige describes how diametric symbols may operate to reproduce hegemony: the *kufiya* becomes dislocated from its historical and political context, thus transnational meanings are “trivialized, sanitized and domesticated” through commercialization and consequently “Otherness is reduced to

sameness...[or] the Other can be transformed into meaningless exotica,” (Hebdige 1991: 97). Theorizing the insidious cultural appropriation of the *kufiya* can be furthered by referring to the following: Why is the *kufiya* desired? How is the *kufiya* marketed to the mainstream (the politics of naming)? How has the scarf been altered in making it more consumable? and finally, what are popular commentaries saying about the *kufiya*? In answering these questions, my intention is to reveal how imperialist culturalist practices are naturalized.

3.5 *The Allure of the Kufiya*

As mentioned previously, the popularization of the *kufiya* is closely linked to wider geopolitical issues. The first and second *intifada*, protests against the Gulf War, invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq after 9/11 have definitively marked an increased appearance of the political usage of the *kufiya* as resistance. Some suggest that its popularization as fashion loosely follow a similar pattern^{xv}. However, there is a significant difference between its transnational usage as reflecting collective forms of solidarity and resistance, on the one hand, and fashion-based appropriation catering to an individualized and diffuse counter-cultural milieu on the other (Hall and Jefferson 1976: 60). The latter functions upon western-situated constructions of the *kufiya*: cultural exotica, fragmented symbol of otherness, dangerous difference. It becomes trendy and appealing to countercultures motivated by desires of distinction. According to Calefato (2004),

“Fashion as image and as a system conveyed through images (photography, film, television, internet) is the place of imitation *par excellence*, the place where identity has strictly to do with repetition,” (3).

Popular representations of the *kufiya* as indigenous to the Orient intimately configures into how it becomes desired, defined, interpreted and representative of the 'other.' The centre/margin articulation of the *kufiya* underpins the countercultural allure insofar as it becomes a means of performing difference while distancing oneself from the Orientalist connotations attached to the object (backward, violent, extrapatriarchal, etc.) (Tarlo 1996: 325).

3.6 The Politics of Naming and Colour-Coding

A fundamental way the transnational political symbol of the *kufiya* becomes sanitized is through discursive constructions of the scarf through the language of fashion. A prime example the language deployed by the self-defined urban-chic store Urban Outfitters marketing the *kufiya* recently on their online catalogue as an 'Anti-War Woven Scarf' (refer to Figure 24). Their marketing campaign articulates a new signification and meaning of the *kufiya* through Barthes' notion of 'meta-languages' – connotative myths about the 'other' reflecting dominant bodies of knowledge (1993: 109). Indeed, as revealed in the historical emergence of the *kufiya* as a political symbol, its symbolic value has emerged through a context of armed resistance, reflecting an ongoing struggle and resistance in the name of social justice. The mythologized construction of the *kufiya* under the rubric of 'anti-war' trivializes its historical politicization, co-opting it into trendy 'left-leaning,' 'peace adoring,' 'war resisting' and 'intellectually enlightened' subcultural circles. My intention is not to suggest that the *kufiya* is the antithesis to 'anti-war' or that it cannot stand for peace (assuming that Urban Outfitter's naming is synonymous with 'peace'). Rather, I am suggesting that the term 'anti-war' glosses over the hegemonic state structures that perpetuate oppression and prevent peace. In my

opinion 'anti-war' expresses a naivety to the plural actions of resistance initiated in the very pursuit of 'peace' and social justice.

The particular naming of the *kufiya* by Urban Outfitters provides an opportunity for mainstream countercultures to forge an oppositional identity while distinguishing themselves as dominant subjectivities, by appropriating visual peripheral markers and attributing them with new meanings. However appropriating it in this sense subverts its resistive meaning by (re)defining connotative readings of the symbol. Moreover implying that the symbol represents an anti-war position – as in against conflict and multiple strategies of resistance – configures into a dualist 'first world vs. third world' imperialist discourse. This discourse extends to the necessary benevolence of the first world (as developed, rational, democratic) to 'help' or be 'sympathetic' to the struggles of the third world. This dualism is reinforced by the poetic description of the desired Urban Outfitter consumer listed on their website:

"Our goal at Urban Outfitters is to be the brand of choice for well-educated, urban-minded young adults. We accomplish our objective by creating a differential shopping experience, which creates an emotional bond with the 18 to 30 year old target customer we serve,"

(<http://www.urbanoutfittersinc.com/profile/urban.jsp>).

What is the form of this *emotional bond* forged between Urban Outfitters Incorporated, young-intellectuals-in-concrete-jungles and the 'Anti-War Woven Scarf'? and how does this bond interpellate subjectivities who in turn appropriate the 'anti-war' scarf? Perhaps this relationship interpellates an 'informed interrogator' of global disorder. Rather, I

would configure the relationship between Urban Outfitters, the consumer, and the ‘anti-war’ scarf into a larger social framework and suggest that the scarf forges a fantasized spiritual connection between first-world body and their racialized counterpart. The whimsical desire to oppose mainstream is achieved by embodying (at the most superficial level) today’s ‘third world.’ The benevolent first world body sympathizes with the third world struggle and incapacity to escape the bonds of war-torn incivility – or perhaps this narcissistic oppositional affirmation is a means of reconciling first world guilt and rejection of the traditional role as *oppressor* (Root 1997: 227).^{xvi} I do not think that this is necessarily a conscious choice made by the consumer; however, the underlying *desire* to possess the scarf cannot be removed from politics. This is premised upon the notion that mainstream understandings of the *kufiya* – familiarity with its checkered pattern, its stylistic draping around the neck, etc. – is familiarized and situated within western structures of knowledge production.

