

Who is Dishonored?

Religious Studies 162C – Sikhism

(Honors contract version)

March 25, 2005

Gabor Por

December 18, 2004 "more than 400 Sikhs attempted to storm the [Birmingham Repertory] Theatre in protest at its production of the play, Behzti (Dishonour)." (Kirby 1) In the following paper I will deconstruct the causes of the protest. The play, written by Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti, a Sikh woman born in the United Kingdom includes a rape and murder committed in a Sikh temple, Gurdwara. The erupting controversy provided an opportunity to examine the importance of Gurdwaras in Sikh social and religious life, the Sikh attitude towards the tolerance, role of women, sexual abuse and the sanctity of life. All of these factors should be considered when analyzing the event along with taking into account the differences in responses to this play within the Sikh community. Furthermore the United Kingdom's and specifically Birmingham's social milieu has to be considered, because both the author and the protestors are living there, in Diaspora. I believe that discussing all these areas will provide a deeper understanding of Sikh belief system and can go beyond the short newspaper headlines. This consideration will prove that those who acted in a violent manner are in minority within their community. While the majority of Sikhs did not agree with their methods the issue affected them emotionally on multiple levels.

Before going into the analysis of the play and the reactions it generated it is important to note the actual events. The play opened in Birmingham December 9 and was scheduled to run till the 30th. (Earlier it had a successful and short run in London.) After the peaceful demonstration that turned violent and injured 5 policemen the theater cancelled the rest of the performances, because they felt they could not guarantee the safety of the

audience. Two days later another Birmingham theater offered to re-stage the play, but the offer was declined. (Naughton 1) The author received death threats and went into hiding. On December 22 700 British artist and leading figures wrote an open letter supporting the author. Shortly after Sikh leaders called the community to withdraw any such threats. (Walls 1) The Queen's annual Christmas speech, broadcasted on TV "included film clips from a visit she made to a Sikh temple"(Hinsliff 1) She called for tolerance and understanding:

"Some people feel that their own beliefs are being threatened. Some are unhappy about unfamiliar cultures. They all need to be reassured that there is so much to be gained by reaching out to others; that diversity is indeed a strength and not a threat."

(Hinsliff 1)

A public and vehement discourse emerged in the following days and weeks. The author spoke out for the first time in an article on January 13, the same day the English PEN club issued a letter to the Home Secretary opposing "[t]he proposed change to the Serious Organised Crime and Police Bill which introduces an offence of inciting religious hatred." (Full 1)

The editing of the book containing the play was done before the actual premier of the play itself. The book includes a short foreword by the author. It is clear from her lines that she is proud of her Sikh heritage. "The heritage of the Sikh people is one of courage and victory over adversity." (Bhatti, 2004, 17) It is exactly this kind courage that she takes on and uses for challenging the status quo and authority. When she feels "imprisoned by the mythology of the Sikh diaspora" she wants to point out the drawbacks and losers of a cultural milieu focusing on winning and victory. She writes that she wanted to oppose

injustice and hypocrisy in a provocative and relevant way. But when she admits in this foreword, written in November that, "writers sometimes cause offense" I believe she was aware what kind of emotions her play would stir. It was her choice and passion to go forth with it. Instead of conforming to the pressure of creating nice work, complying with traditional aesthetics she set out to challenge and hopefully change society for the better.

In her quest to show injustice she created a world where everybody is a victim. I will mention specifics later what the Sikh audience and readers might find offensive, but the first thing that stroke me upon reading the whole play was how dysfunctional every person and every relationship was. Ms. Bhatti's play is filled with victims; almost everybody is suffering from a deep wound. This mere fact, that all characters are sick one way or another would be offensive for those readers or theatre goers who expect a play to reflect the real world or paint an even more idealistic view. This world is a dark one, I suspect much darker than any actual Sikh or other communities. This level of concentration of human misery in an otherwise seemingly middle-class British environment is clearly an exaggeration.

