PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

STIGMATIZED IDENTITIES: ISLAM BE/COMING RACIALIZED IN WESTERN HEGEMONIC DISCOURSE

Aamir Shehzad[1], Quratulain Arshad[2]

[1] Assistant Professor, Government College of Management Sciences Mansehra, KPK.

[2] Lecturer, Islamia University Bahawalpur.

ABSTRACT

"A discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power" (Foucault, 1998)
This study is undertaken to ascertain public and private sphere of Islamic identity formation and the way in which it is transcribed in the realm of western hegemonic discourses. For last three decades, there has been considerable increase in representation of Islam in the West. Drawing on Foucauldian discourse analysis this study analyzes the discursive practices of western discourses on Islam and terrorism. I use the metaphor of stigma to accentuate distorted image of Islam and hatred against Muslims. In the wake of 'war on terror' the racialization of Islam and/or Muslim in avowedly western discourse became more intense. Anti-islam/muslim sentiments are inculcated among non-muslims through media and other dominant discourses so as to stigmatize Islam and thereby provoking religious and cultural hatred worldwide and causing islamophobia/xenophobia.

INTRODUCTION

It has become commonplace to observe attacks on Muslim communities around the world particularly following 9/11 and media stigmatization of Islam. For instance, we see a white woman – walking on the street of America – shouts at two Muslim women. Out of extreme hatred of Muslims, she calls them terrorists and forcibly nips off their head scarf. But no one labeled this event as white racism/fundamentalism. Another woman shouts and then assaults an aged Muslim man on the street of America. This again is not condemned as white supremacist attack. Similarly a woman member of Australian senate ridicules and agitates against Muslim women wearing hijab in Australia – right after horrific terrorist attack on innocent Muslims in New Zealand. She enters into senate wearing hijab and then takes it off in front of

all members. She records her protest and criticism against Islamic practice of observing hijab and associates it with terrorism. These incidents happen on daily basis against Muslims particularly immigrants around the world but western media never bothers to expose, as these concede in white criticism. On the contrary, whenever we witness any terrorist incident committed against non-muslims anywhere around the world, western media instantly labels it as 'Islamic fundamentalist activity' and blames Muslims without any confirmation. The western media always does it purposefully to portray negative image of Islam. Through stigmatizing Islam, West tries to convince non-Muslims that Islam tends to kill non-believers. Islam is being presented as religion of violence which ultimately causes islamophobia, white racism and xenophobic attacks against Muslims. It is imperative to investigate the role of media and western discourse on Islam for stigmatizing Muslim identity.

Islam, the second largest religion in the world after Christianity, is the most proliferating religion. Because of its glory and rapid proliferation, Islam has been associated with violence, war and other destructive practices. West considers Islam's proliferation in the West as a threat to western civilizations. Hence Islam is misrepresented to the people as a belief that is intolerant to non-muslims. This misrepresentation of Islam is done to greater extent with ulterior motive of stigmatization of Islam and to some extent without knowing Islam; and is resultant of menace to bring harmony between Islam and west.

The clash between Islam and the West is due to misunderstanding and misinterpretation on both sides. West attempts to stereotype Muslims without completely comprehending Islamic civilization. On the other hand if Muslims dislike western civilization and consider western social values adversative to theirs, they do so without understanding the difference between Islamic and western civilization. A civilization is a way of life of a particular society based on socio-cultural organization. Every civilization is different from others in terms of socio-cultural and religious orientations; "civilizations are differentiated from each other by history, language, culture, tradition, and most important, religion" (Huntington, 1993). These differences are inherent and pre-exist from centuries but these do not prescribe any sense of superiority among civilizations. Today, the world's civilizations are at clash with each other due to sense of superiority. Samuel Huntington hypothesizes that wars among future generations would be fought not between countries, but between cultures. He argues;

It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilization will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future (Huntington, 1993).

The fault line between civilizations, as propounded by Huntington, is the classification of civilizations on the basis of supremacy, particularly in connection to Islam and West. He sees civilizational conflicts between Muslims and non-muslims and controversially identifies the "bloody boarders" between Islamic and non-islamic civilizations. Western civilizations are presented superior to the civilizations of the non-western world. The interpretation of civilization today is problematic as it is based on ethnocentric perspective. Some civilizations are considered morally advanced while some are morally backward, what makes civilization challenging for anthropologists. Nevertheless, the difference among civilizations can only be based on technological advancement rather than any moral superiority or inferiority.