Vocal opposition eventually led to Urban Outfitters’ removal of the name ‘Anti-War Woven Scarf.’ The opposition subsequently leading to its removal was not rooted in the insidious commodification and trivializing of its political meaning. Multi-vocal resistance to the label ‘anti-war’ proposed the argument that the *kufiya* is representative of terror^{xvii}. Narrated over various blog, one blogger sarcastically situates the scarf as more appropriately accenting a “RPG launcher,” an “AK-47,” and “suicide belt.”^{xviii} Ongoing opposition in the US led Urban Outfitters authorities to remove the item all together with an issued apology (Figure 25). Nevertheless, walking into the Urban Outfitters in downtown Toronto reveals that the product continues to be sold in Canada. Moreover,

“Canada’s Fashion Magazine” *Flare*, cited Urban Outfitters version of the *kufiya* as a fall 2007 ‘must have’ (Figure 27). Name removed, the *kufiya* is (re)defined once again as a nameless object of cultural exotica. Urban Outfitters also stopped selling the scarves in the contentious black/white and red/white varieties. Presumably this distances them even further from provocative political debates. Instead they carry the ‘scarf’ in array of turquoise, mustard, green and purple combinations. Constitutive codings of colour alter connotative meanings of the scarf. Since black and red scarves connote particular racial and political meanings, producing the same pattern and style in different ways produces a new language of the scarf. *Kufiya*-wearers in this case are able to further distance themselves from the object of dominant-hegemonic connotation of the *kufiya* while retaining the dangerous rebel identity maintained in the style of the scarf. Its difference and countercultural potential is maintained by deriving ‘inspiration’ from the origin ‘other.’ It then becomes ‘claimed’ by the mainstream by alterations in colour, design and so forth situating cultural productions of ‘otherness’ within complex power relation used to consume, manage, control and regulate difference (Huggan 2001).

Urban Outfitters is not the only store I have come across that is selling the ‘trendy’ item. Figures 16-17, show pictures I have taken at trendy Yonge/Dundas storefront. Topped over mini-skirts, iconic tees, skinny jeans and Chuck T’s – the popularity of the *kufiya* as a fashion accessory is growing strong, as an increasing number of stores carry the item, it becomes impossible to evade *kufiya*-wearers in particularly ‘trendy’ areas of Toronto.

3.7 Popular Commentaries: From “What’s it Called Again?” to “Terrorist Chic”

Mass media narrations of the *kufiya* as trendy add yet another nuance to the consequences of cultural appropriation. Juxtaposed against the multicultural accommodation of the scarf and mainstream fashion stores such as Urban Outfitters’ connotative construction of its symbolic value – mass media portrayals offer a new terrain for interpellating possible meanings of the scarf and identities of social subjects who appropriate them. My interest in exploring popular commentaries between Canada and the U.S. regarding the popularization of the *kufiya* reflects the power of dominant media apparatus to monopolize the cultural production of the *kufiya*. First, it is interesting to note debates between minority groups on the issue as narrated on numerous online blogs: the former are disheartened by the cooptation and appropriation of the *kufiya* as trendy^{xix}. The latter arguing that it’s a symbol of terror, or that growing popularity for the scarf is removed from political meaning^{xx}.

The most widely disseminated and accessible debate of the *kufiya* in mainstream mediums refers to the popularization of the symbol as the ‘Muslimization of fashion’ (Burshtein 2007), ‘Fear Fashion’ or ‘Terrorist Chic’ (Hernandez 2006). In the same articles, the authors discount ongoing debates over the issue arguing that there is, “...considerably less political meaning to the keffiyeh trend than each side of the political debate is giving it,” (Burshtein 2007). Meanwhile, information used to situate the usage of the *kufiya* in Palestine within the articles display overtly Orientalist rhetoric such as,

“It is also what millions of Americans see on their TV screens practically every night, worn by Palestinians *defying* Israeli soldiers in the occupied territories...the

current televised *spectacle of kaffiyeh-wearing rebels* playing hob with the Israeli army gives the scarves an off, often ironic resonance when they are worn in the West,” (Cocks 1988, emphasis added).

Daniel Hernandez (2006) writing for the LA Times reiterates popular connotative meanings of the *kufiya* with Islamic fundamentalism, and militancy. He references Rashid, identifying him as neither Arab nor Muslim but wears it “to look like a warrior” (Hernandez 2006). Exploring the emergence of ‘fear fashion’ evidenced by the popularization of the *kufiya* and various forms of veiling (presumably influenced by Islamic veil) – the *kufiya* and veil are homogenized as fear fashions from the Orient that can offer to the western subject a hint of ‘eroticism’ and ‘sexiness’ (Hernandez 2006). Hernandez’ closing remarks speak to his personal experience with the *kufiya*

“I took it [a *kufiya*] home and wrapped it around my neck and, standing before my mirror, my own countenance startled me stiff. I looked pretty damn Arab all of a sudden. No wonder my older siblings in San Ysidro, half-jokingly—I hope—call me “terrorista” when I approach,” (Hernandez 2006).

Kibum Kim (2007) writing on the reemergence of the *kufiya* fashion trend includes a quote from Mik Moore, chairman of the board of directors for the Jewish Student Press Service. In speaking to the ambivalence of the symbol and its popularization he suggests, “Because there are people who wear the kaffiyeh as a sign of *solidarity with Palestinians*, some people view it as an *endorsement of terrorism*,” (Mik Moore quoted in Kim 2007, emphasis added). In this context the reader is encouraged to think of *all* Palestinians to be

terrorists, and therefore *all* allies of the Palestinian struggle inevitably become terrorist sympathizers.