A quick overview will qualify the above. Balbir, the mother had a trauma that we learn about very slowly that made her incapable of coordinating herself. Her incontinence and other physical problems are so severe that they require the help of social services. She is also blinded by her own thoughts and wishes that she does not even want to accept the world as her own eyes see it. This shows a parallel between her high degree of separation from the outside world in her eyes and area of movements, i.e. she never goes out. Min, her daughter seems an overtly simply person, who is too shy compared not just the generic, secular population but her own community. Even this term "community" doesn't apply to

her enough, because she does not participate regularly enough in Sikh worship or social events.

Mr. Sandhu, the next character who we get acquainted with is a hypocrite as we learn from the scenes when he takes off his turban being alone. Furthermore his actions first show some confusion, as if he would have removed himself from the world somewhat. But through a series of events we learn that this is just a veneer to distract people, and meanwhile he is very much aware of the situation and in control. He plays power games both mentally and physically. Power is his main focus. As any sociologist would tell you rape is about power and not sex. And he regularly raped people of both gender. He sought more and more power and didn't have a healthy way of handling it. Considering that this is not a theatre review I am allowed to include spoilers of the plays. Mr. Sandhu had a homosexual affair with Min's father Tej. Min caught them and her father's shame probably contributed to his suicide. It's typical for Mr. Sandhu that he puts the blame for Tej's death on Min. Not taking responsibility is one kind of defense mechanism he has practiced for long time.

Polly, one of the middle aged ladies is a widow, who somewhat desperately seeks attention from men, even from such an outsider as a black caretaker. Teetee, her friend wants to help his son's business, because he is not doing very well She subdues herself to Mr. Sandhu, but later events turn against her. She is another person who wants outside help, relies on external forces for happiness and connects her own satisfaction on the condition of her son's. But she is the person who cannot handle humiliation anymore and grabs the sword to annihilate the cause of so much pain in her life and in her communities. The fact that it is Balbir and not Teetee who does the final cut on Mr. Sandhu has to do with whose hurt is

fresher. But by the end of the play they could be interchangeable in this regard. Teetee's generic justification for the gender dynamics was not used in the context of rape but shows one possible attitude. She pronounces these words which show more understanding and cunning than one would suspect earlier: "Our men are cruel to our women but we get used to it and we follow the rules, letting each slap and tickle and bruise and headbutt go by. And at the end of this rubbish life, we write the rules." (Bhatti, 2004, 100)

All of these characters are in imbalance but none as much as Giani, who appears as the village fool. He acts simple or simple minded (we'll never know for sure), his words are enigmatic and this allows him to allow some truth, that nobody else can utter in this environment. Like his symbolic question: "But suppose you haven't been... very good inside... for a very long time... and what if you can't become a butterfly?" (Bhatti, 2004, 72) This certainly applies to Mr. Sandhu, but probably to himself too. Thus behind his simplistic manners there is a strong ability to observe reality with a sharp eye and better sense of morals than most others. Another term one might use to describe Giani is spiritual. He quotes the Scriptures often, giving answers with holy words instead of his own. He shows the ideals of the religion in sentences like "God always looks after the weak, protects believers and destroys evil." (Bhatti, 2004, 103) This ideal concept of religion and God is juxtaposed to the corrupt leader, and the institutionalized background that does not have strong enough failsafe to protect members from that kind of behavior.

I left Elvis for the last and not just because he is the only non-Sikh in the play. In that sense he creates a separate category. He provides a counterbalance, an outsider's point of view that may or may not bring some healing to Min at the end. He is a sounding board against what various aspects of religion and practice is thrown when he shows genuine

interest both towards the religion and Min herself. We learn what the others know or not, what they consider important because of his inquisitiveness. Finally he provides a flash of hope at the end. The title of this last scene, number 15, is "Resurrection." In it Min hesitantly but accepts Elvis' love and arm. This would suggest that the only way for her to find herself, to revive her life after being raped is by joining with a non-Sikh.

So far I analyzed the content and characters of the play. I would also like to point out the peculiarities of its language. It is almost entirely built up from short, staccato sentences. Sounds like one cry after another. People filled with anger and little patience speak this way. The exceptions are Elvis and Giani. The play is modern in the sense that foul language was not avoided where the author deemed it appropriate for the situation. Including the second line, thus setting the tone for a harsh drama right away.