West undertakes the task of representing Islam and rest of the world as 'othered'. This representation of non-western world by the west is controversial on two presumptions. First, no interpretation is neutral or authentic. Writing about human being is not giving mathematical or quantitative account rather it involves subjective measurement; meaning that we know about anyone else through our subjective analysis which can never be substantive. Therefore every representation is not completely original. According to Edward Said (1981) creating knowledge pertaining to human society is historical knowledge based on subjective judgment and interpretation. Representation and interpretation always entail basic presumption that who is the interpreter, what power relation permeates between the interpreters and interpreted, what is the stance of interpreter and at "what historical moment the interpretation takes place" (Said, 1997). Second, the West approaches the non-western world – specifically Islamic – through the framework of colonialism which involves the position of dominance and subjugation. Commenting about representation of Islam in Western Discourse, Edward Said (1981) states, "knowledge of Islam and of Islamic peoples has generally proceeded not only from dominance and confrontation but also from cultural antipathy" (Said, 1997).

Following the event of September, 11 the scenario has become more racially charged and resulted in public's unwillingness to accept Muslims' acculturation in the West in general and the US in particular. This increased atmosphere of hatred for Muslims, especially immigrants around the world. Due to increase in islamophobia, hate crimes against Muslims particularly against immigrant community increased. The present study is undertaken to examine western narrative of terrorism and its association with Islamic world through the lens of Foucauldian discourse analysis. How west has emerged as adversary to Islam through the development of language and discourse and stigmatized Islamic identity.

Discourse and Power

A discourse is an interactive verbal expression in a speech or writing. Webster dictionary defines discourse as "a. verbal interchange of idea… b. a formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject"

(Webster, 2019). The term has taken on multiple connotations. It is not purely a linguistic term; it may refer to a spoken or written use of language generated within a specific context, thus "discourses are articulated through all sorts of visual and verbal images and texts and also through the practices that those languages permit" (Rose, 2001). Over the last three decades, the term has proliferated in different scholarly traditions, and is being used as a key term in the fields of humanities and social sciences by various academicians and theorists but not with exactly the same implication. Since Sara Mills (1997) ascertains, discourse "has become common currency in a variety of disciplines: critical theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many other fields" (Mills, 1997). However, French philosopher and social theorist Michel Foucault develops his conception of discourse as a social practice through which human beings see, understand, and make sense of social reality. A discourse usually stems out in a social context and shapes social practices. It is a source of information regarding social attitudes, beliefs, experiences and practices; as Foucault (1972) observes, discourses are "practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972).

Different discourses get generated in a social context serving various purposes like policy, ideological contention and power structure. Every discourse is shaped by the world and shapes the world; discourses are produce to "create meaning, force, and effect within a social context" (Mills, 1997). According to Foucault (1980) individuals are always subjected to the production of truth. He articulates, "in a society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (Foucault, 1980). Hence the construction of discourse is to produce truth claim. According to Foucault there is a close relation between discourse and power. Whenever power is used to implement the truth of any discourse in a given context, the 'regime of truth' is produced through this discursive practice.

Truth isn't outside power…Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint… and it includes regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth; that is the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish 'true and false' statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; and the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980).

West emerged as adversary to Islam and other non-western societies through the development of language and discourse by depicting and presenting difference between itself and the others it encountered in the course of expansion. In general sense of the term, discourse is a 'rational expression' in a speech or writing. But now the term is loaded with specialized connotations. A discourse is a statement or a set of statements used in a particular way of representing and creating a specific knowledge what Foucault explains

'discursive formation'. An important implication of the notion of discourse is the "production of knowledge through language. But it is itself produced by a practice: 'discursive practice' – the practice of producing meaning. So discourse enters into and influences all social practices" (Hall, 1992). Stuart Hall uses the word of discourse in a similar way to ideology that is "a set of statements or beliefs which produce knowledge that serves the interests of a particular group or class" (Hall, 1992). Hall summarizes Foucault's conception of discursive formation of discourse; for Foucault discourse is,

A group of statements which provides a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment…Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language. But…since all social practices entail meaning, and meanings shape and influence what we do – our conduct – all practices have a discursive aspect (Hall, 1992).