These narratives attest to dominant readings of the *kufiya*. These popular representations inevitably inform the allure to the scarf constituted within an Orientalist imaginary.

Hall's (1990) notion of *inferential* racism describes the subtle ways ideological discourse embedded with binaries of racial difference is naturalized through media text:

“By *inferential* racism I mean those apparently naturalized representations of events and situations relating to race, whether ‘factual’ or ‘fictional’, which have racist premises and propositions inscribed in them as a set of *unquestioned assumptions*. These enable racist statements to be formulated without ever bringing into awareness the racist predicates on which the statements are grounded,” (13).

This notion of inferential racism explores the subconscious ways racist discourse is reproduced. In opposition to overtly racist representations, inferential racism may manifest in the proposed neutrality of mass media. Indeed ‘just below the surface’ we find the naturalization of maligned conceptions of the ‘other’ – the signified meanings of the *kufiya* situated within an Orientalist imaginary.

Only one of the four articles I have found in popular media is situated in the Canadian context.^{xxi} This may speak to the relatively stagnant debate over the cultural appropriation of the *kufiya* in Canada. The apathy in Canada is indicative of its multicultural accommodation and its concomitant discourse of tolerance. We have become

desensitized and saturated with symbols of difference, the extent to which we have become indifferent to difference. This does not mean that connotative meanings of the *kufiya* in Canada do not conjure the same Orientalist imaginary. Indeed Burshtein's article attests to this through her observance of the 'Muslimization of Fashion' which inevitably constitutes Islamic cultural expressions as the practices of veiling and the donning of the *kufiya*. Despite the historical genealogy of the *kufiya* that defines it as Arab and not Islamic dress, the *kufiya* is continuously located within the western conceptions of the 'Orient' in that all things from the area is a production of the 'Muslim' world.

As the *kufiya* is incorporated within a western constellation of power and knowledge, the integrity of the embodied transnational system of knowledge becomes comprised. Meanings encoded through its emergence as a symbol of resistance in Palestine become displaced when deployed here – subjectivities are subject to interpellation by hegemonic gaze. Even as *resistance*, the transnational *kufiya* may become contradictory in marginalizing indigenous resistance movements. In this respect, transnational cultures of resistance must first be rooted in redressing localized forces of oppression so as not to become complicit in reproduction of colonial relations. The fetishized appropriation of the *kufiya* in popular culture pushes its political expressivity to the periphery. Its fantasized deployment as 'anti-war' 'ethnic chic' or simply 'scarf' as encoded through dominant-hegemonic knowledge, insidiously repoliticizes it and is only definitively readable as resistance in overt spaces of contestation. These forms of repoliticization reveal 'new relations of force' (Hall 1986: 47) a renewed form of imperial domination

between classes and cultures of resistance through the ostensible accommodation of the *kufiya*. These 'relations of force' become crystallized as the constructed 'neutral-bearers' of truth implicitly naturalist Orientalist composition of the other.

Conclusion

This research seeks to explicate the relationship between clothing and identity production and how they intersect to produce powerful strategies of representation. As such my research explores the interconnections of representational practices by peripheral social subjectivities into western hegemonic tropes of power and knowledge. I suggest that these interactions have caused several ruptures in the semiotic coding and cultural power of the *kufiya* as a transnational symbol of resistance.

The ostensible multicultural accommodation of the *kufiya* works to subvert transnational situated meanings converting it into a specter of multiculturalism. Moreover peripheral strategies of intervening Orientalist cultural productions and fetishistic appropriation of the *kufiya* in the western context requires multiple additional connotative indicators in reclaiming its potential to mark transnational identities of resistance. This research articulates the plural manifestations of western domination in relation to the politics of representation – extending through an idea of management: the management of racialized representations of ‘self’ through multiculturalism; of nascent movements of resistance through restriction to confined temporary spaces; of its colonial practices and the imperial present through encouragement of productions of ‘belonging’ over a ‘geography of colonialism’ – even so as localized global systems of representation are mediated and commodified through hegemonic cultural (re)definitions. Consequently, these processes transform the multi-vocal expressions of resistance embodied within the *kufiya* into a mass-produced fashion trend.

The power of the hegemonic (white) gaze was used in this paper to explain how the transnational embodiment of the *kufiya* relies upon the intersection of overt social spaces of contestation to indicate resistance. The power of gaze is also able to subvert politicized meanings of the *kufiya* and transform it into a production of exotic fashion. However this paper is limited in its exploration of the power of the hegemonic gaze in interpellating subjectivities marked by the *kufiya* as well as specific categories of race, national origin, gender, religion and so on. Can an Arab or Muslim man ever simply *wear* the *kufiya* as an ambiguous symbol of difference? For instance, how do connotative readings of the *kufiya* change among its deployment by a racialized man versus a white female? Why would the former more likely be interpreted as threatening, dangerous and deviant, whereas the white female would more likely be read as passive, innocuous, safe. Indeed imperialist culturalist frameworks do influence social decodings of individual *kufiya*-wearers. This also presents interesting implications for white allies to communicate anticolonial resistance through the donning of the *kufiya*.

Additional questions that extend from this work include exploring the implications on the connotative meanings of the *kufiya* once it no longer is considered 'trendy.' In other words, what is the permanency in semiotic transformation of the *kufiya* through its dislocated western incorporation? This also relates to further questions about its usage as resistance. For instance does its saturation within the domain of fashion subsume the desire to deploy it *politically*?