I outlined earlier the major steps in the unfolding drama about the drama. But the basic recounting of them or even the story does not fully shed light on the nature of the problem. Two levels of discomfort were voiced from those who opposed the play. I would label them internal and external factors. The latter seemed more important in the British press. The issue of representation, whether an artwork coming from a member of a minority group should and does represent the community towards the rest of the country or world. Jagdeesh Singh, who in an independent incident earlier was attacked by racists and was called 'Paki Bin Laden, voiced his opinion: "It is hardly surprising that Sikhs are sensitive about this play. We live every day with racism based on misinformation." (Asthana 1) His concern with many other Sikhs was based from the fact that the general public knows so little about Sikhs. Thus he emphasized that the type of information presented to them should be positive and representing the core values of his religion and community. This obligation

of representation in his view is more important than freedom of speech for practical purposes.

All the articles and voices from Sikh authors in the British press acknowledged the importance of freedom of speech. They did not wish to institute censorship. As the person quoted above said: "You have to balance the desire for freedom of expression with the fact that it could provoke even greater prejudice." (Asthana 1) For him and others physical freedom and decreasing or mitigating racism towards their own community is worth limiting or balancing the controversial voices such as Bhatti's.

The issue at stake here is whether an artwork, a play stands only for the author's ideas or will it be treated as representing her community, background and the setting in which she opted to place her play. While her intention was the former, we cannot disregard that the mind of the people working in a way that when they see something from a member of a group they generalize that for the whole group. The same process applies to the content, not just the artist, or author. If they see, or read about a rape and murder happening in a Gurdwara and have no or very limited notions about the Gurdwara and the Sikh community they may make the assumption that the events described in this play are regular non-extraordinary ones.

Ms. Bhatti made her intentions clear in a statement she issued January 13:

"There can never be any excuse for the demonisation of a religion or its followers. [...] I certainly did not write Behzti to offend. [...] For a story to be truly universal, I think it is important to start with what is specific. Though the play is set in a Gurdwara, its themes are not just about Sikhism." (Bhatti 2005, 1)

I found a discrepancy between two reports. Ms Bhatti wrote: "nothing in Behzti was ever altered as a result of pressure from anyone." (Bhatti 2005, 1) On the other hand another article reported: "The city's Sikh community, [...] was consulted in advance by the theatre, which agreed to make some textual changes and to allow a statement from the community to be issued to the audience." (Kirby 1) Not being present at these meetings I cannot tell who is providing a more accurate picture. But I would like to point out that conversations did take place before the opening of the play and I find that significant. It shows that the author, the producers of the show and the theatre were not defiant and open to some compromise. Unfortunately the two sides interpreted the goals and consequences differently. Some of the Sikh community would have preferred to change the setting of the play to a more neutral territory. Their primary objection was thus about the location. But she "said that it was fiction so should go ahead." (Asthana 1)

This leads to our first point regarding the play itself. It is mostly set in a Gurdwara, a Sikh temple. A Gurdwara is a sacred space; its name literally translates "the house of the Guru." The term "guru" no longer refers to a particular person, but to the community and the book. The highest authority is transferred to the sacred books and this principle is referred to as Guru Granth. The book is treated as a royalty. It is at the highest, central point, and the only throne in the building. It is carried ceremonially over the head to show physically that it is indeed the highest physical entity. It is covered with rich textiles and treated in every moment with deepest respect. The Gurdwara is indeed the House of the Book.

Furthermore in mainstream Sikhism the right to interpret the writings belongs to the whole community by virtue of the Guru Panth principle. Thus the Gurdwara, housing both

the book and the community is the most sacred place a Sikh can imagine (outside of the Takhats in Punjab.) The Gurdwara, besides being the place of congregational worship also hosts the langar. This is the community kitchen where everybody is welcome. (The term also designates the meals served there.) The larger Gurdwaras are open 24 hours a day. It serves as refuge, home for the community. Just from these two aspects one can see the central nature of the Gurdwara and can surmise the "warm, fuzzy" feeling most Sikhs would associate with it. To locate such horrendous crimes as rape and murder is unimaginable and hurtful of Sikh feelings.