Discourses are everywhere and in everything. A discourse is never a transparent phenomenon. It is not always the same. It imbibes power but power as an 'exercise' rather than a 'property'. All discourses are constructed from the perspective of dominant class and serve the purpose of exercising power relation.

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enables one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned, the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980).

Drawing on Foucauldian discourse analysis, I develop theoretical framework to analyze discursive formation of western institutionalized discourses for stigmatizing and polarizing Islamic identity. The framework developed for this study centers on the following three aspects of Foucault's discourse theory.

The Subjective self

For Foucault subjectivity is the constitution of self in relation to discourses. It is the effect of power and discourse that construct subjects. We adopt subjective positions that make our identities or selves; we locate ourselves (position ourselves) on that conceptual map.

Power and knowledge

Discourses are not mere social expressions, but serve a particular intend, that is the exercise of power. According to Foucault discourses are tied up with power; power refers to "a whole series of particular mechanisms, definable and defined, that seem capable of inducing behaviours and discourses" (Foucault, 1996). Through power, knowledge is put to work via discursive

practices to regulate people's conduct. For Foucault power doesn't mean controlling, representing, or concealing; power also produces reality; it produces domain of object and rituals of truth. Thus the notion of power here is both enabling and constraining.

Dominant Discourses

According to Foucault some discourses in our society are so entrenched that it is difficult to challenge them. These dominant discourses are embedded in various kinds of institutions and social practices. These institutions i.e. media, politics etc are ways of organizing, regulating and administering social life.

Islam in Western Discourse

The overall structure of world civilizations entails the process of continuity and sovereignty to other civilizations; and inventing the 'other' a frightening antagonist. In the past half century, this civilizational conflict is getting deeper; and the crisis it brings is also getting overt and uncontrollable. To put it simply, Western civilization has hegemonized and controlled non-Western civilizations particularly Islamic civilization. Islam is not just a religion; it is a complete civilization which posses threat to all other civilizations especially Western. Consequently West fights Islam by occupying and dividing major countries of Islamic world, and creating war against Islam. The aim is to thwart Islamic discourse from nurturing a wave that would lead to unified Muslim world.

The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of co-existence. Both are in confrontation with each other from long past but the conflict is not between Islam and Christianity, rather "it is always the west, and not Christianity, that seems pitted against Islam" (Said, 1981). In order to trace the history of rivalry between west and Islam, Shadid and Van Koningsveld (2002), suggest that history of changing power relationship between west and Islam is divided into four periods. The first period (622-1492) marks the hegemony and expansion of Islam from the desert of Arabia to Africa, Asia, and Europe. In the second period, from eleventh century till 1683 – partial overlapping of the one, west counter attacks through Christian crusades. The end of the crusades marks the beginning of the third period which eventually results in the fourth period that of the western hegemony and colonization of the Muslim world in nineteenth and twentieth century (Shadid and Koningsveld, 2002). Though the tension between Islam and the West rose in the seventh century with the emergence of Islam but Europe's interest began in Islam at the end of eleventh century. After regaining power from Muslims through series of crusades Europe's standpoint of Islam during colonial period gained new perspective when it was used to legitimize the subjection of almost the entire Muslim world by a few European superpowers (Shadid and Koningsveld, 2002).

Edward Said (1981) illustrates West's distorted presumption of Islam in the Western hegemonic regime of truth. Western societies propagate image of Islam through exercising institutional authority; according to Said, "Islam is 'news' of a particular unpleasant sort. The media, the government, the geopolitical strategies, and the academic experts on Islam, are all in concert: Islam is a threat to Western civilization" (Said, 1981).

West has authoritative stance over creating and controlling discourses against Muslims particularly in the wake of 'war on terror'. After the collapse of British imperialism, United States came to exercise power around the world intervening and controlling affairs of lesser powerful countries particularly Middle Eastern and South Asian regions. US interest in Middle Eastern region grew out of political and economic concerns. The major interest of United States is the access to oil and political hegemony in the region. This perspective of American safeguard has dominated American foreign policy since middle of twentieth century and continues to be the major foreign concern.