This research has highlighted the creative and subversive potential of clothing practices as a mode of representation. Embodied codings of resistance are not ceaselessly reproduced upon transnational appropriation but rather become reconstituted in various social spaces. These interactions become mediated through wider social structures which have the power to sanitize and subvert original meanings through hegemonic accommodation. The seemingly innocent task of deciding ‘what to wear’ inevitably intersects with plural dimensions of power. These complicated interactions inform desires to possess the *kufiya*, and let it represent, communicate, and make meaning of identities without saying a word – and so, the *kufiya* can never be ‘just a scarf.’

ⁱ Please note that references to the pictures are embedded in the 'Figures' section of this paper. The only exception applies to the picture of Yasser Arafat, which was retrieved from: Reed (2004).

ⁱⁱ The scarf has multiple English spellings: *kufiya*, *kaffiyeh*, *keffiyeh* and is also known as a shemagh or hatta.

ⁱⁱⁱ Please note that I have made a conscious effort not to capitalize concepts such as 'west,' 'third world,' 'first world' and 'war on terror' so as not to crystallize the unequal relations of power and racializing processes denoted through their usage.

^{iv} See for instance Alvi, Hoodfar et al 2003: 75; Bannerji 2002; Bullock 2002; Fanon 1965; Kawaja, Brand et al 1999; Swedenburg 1995; Tarlo 1996. These texts cite the deployment of various modes of dress in dialectical opposition to western imperialism.

^v For more information on Israeli apartheid structures refer to Carey (2001), Davis (2003) and Pappe (2004)

^{vi} Resistance in the sense represents contestation of western financial support of oppressive Israeli state structures, or may also reflect a desire for western states to provide increase support to Palestinians.

^{vii} This relates to Schiller and Fouron's (2001) text *Georges Woke Up Laughing: Long-Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home* conception of long-distance nationalism premised upon the following factors: (1) There is a shared 'common descent' or identity that is integral to notions of national belonging; (2) exercising citizenship in a national community outside territorial boundaries through various actions: demonstrating, art, remittances and so forth as a contribution to the well-being of one's homeland; (3) difficult conditions in the homeland or host society to contribute or realize the well-being of the homeland (pp. 20-23).

^{viii} Benedict Anderson's (1991) notion of the imagined community explores the concept of a nation as a forging of a political community contained within discursive boundaries, thereby establishing a common membership of the collective. These boundaries can be characterized as flexible and are continuously renegotiated. However, they are necessarily established to secure state sovereignty and to build a common consciousness distinguishable it from other nations. Historically it was through print capitalism that conceptions of imagined community and nationalist sentiment/desires were circulated through elite literate classes throughout Western Europe.

^{ix} I draw the distinction between real and imagined not for the purposes of delving into notions of authenticity but rather to draw on the possibility that those performing politics through representation of the *kufiya* need not necessarily draw a direct attachment to Palestine – in the ethnic conventionally kinship continuum defined sense of the term. Instead the *kufiya* as Political necessarily embodies and represent the ongoing Palestinian struggle in imagining prospects of self-determination, justice and redistribution of power and sometimes but not always territorial sovereignty – but more widely reflect a common consciousness rather than ethnic identity referred to a real attachment to Palestine.

^{*} Recent prohibitions of the *hijab* in public space demonstrate the limits of multiculturalism and accommodation of difference. Though such prohibitions were guised under a rubric of 'safety' the unwillingness to compromise and top-down decision-making prove problematic. In late February a young veiled Muslim girl was ejected from a soccer tournament for wearing the veil (CBC News, 2007). Claims of racism were neutralized by counter-claims stating that the referee was Muslim himself. Similarly in mid-March a prison guard in training was given an ultimatum to either remove her *hijab* or resign from the program (Montpetit, 2007). The veil in both this – as well as the young soccer players' case cited the veil as posing a physical danger to the women involved and possibly others through their interactions. Irrespective of the merits of the espoused safety discourse the issue is the inability to compromise. The ultimatums given in these cases reflect ideological assumptions situating the role of the veil in private and public spheres. The capacity practice one's beliefs – cultural or religious – are limited to realms in which they will not interfere with existing norms. The same safety discourse is deployed in Herouxville, Quebec's Town Declaration where it reads; *You may not hide your face as to be able to identify you while you are in public. The only time you may mask or cover your face is during Halloween...* (p.3

<http://municipalite.herouxville.qc.ca/>). Orientalist constructs of the Muslim woman in Canada media has been widely cite which impede the forging of any sense of belonging despite multiculturalism. See for instance Arat-Koç (2002); Bullock and Jafri (2000); Razack (2005); and Jiwani (2005a, 2005b, 2006).

^{xi} The idea of images used as power or as a tool of power is borrowed from Michel Foucault (1995) *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of a Prison*, p. 25. Similarly Stuart Hall (1993) in *Encoding/Decoding*, pp. 98-99 suggests that images are a form of ideological apparatus encoded with meanings reflecting the dominant social, political and economic order.

^{xii} Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua's (1995) *Decolonization Antiracism* explore in detail how liberal-pluralist ideology and anti-racist activism contribute to the ongoing colonization of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Official Multiculturalism is offered as one of many examples contributing to structures of oppression and domination insofar as racialized communities are accommodated as separate entities within the framework of a white-supremacist state. Therefore, "...official policies and discourses of multiculturalism and immigration obscure Native presence and divert attention from their realities, and when communities of colour resist their marginalization in ways that render Aboriginal communities invisible" (Lawrence and Dua 2005: 135).