The social aspect related to the gurdwara is the relative lack of hierarchy. There are no equivalents of the various levels of ranks of say Catholic clergy. Sikhism is democratic in its principles, all males and females are equally important. But even with clear principles life in a complex society requires somebody taking responsibility for action and decisions, thus Gurdwaras has boards. Wherever power is present and the possibility of its concentration there is always a chance for its corruption. This is exactly what happened in this play. The democratic nature, lack of formal structure, lack of "checks and balances" allowed the situation to develop and perpetrate itself for decades where Mr. Sandhu could held a high office without fear of retribution for his actions and continue to play his games.

The case of Birmingham is special in a number of ways. Its Guru Nanak Gurdwara "was the first Gurdwara in Europe to be purchased for the sole use of worship by the Sikh community." (Guru 1) It sounds even more impressive when one learns that until the 1970s there were restrictions on opening Mosques, Temples and Gurdwara. Sikhs, through their participation in the Birmingham Council of Faiths were "instrumental in helping to breakdown such barriers." (Smethwick 1) Another Gurdwara in town, Gurdwara Nishkam

Sevak Jatha, boasts as the highest building in Birmingham. This data suggests how proud Sikhs in Birmingham may be of their places of worship. So for them it must feel especially shameful to depict actions like this play does.

Thus we are approaching another key component of the matter, the events in the play. Unfortunately as of this time I have not obtained a full copy of the play. I am not familiar with the whole play, and do not know how the 10 page excerpt available online fits into the whole structure. What other issues and characters emerge in the play. In short the context is missing. Here is a quick summary of the scene:

Min, a girl described as not-so-young anymore, steps out of the Gurdwara with bloodstains on her pants. Two women and her mother start to scorn and beat her for breaking the taboo of coming to the temple in an unclean state. They stop only when Sandhu, a respectable Sikh man enters the scene. Min says that he violated her. But nobody believes her and she is forced to apologize for the dishonor she brought to the place. Then Sandhu asks for her hand in marriage and acknowledges that he indeed was with her and with others in the past in similar manner. The two women also come out and acknowledge that they were treated the same way and they still beat and scorn the girl well knowing what happened. Min's mother later understands the full scope of the tragic event.

As we see, unfortunately, this story could have happened in any setting. It tells the familiar story of semi-institutional rape and its cover-up. Just as in other patriarchal societies those who are in power, the males, define the concept of honor. The two women who participate in the breaking down of Min call her dishonorable. They act as if fully internalized the taboo of women going to the Gurdwara during their cycle. My limited research seemed to contradict the existence of such taboo. "Guru Nanak openly chides those

who attribute pollution to women because of menstruation and asserts that pollution lies in the heart and mind of the person and not in the cosmic process of birth." (Arora 1) If this is the case and followed accordingly in Birmingham too, then in my opinion Ms Bhatti's creativity coalesces to distortion of truth. She certainly has the right to create fiction any way she wants. I have no doubt that intelligent viewers and readers are capable of separating fact from fiction. However if they are not aware that the taboo explicitly stated in the play does not exist then it will change one of the basic frameworks of understanding Sikh religion. Without further and more correct information they would go on assuming that Sikh religion is similar to Islam in this regard. I was trying to find a comparable example from the dominant religion of the west, Christianity. In the 1988 movie "The Last Temptation of Christ", based on Nikos Kazantzakis' 1951 novel, the historical Jesus seemed to follow an alternative fate and did not die on the cross. The movie angered a fair number of Christians enough to protest vehemently. I am aware that this is not entirely comparable, because that piece of fiction changed a core tenet of the religion, while here we are dealing with an issue that may not be a central doctrine. Nevertheless they both misrepresent the official stand on important issues.

When examining rape from sociological perspective gender relations need to be looked at closely. Women compared to the three Abrahamic religions generally had more rights from the very beginning in the Sikh religion. It can be partially explained by the later founding date of the religion, it is only 500 years old, as opposed to 2500-3000, 2000 or 1400 (Judaism, Christianity, Islam respectively.) The old patriarchal society provides more and more freedom for women as time progressed. However this in itself does not explain the founding father's, Guru Nanak's attitude towards women. In the context of his own

historical time and geographic location he was rather progressive, recording a more enlightened view than his contemporaries. The following is a brief overview of Harjit Kaur Arora's article "Sikhism & the Status of Women." I believe it considers all areas in a concise and relevant way.

Guru Nanak praised women and reprimanded those who considered them inferior to men. God is introduced not exclusively in masculine terms, but feminine as well, thus strengthening "its" gender indifference. The holy congregation (Sangat) includes women, the same way as it does men. Women participate in communal praying. Marriage is an equal partnership of love and sharing between husband and wife. Sati-- the practice of women burning themselves on their husband's funeral pyre--, female infanticide, wearing veils, rape and brutalities committed against women were all condemned by Guru Nanak. The status of women is further enhanced later by appointing female missionaries, religious and military leaders. Education is not just accessible but strongly encouraged for them. They have full economic rights, including owning and inheriting property. The institution of arranged marriage still exists today, but it is forbidden to enforce it. Widows are allowed to remarry. A decent number of Sikh women's names, roles, virtues, and activities were recorded throughout their history. Simple dress code encouraged for both sexes. Wearing the five required articles of faith is accepted for women too. It is not universally practiced among Sikhs, but there is no scriptural sanction against doing so. Women can participate in the initiation ceremony. Upon completing it they receive the "Kaur" surname, which literally means "Princess." From the extensive list above one may conclude that gender equality has been achieved in Sikhism. This is not entirely true. Most religious and community leaders

are still males. Similarly to other religions Sikhs claim that men and women are legally equal but technically different in their roles and access.

Considering that the play includes a murder we have to examine what can be said about Sikhs opinion on (taking a) human life? They consider every human being God's creation and therefore oppose murder on religious ground. At the same time there is a strong military heritage in the community. They are proud warriors. They participated in a number of successful wars and battles and play an important role in India's current military and police force. The essentially male aggressivity is encouraged, but directed only towards members of outside the community. Therefore this aspect does not apply to this play to its full extent.

I would like to mention that the Sikh religion has built-in tolerance in its structure. If we look at their most sacred text we'll find texts from non-Sikh authors in it. This reveals their respect for other traditions. One of the people who voiced his opposition towards the play is Jasdev Singh Rai, director of the Sikh Human Rights Group. His organization is the Sikh equivalent of Amnesty International, fighting in the Punjab area, on the international field regarding human rights and paying attention to the ecological/environmental issues too. He said though: "We [Sikhs] had freedom of speech long before the West and understand its boundaries. It is only 30 years since this country came to the conclusion that racism could not be defended on this basis." (Asthana 1) On one hand, being the director of the organization, he must be an activist with a deep understanding of human rights issues. On the other hand he seems to oppose the extension of free speech to hate speech. This is a complex issue that I do not have room to consider this at this time. I just want to acknowledge that the play resulted in a public debate and that in itself is a healthy outcome.

I found three sociological essays that shed some lights and gave me new perspectives to look at the issue. All three of them were written in the late 1990s but they are still relevant. Two of them based are the summaries of scientific surveys, one from the United States (Angelo) and one from the United Kingdom (Drury). The third essay (Puar) is more theoretical and political, based on six deep interviews with second generation Sikh women in the UK. I suggest that even the ones originated from the US one should not be disregarded, because of its location, because there are relevant insights. The question I was asking while reading these essays is how typical or atypical the women, their behavior, depiction was in Ms. Bhatti's play compared to sociologically perceivable reality.

Puar's objective was "to illuminate why Western dichotomies of white/black, East/West and oppressor/oppressed consistently reinscribe identity a fixed, static and boundaried state." (Puar 128) Thus she was focusing on identity and how it is in constructed, influenced by society. She speaks of stereotypes of passivity, docility and helplessness associated with South Asian women. For her thus manifests in the lack portrayal "in the context of their own self-agency, of resistance constructed and functioning within specific social contexts." (Puar 129) These are her postulates based on the interviews. From this she surmised that second generation Sikh women, i.e. those who were born in Great Britain by parents who emigrated from the Punjab, are somewhat defining their own identity by these stereotypes. I explained above how everybody is a victim of something in this play. Puar aggress that South Asian women are framed as victims by default for several reasons including the patriarchal religion, the racism of the country they live in and the image of their sexuality. With the exception of racism all the other features

play a part in the play's underlying issues. Thus Puar seems to support Bhatti's negative view.