^{xiii} The potential role clothing plays in creating racial categorizations is borrowed from Mani (2003) who explores South Asian diasporic representational practices in the U.S. Mani demonstrates how markings of difference through ethnic dress are intended to be received by the white gaze (configuring into dominant racial imaginaries of difference). Thus she argues such clothing practices become complicit 'in the popular desire to consume 'ethnic chic' (120). Performativity, however, offers potentials of dialectical representation in contrasting the dominant majority and ethnic chic subcultures (130).

^{xiv} See for instance Arat-Koç 2005; Bullock, K. H. and Jafri, G. J. 2000; Fekete 2006; Jiwani 2005a and 2005b; Morris, 2004; Razack 2004b and 2005; and Said 1993 for examples cultural relativist argument deployed in mass media to articulate Orientalist portrayals of the homogenized Muslim and Arab Other. Some of these texts explore ideological productions in the so-called Orient itself, Muslim and Arabs in Canada or in the larger constituted 'west.'

^{xv} See for instance Cocks (1988) or Swedenburg (1993)

^{xvi} Deborah Root (1997) critically examines white countercultural appropriation of Aboriginal identity in British Columbia. She suggests in her analysis that 'hippies' appropriate and adorn themselves with traditional Aboriginal jewelry and fringe as a means of resolving white guilt and evasion the traditional colonizer role (227).

^{xvii} Burshtein 2007; Dols 2007; Lando 2007. This argument is made on numerous blogs, such as: "Strangely Familiar 'Anti-War Scarves' Now at a URBN Near You," <http://jewschool.com/2007/01/16/oddly-familiar-anti-war-scarves-now-at-an-urbn-near-you/>; "Keffiyeh, Kaffiyeh, kafiye, kafiye... it's all the same swastika," <http://www.cafepress.com/aaronscase/538489>; and "Hate Couture: The Keffiyeh Craze," <http://michellemalkin.com/2006/07/20/hate-couture-the-keffiyeh-craze/>

^{xviii} See blogger 'Mobius' article "Strangely Familiar 'Anti-War Scarves' Now at a URBN Near You" (2007, January 16): <http://jewschool.com/2007/01/16/oddly-familiar-anti-war-scarves-now-at-an-urbn-near-you/>;

^{xix} See for instance www.kabobfest.blogspot.com/2007/01/kaffiya-kraze-revisited.html or <http://www.counterpunch.org/dols02232007.html>

^{xx} See references made in

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?apage=1&cid=1167467767600&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FshowFull>, or <http://jewschool.com/2007/01/16/oddly-familiar-anti-war-scarves-now-at-an-urbn-near-you>

^{xxi} Articles analyzed were: Burshtein *National Post* 05.26.2007; Cocks *Time* 03.21.1988; Hernandez *Los Angeles Times* 04.09.2006 and Kim *New York Times* 02.11.2007

Figure 1: Resistanceⁱ

Figure 2: Resistance^{*ii}

Figure 3: Resistance^{*iii}

Figure 4: Resistance^{*iv}

Figures 1 - 4 are photos taken at a Toronto rally on February 17, 2007, protesting Indigo Books and Music Inc.'s support of the 'Heseg Foundation for Lone Soldiers.' This foundation supports individuals who have no kinship relation to Isreal and decide to join the Israeli military.

* Photo was manipulated slightly from its original form to maintain anonymity of the protester.

Figure 5: Resistance*^v

Figure 6:
Resistance^{vi}

Figure 7: Resistance^{vii}

Figure 5 was taken at Toronto's annual Labour Day Parade on September 3rd, 2007. This particular contingent was advocating for the rights of Palestinians workers in Palestine.

Figures 6 and 7 were taken at a rally on Parliament Hill on September 28th, 2002.

Figure 8: Resistance^{viii}

Figure 9: Counterculture^{ix}

Figure 10: Counterculture^x

Figure 11: Counterculture^{xi}

Figure 8 was taken at Toronto's annual Labour Day Parade on September 3rd, 2007.

Figure 9 is a picture of David Beckham wearing a *kufiya*.

Figure 10 is a picture of an individual that self-identifies as adopting the *kufiya* because it is considered 'trendy.'

Figure 11 marks the 'rebel identity' connoted by the *kufiya* and offensive hand gesture.

Figure 12: Resistance^{xii}

Figure 13: Counterculture^{xiii}

Figure 14: Resistance^{xiv}

Figure 15: Counterculture^{xv}

Figure 12 was taken at a protest in Ottawa.

Figure 13 is marketing the *kufiya* as a 'super-cool oversized scarf' on *Harald's* online fashion catalogue

Figure 14 was taken at a protest in Ottawa in September 2002.

Figure 15 is a picture of a supermodel fashioning the *kufiya* at Balenciaga's fashion show in February 2007.

Figure 16: Counterculture^{xvi}

Figure 17: Counterculture

Figures 16 and 17 are pictures taken at a trendy fashion store on Yonge St. (Toronto).

Figure 18: Counterculture

Figure 19: Counterculture^{xvii}

Figure 20: Counterculture^{xviii}

Figure 21: Counterculture^{xix}

Figure 18 is a picture taken at Urban Outfitter's in Toronto.

Figures 19 and 21 are pictures found in the late 1980's album covers of *Delta 5* and *Defunkt* (respectively). Members within both groups adopted the *kufiya* to compliments the bands' 'left-leaning' countercultural images.

Figure 20 is a picture of 'rebellious' Colin Farrell donning the *kufiya*.

Figure 22: Hyperpoliticization^{xx}

Figure 23: Hyperpoliticization^{xxi}

Figure 24: Counterculture^{xxii}

Figure 25: Counterculture

Figure 26: Counterculture

Anti-War Woven Scarf

Due to the sensitive nature of this item, we will no longer offer it for sale. We apologize if we offended anyone, this was by no means our intention.

Figure 27: Hyperpoliticization^{xxiii}

Figure 22 was a picture utilized to iconize the *kufiya* as ‘terror’ on a blog condemning the emergence of the scarf as trendy.

Figures 23 and 27 are pictures taken from a popular online Canadian news site, CBC.ca News. In both instances the images are utilized to situate the western reader in the political climate of the Middle East.

Figures 24 and 25 are marketing strategies citing the *kufiya* as trendy in Urban Outfitter’s online Spring catalogue.

Figure 26 reflects the statement released by Urban Outfitter authorities after strong opposition led to the removal of the ‘Anti-War Woven Scarf’ scarf from the online catalogue.

Figure 28: Counterculture^{xxiv}

Figure 28 is taken from the September 2007 issue of *Flare Magazine*. The picture is listed under the thematic of 'Urban Warrior'

- ⁱ *CAIA Demonstrates Against Indigo Books and Music Inc.'s Apartheid Links*. (2007, February 17). Toronto: Coalition Against Israeli Apartheid. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.caiaweb.org/>
- ⁱⁱ *Story in Pictures: Journalism: Boycott Indigo and Chapters Day of Action*. (2007, February 17). Retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.johnb.smugmug.com/gallery/2483151#130278272>.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid, retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.johnb.smugmug.com/gallery/2483151#130278521-M-LB>
- ^{iv} Ibid, retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.johnb.smugmug.com/gallery/2483151#130278566-M-LB>
- ^v *Labour Day Parade 2007 or Handala's First Trip to the CNE: Handala Moving Along Queen Street*. (2007, September 3). Toronto: RAPS. Retrieved September 6, 2007 from <http://www.raps.ca/photos/labour-day/2007/labour-day-09-2007-059.htm>.
- ^{vi} *Solidarity for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR): SPHR Photogallery, Album 03*. (2002, September 28). Retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.sphr.org/photogallery/displayimage.php?album=41&pos=19>.
- ^{vii} Ibid, retrieve July 12, 2007 from <http://www.sphr.org/photogallery/displayimage.php?album=41&pos=25>
- ^{viii} *Story in Pictures: Journalism: Labour Day*. (2007, September 5). Toronto: RAPS. Retrieved September 6, 2007 from <http://www.raps.ca/photos/labour-day/2007/labour-day-09-2007059.htm>
- ^{ix} *HawgBlawg*. (2007, July 3). "Beckham in Kufiya-Shemagh; Kate Moss for Palestine." Retrieved July 8, 2007 from http://bp0.blogger.com/_G_ctFbLwC5I/Rop0Z2dxYHI/AAAAAAAAAPo/9T7Zv5L8nqk/s1600-h/ap_beckham_tattoo420x300.jpg
- ^x Kibum, K. (2007, February 11). "Where Some See Fashion, Others See Politics" *New York Times*. Retrieved February 25, 2007 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/11/fashion/shows/11KAFFIYEH.html?ei=5088&en=33680aa2c38e84f2&ex=1328850000&adxnnl=1&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&adxnnlx=1171386267-rFLGtwfUAP3PCueq02M2ew>
- ^{xi} *Colonial Fashion*. (2005, August 13). The Treehouse and the Cave. Retrieved August 1, 2007 from <http://thetreehouseandthecave.blogspot.com/2005/08/colonial-fashion.html>
- ^{xii} *Solidarity for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR): SPHR Photogallery, Album 03*. (2002, September 28). Retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.sphr.org/photogallery/displayimage.php?album=40&pos=96>.
- ^{xiii} Schechter, L. (2006, Nov. 8). "Object Lesson: Global Warming Harald's Super-Cool Oversized Scarf Will Change How You Feel About Winter," Retrieved May 5, 2007 from http://images.google.ca/imgres?imgurl=http://www.refinery29.com/editorial/img/haraldobjectlesson_instory.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.refinery29.com/object_lesson/global_warming.php&h=330&w=384&sz=41&hl=en&start=86&tbnid=SY2O-ASgOBT6wM:&tbnh=106&tbnw=123&prev=/images%3Fq%3Dkaffiyeh%26start%3D72%26gbv%3D2%26ndsp%3D18%26svnum%3D10%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DN
- ^{xiv} *Solidarity for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR): SPHR Photogallery, Album 03*. (2002, September 28). Retrieved July 12, 2007 from <http://www.sphr.org/photogallery/displayimage.php?album=40&pos=78>.
- ^{xv} Burshtein, K. (2007, May 29). "You Say Keffiyeh, I Say Shemagh: Urban Outfitters; Can Keffiyehs Ever Be Just a Fashion Statement?" *National Post*. Retrieved June 6, 2007 from <http://www.canada.com/topics/lifestyle/story.html?id=e7acb72b-fe7d-4ce2-a86d-63a3fa6cf566&k=12255>.
- ^{xvi} Figures 16-18 are taken by author between April 2007 and July 2007 in Toronto, ON Canada.
- ^{xvii} *HawgBlawg*. (2006, March 21). "Delta 5" Retrieved April 2007 from <http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/6803/1404/1600/delta5.jpg>
- ^{xviii} *HawgBlawg*. (2006, March 21). "Colin Farrell, Kirstin Dunst, Flavia de Oliveira." Retrieved April 2007 from http://bp0.blogger.com/_G_ctFbLwC5I/RqAphsPUk8I/AAAAAAAAAQg/Qf9FRKDvQ0A/s1600-h/colin.jpg.
- ^{xix} *HawgBlawg*. (2006, March 21). "Defunkt, 1988." Retrieved April 2007 from <http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/6803/1404/1600/defunkt.jpg>.
- ^{xx} "Strangely Familiar 'Anti-War Scarves' Now at a URBN Near You." (2007, January 16). Retrieved March 2007 from <http://jewschoool.com/2007/01/16/oddly-familiar-anti-war-scarves-now-at-an-urbn-near-you/>.
- ^{xxi} *CBC News Online: Photo Gallery*. Retrieved August 5, 2007 <http://www.cbc.ca/news/photogalleries/arafat/index.html>