Puar also found that while these women "identify religiously, ethnically and/or culturally as Sikh... none of them, however, seemed particularly attached to Sikhism as a religious identity." (Puar 135) This statement also has some resonance with the play, although Min tries to follow the religion, but she does not go out of her way to do so.

"South Asian women's sexuality is curiously stereotyped as passive, submissive, licentious and available. (Puar 136) This is clearly the framework of Mr. Sandhu's mind from which he operates. The most intriguing sentence though in this essay was: The stereotype of the dirty, ugly South Asian woman thus becomes exoticized through middle-class consumption." (Puar 137) It doesn't relate directly to the play, because there is no Caucasian male in the play. But I wonder how much Mr. Sandhu's attitudes and therefore his actions were influenced by the British society that surrounds him. After all he departed from the traditional respect and treatment of women that is characteristic for Sikhs. Being a fictional character in a short fictional play we would never know the answer for the question, or what significance would Ms. Bhatti attribute to this factor. Puar also pointed my attention to the movie *Mississippi Masala*, in which a South Asian woman consumes her love with a black man. This parallel could be the subject of further analysis, but it was such a long time ago when I saw the movie, that I cannot go into it without secure knowledge about it.

Angelo did an extensive set of interviews in upper state New York interviews with dozens of Sikh men and women. He found that female respondents are highly educated. "92 percent of female respondents in possession of at least a B.A., attests to the relative equality

of status of the Sikh female." (Angelo 169) While this high number may be special to the American diaspora, but "Sikh families have always encouraged and provided for the education of their young women." (Angelo 173) However none of the women in Behzti were overtly educated. Maybe this limitation was set on purpose or maybe it reflects British reality more. Nevertheless this generic statement applies to Sikhs anywhere: "Women are the guardians of the values and traditions of the Sikh community." (Angelo 170) On the same page he wrote: "Immoral or irresponsible behavior in a woman is regarded as much more serious than for a man." (Angelo 170) This is a key in understanding this play. This is a partial reason why Mr. Sandhu was not called upon his deeds, it was not considered as serious as if a woman had acted in a similar manner. The final point from this study relevant to our play can be found here: "Although the preferred marriage model indicated less willingness to adapt to a Western mode, the insistence on consent, and in some instances outright refusal, was a moderating factor." (Angelo 208) Even under the dire circumstances when Mr. Sandhu offered to take Min as his wife she had the right to refuse him. People around him may not like it, but they didn't question her right to do so. This attitude is admirable, particularly when compared with other religious traditions, which practice arranged marriages.

The data for the third and final essay I would like to use is coming from a survey in the mid 1980s. One might consider this dated, but its findings may point us towards the right direction for deeper understanding. It examines how the multiple identities of Sikh girls developed in Great Britain. "Only three percent said that their parents allowed them to have boyfriends." (Drury 103) To fully evaluate this number we should know the corresponding number for other ethnicities or religious groups. I don't, but the number still

seems rather low. Balbir on one hand wanted her daughter to have a life, go out, on the other hand was very demanding of her to be involved in taking care of her mother. This pressure is in alignment with this statement: "A majority (73%) spent most of their spare time at home;... Their social lives tended to be lived within the community." (Drury 103) Balbir would not have approved of Elvis. Endogamy, marrying within the group, is very much encouraged for Sikh girls.

Before Operation Bluestar politics was a marginal element in the girls' identity. But after it they had to face it, became more knowledgeable and more importantly their sense of attachment to India as their "real home" decreased. (Drury 103) This play is set two decades after those event, and the issue didn't even come up. It became so integrated that they the myth of return has totally dissipated.