^{xxii} Figures 24-26 *Urban Outfitters: Early Spring: See It All*. Retrieved January 2007 from <http://www.urbanoutfitters.com/images/us/local/kickers/gateway/scarf.gif>.
^{xxiii} *CBC News Online: This Week in Pictures*. Retrieved September 5, 2007 from <http://www.cbc.ca/photogallery/news/175/3/>.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. Castañeda, C. et. al. (Eds.). (2003). *Uprootings/Regroundings : Questions of Home and Migration*. New York, NY: Berg Publishers.
- Alvi, S.S. Hoodfar, H. and McDonough, S. (Eds.). (2003). *The Muslim Veil in North America: Issues and Debates*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1995). "The Production of Locality," in R. Fardon (Ed.), *Counterworks*. New York: Routledge, pp. 205-225.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arat-Koç, S. (2002). "Imperial Wars or Benevolent Interventions? Reflections on 'Global Feminism' Post September 11" *Atlantis* 26.2: 53-65.
- Arat-Koç, S. (2005). "The Disciplinary Boundaries of Canadian Identity After September 11: Civilizational Identity, Multiculturalism, and the Challenge of Anti-Imperialist Feminism." *Social Justice* 32(4): 32-49.
- Bakirathi, M. (2003). "Undressing the Diaspora," in *South Asian Women in the Diaspora*. N. Puwar and P. Raghuram (Eds.). Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Bannerji, H. (2002). *Inventing Subjects: Studies in Hegemony, Patriarchy and Colonialism*. London: Anthem.
- Barthes, R. (1993). *Mythologies*. A. Lavers. (trans.). London: Vintage.
- Barthes, R. (2006). *The Language of Fashion*. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Belova, O. (2006). "Speaking for Themselves? Problematising the Production of Meaning in Visual Artefacts." *Culture and Organization* 12(1): 37-49.
- Bullock, K. H. and Jafri, G. J. (2000). "Media (Mis)Representations: Muslim Women in the Canadian Nation." *Canadian Woman Studies* 20(2): 35-40.
- Bullock, K. (2002). *Rethinking Muslim Women and the Veil: Challenging Historical and Modern Stereotypes*. London: The International Institute of Islamic Thought.

- Burman, J. (2001). "At the Scene of the Crossroads, 'Somewhere in this Silvered City': Diasporic public spheres in Toronto." P. Moore and M. Risk (Eds.). *Culture of Cities: Under Construction*. Oakville, ON: Mosaic Press. Pp.203-211.
- Burshtein, K. (2007, May 29). "You Say Keffiyeh, I Say Shemagh: Urban Outfitters; Can Keffiyehs Ever Be Just a Fashion Statement?" *National Post*. Retrieved June 6, 2007 from <http://www.canada.com/topics/lifestyle/story.html?id=e7acb72b-fe7d-4ce2-a86d-63a3fa6cf566&k=12255>.
- Cabral, E. (Ed.). (2007, September). "Urban Warrior: Fierce Fashion Reigns as Tough Chic Storms the Streets" *Flare: Canada's Fashion Magazine* 29(9): 200.
- Calefato, P. (2004). *The Clothed Body*. Oxford and New York, NY: Berg.
- Carey, R. (Ed.). (2001). *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid*. New York, NY: Verso.
- CBC News. (2007, February 25). "Muslim Girl Ejected from Tournaments for Wearing Hijab." *CBC News*. Retrieved April 10, 2007 from: <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/toronto/story/2007/02/25/hijab-soccer.html>
- Chambers, R. (1997). "The Unexamined." M. Hill (Ed.). *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 187-203.
- Cocks, J. (1988, March 21). "Scarves and Minds Kaffiyehs from the Middle East Warm Up March Winds." *Time*. Retrieved July 28, 2007 from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,967046,00.html>
- CTV.ca News Staff. (2006, March 29). "Canada cuts relations with Palestinian Authority." *CTV News*. Retrieved Aug. 15 2007 from http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060328/abbas_hamas_ap_060329/20060329?hub=TopStories.
- Davis, U. (2003). *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within*. New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Debord, G. (1994). *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.
- Dols, C. (2007, February 23). "Islamaphobia at Urban Outfitters: The Case for Keffiyehs" *Counterpunch*. Retrieved March 5, 2007 from <http://www.counterpunch.org/dols02232007.html>
- Fanon, F. (1965). *A Dying Colonialism*. H. Chevalier (trans.). New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Fekete, L. (2006). "Enlightened Fundamentalism? Immigration, Feminism and the