Ms. Bhatti's play is titled Behzti – Dishonour. From the fragments and the reviews it is evident that she juxtaposes the perceived dishonor of a young woman suffers by being raped with the moral codes of the larger society, which would suggest that the rapist is the criminal and he should be dishonored and punished. This is the theme of the 1988 movie: "The Accused", which dissects who is responsible for a rape, the victim with a "questionable character" or the perpetrators. Another comparison that jumps to mind is the widening scandal within the Catholic Church, where clergy people were found guilty of sexual misconduct and higher-ranking clergy people guilty of covering up their activities. Behzti paints a similar picture where several people accepted the repeated rape committed by a member, an elder of the community and he was protected. Anybody with moral engagement would agree that this is a controversial issue which must be considered.

The people who opposed the play however felt that something else was dishonored by it: their faith, religion and sacred space. They felt hurt by reading, seeing, hearing about these in a more than disrespectful manner. I am not here to pass judgment, having no expertise, limited perspective, right and/or sufficient information to do so. As an outsider what I can observe is that until violence erupted, both sides acted within their rights. Showing more respect, tolerance and consideration would have been beneficial for both sides. I believe the long term solution for both the artists, who want to practice freedom in their artistic creations and be liberated from the burden of representation, and for the Sikh community who would like to portray a carefully balanced view of themselves, is to have more Sikh artworks, including novels, poems and plays available. The more the public sees and knows about the community the less they would use any single work for generalization of the whole community.

Works cited

Angelo, Michael. The Sikh diaspora: tradition and change in an immigrant community. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.

"An offensive act?" The Independent. 21 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://enjoyment.independent.co.uk/theatre/features/story.jsp?story=595098>>

Arora, Harjit Kaur. "Sikhism & the Status of Women." Sikh Spirit. 2000 Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://www.bsingh.dsl.pipex.com/khalsa/news51.htm> >

Asthana, Anushka. "Tempest of rage shakes Sikh temple." The Observer. 26 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,5092295-102274,00.html> >

Bhatti, Gurpreet Kaur. Bhezti (Dishonour). London: Oberon Books, 2004.

Bhatti, Gurpreet Kaur. "This warrior is fighting on." The Guardian. 13 Jan. 2005. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1389198,00.html> >

"A Comparative View on Women." searchsikhism.com Retrieved 1 Mar. 2005 < <http://www.searchsikhism.com/islam4.html> >

Drury, Beatrice. "The Impact of Religion, Culture, Racism and Politics on the Multiple Identities of Sikh Girls." Culture, identity and politics: ethnic minorities in Britain. Ed. Terence Ranger, Yunas Samad, Ossie Stuart. Aldershot: Avebury, 1996. 99-111.

"Full text of the authors' letter." The Guardian. 13 Jan. 2005. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/story/0,,1389426,00.html> >

"Guru Nanak Gurdwara." BBC. Retrieved 1 Mar. 2005 < http://www.bbc.co.uk/birmingham/content/panoramas/smethwick_temple_360.shtml >

"Guru Nanak Gurdwara in Smethwick." southall-punjabi.com. Retrieved 1 Mar. 2005 < http://www.southall-punjabi.com/birmingham/guru_nanak_Gurdwara.html >

Hinsliff, Gaby., Anushka Asthana. " Queen's impassioned plea for diverse Britain." The Observer. 26 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,5092283-102285,00.html> >

Kirby, Terry . "Violence and vandalism close production." The Independent. 21 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < http://enjoyment.independent.co.uk/low_res/story.jsp?story=595097&host=5&dir=500 >

Naughton, Philippe. "A second theatre offers to stage controversial Sikh play." The Times. 20 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1410371,00.html> >

Puar, Jasbir K. " Resituating Discourses of 'Whiteness' and 'Asianness' in Northern England: Second-generation Sikh Women and Constructions of Identity". New frontiers in women's studies: knowledge, identity and nationalism. London: Taylor & Francis, 1996. 126-150.

Walls, Jacqui. "'Death Threats to Writer Must Be Withdrawn' - Sikh Leaders." The Scotsman. 24 Dec. 2004. Retrieved 1 March 2005 < <http://news.scotsman.com/latest.cfm?id=3925215> >