- Right." *Race and Class* 48(2): 1-22.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of a Prison*. Trans. A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hage, G. (1994). "Locating Multiculturalism's Other: A Critique of Practical Tolerance" *New Formations* 24:19-34.
- Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (Eds.). (1976). *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, S. (1986). "Popular and the state," Bennett, T., Mercer, C., and Woollacott, J. (Eds.) *Popular Culture and Social Relations*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, pp.22 -49.
- Hall, S. (1990). "The Whites of Their Eyes: Racist Ideologies and the Media." M. Alvarado and J. Thompson (Eds.). *The Media Reader*. London: British Film Institute, pp. 7-23.
- Hall, S. (1992). "The Question of Cultural Identity," in S. Hall, D. Held and T. McGrew (Eds). *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 273-325.
- Hall, S. (1993). "Encoding, Decoding." S. During (Ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 90-103.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage in association with the Open University.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (2003). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hebdige, D. (1991). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge.
- Hernandez, D. (2006, April 9). "'Terrorist Chic' and Beyond Kaffiyehs: military prints and heavy boots on the streets of L.A. all speak to a post-9/11 world—Call it 'fear fashion.'" *LA Times*. Retrieved June 4, 2007 from <http://www.latimes.com/features/magazine/west/la-tm-terrorchic15apr09,0,5516881.story?coll=la-home-magazine>
- hooks, b. (1988). *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Huggan, G. (2001). *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Jiwani, Y. (2005a). "'War Talk' Engendering Terror: Race, Gender and Representation in Canadian Print Media." *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* 1(1): 15-22.
- Jiwani, Y. (2005b). "The Great White North Encounters September 11: Race, Gender, and Nation in Canada's National Daily, *The Globe and Mail*." *Social Justice* 32(4):50-68.
- Jiwani, Y. (2006). *Discourses of Denial: Mediations of Race, Gender, and Violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Kawaja, J. (Director), Brand, D. (Writer), Stikeman, G., Wong, M., Hubert, N. and Lachapelle, A. (Producers). (1999). *Under one sky...Arab Women in North America Talk About the Hijab* [Documentary]. Canada: National Film Board of Canada.
- Kibum, K. (2007, February 11). "Where Some See Fashion, Others See Politics" *New York Times*. Retrieved February 25, 2007 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/11/fashion/shows/11KAFFIYEH.html?ei=5088&en=33680aa2c38e84f2&ex=1328850000&adxnnl=1&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&adxnnlx=1171386267-rFLGtwfUAP3PCueq02M2ew>
- Lando, M. (2007, January 19). "US Chain Pulls 'Anti-War' Keffiyehs" *Jerusalem Post New York*. Retrieved March 22, 2007 from http://www.standwithus.com/news_post.asp?NPI=1086
- Lawrence, B. and Dua, E. (2005). "Decolonizing Antiracism." *Social Justice* 32(4): 120-143.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Massad, J. (2003). "The Ends of Zionism" *Interventions*, (5)3:440 – 448.
- Montpetit, J. (2007, March 15). "Muslim Groups Decry Quebec's Treatment of Prison Guard" *Canoe Network News*. Retrieved April 09, 2007 from: <http://cnews.canoe.ca/CNEWS/Canada/2007/03/14/pf-3754394>.
- Morris, R. C. (2004). "Images of Untranslatability in the US War on Terror" *Interventions* 6(3): 401 – 423.
- _____. (2007). *Herouxville Town Declaration*. Retrieved April 3, 2007 from: <http://municipalite.herouxville.qc.ca/>

- Pappe, I. (2004). *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Razack, S. H. (2004a). *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping, and the New Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Razack, S. H. (2004b). "Imperilled Muslim Women, Dangerous Muslim Men and Civilized Europeans: Legal and Social Responses to Forced Marriages" *Feminist Legal Studies* 12(2): 129-174.
- Razack, S. H. (2005). "Geopolitics, Culture Clash and Gender After September 11." *Social Justice* 32(4): 11-31.
- Reed, J. (2004, November 23). "After Arafat: Which Path for Palestine?" *CBC News Online*. Retrieved August 3rd, 2007 from http://images.google.ca/imgres?imgurl=http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp_reed/gfx/arafattimeline.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp_reed/20041123.html&h=208&w=250&sz=34&hl=en&start=2&um=1&tbnid=s-iTSHLphgbVTM:&tbnh=92&tbnw=111&prev=/images%3Fq%3Dyasser%2Barafat%2Bcbc%26svnum%3D10%26um%3D1%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DX
- Root, Deborah. (1997). " 'White Indians': Appropriation and the Politics of Display." B. Ziff and P. V. Rao (Eds.) *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp. 223-236.
- Schiller, N. G. and Fouron, G. E. (2001). *Georges Woke Up Laughing: Long-Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sharma, N. (2006). *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, M. P. (2001). *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Smith, M. P. and Guarnizo, L. E. (Eds.). (1998). *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

- Stein, R. L. and Swedenburg, T. (2005). "Introduction: Popular Culture, Transnationality and Radical History." R.L. Stein and T. Swedenburg (Eds.) *Palestine, Israel and the Politics of Popular Culture*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp.1-26.
- Subbaraman, S. (1999). "Catalog-ing Ethnicity: Clothing as Cultural Citizenship" *Interventions* 1(4): 572-589.
- Swedenburg, T. (1992). "Seeing Double: Palestinian/American Histories of the Kufiya" *Michigan Quarterly Review* 31(4): 557-577.
- Swedenburg, T. (1995). *Memories of Revolt: The 1936-1939 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tarlo, E. (1996). *Clothing Matters: Dress and Identity in India*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Yeğenoğlu, M. (1998) *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.