During Soviet Afghanistan war (December, 1979 – February, 1989) America supported Afghanistan Democratic Party against Soviet invasion. Instead of involving directly into the war, America – through Saudi Arabia and Pakistan – created mujahedeen which later became Taliban and Al-Qaida. These mujahedeen were created and supported under America's plot against Soviet expansion to Afghanistan. Soviet leadership supported Afghan government and wanted to bring Afghanistan under Soviet imperial rule. This was unbearable for America therefore cold war came to Afghanistan in 1956. During The Cold War era (1956-1978) Soviet Union accorded about US 3 billion aid to Afghanistan, and during the same period America gave Afghanistan US 533 million aid (Rashid, 2010) for militant insurgencies. The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan on December 24, 1979 which caused US president Jimmy Carter to launch a plan to resist Soviet extension. US policy was to arm Afghan mujahedeen to oppose Soviet intrusion because America did not want to see them controlling central Asia and possible control over much of oil suppliers. Al-Qaida's supreme leader Osama bin Laden was soviet-hating freedom fighter; he was trained – along with his guerrillas – by CIA (Fisk, 1998). When Bin Laden came to Afghanistan he was on CIA roll and latter on began to propagate extremist norms.

After Soviet's withdrawal from Afghanistan, America wanted to empower its marionette government in Afghanistan but mujahedeen resisted against this as they fought their part for freedom. There began a clash between America and mujahedeen. America declared mujahedeen as terrorists and supported puppet government. A decade ago these mujahedeen were called freedom fighters and now they are declared terrorists. This shows hegemonic stance of America. Through manipulating power it can form any discourse against anyone. When the situation became more aggravated between America and Taliban, America decided to take control of Afghanistan for which it constituted 9/11 conspiracy after which Taliban were declared Islamic fundamentalists and terrorists. America got right to attack Afghanistan.

Earlier United States created mujahedeen and declared them freedom fighter because they were being used for America's ulterior motifs that was to vanquish Soviet Union. But when America didn't need these mujahedeen they announced them as terrorist. It was America's policy to create discourse of terrorism and associate Afghan mujahedeen as terrorist. This discourse was generated to launch war against Afghanistan and take control of Afghanistan. For which America planned 9/11 incident and paved the way for attacking Afghanistan.

In the wake of 9/11 incident and resultant 'war against terror', various theorists and social critics are impelled to sketch the event with its socio-political implications. Some prominent philosophers and social thinkers such as Slavoj Zizek, Noam Chomsky, and Jacques Derrida examine the causes and effects of 9/11 event, and in its aftermath, America's authoritative discourse against terrorism and bringing world peace and harmony in jeopardy. As Slavoj Zizek (2002) analyzes America's standpoint on 'war against terrorism' in the wake of September 11 attacks. According to Zizek 9/11 was a 'fantasmatic' image, entered and shattered our reality, "September 11 attacks were the stuff of popular fantasies long before they actually took place" (Zizek, 2002). America's plot against Islam actually started way back through Hollywood's solicited help rendered to Pentagon. Hollywood established catastrophe movies with the objective of "imagining possible scenarios for terrorist attacks and how to fight them…Hollywood does in fact function as an 'ideological state apparatus'" (Zizek, 2002). Using Althusser's term 'ideological state apparatus', Zizek emphasizes the hidden role of media to support the ideology of dominant discourse. The fact is that US government plotted against Islam through institutionalizing dominant discourse. On one hand Al-Qaeda was symbolized as the incarnation of evil and a continuous threat to the west. On the other hand, by creating a narrative to encounter this evil threat, America legitimized its designed attacks on Afghanistan.

Jacques Derrida, French philosopher and the founder of Deconstruction, observes America's utilitarian and manipulative attitude;

9/11 introduces a deconstructive critique that is sober, alert, vigilant, attentive to everything that, through the best-substantiated strategy, the most justified politicking rhetoric, media powers, spontaneous or organized trends of opinion, welds the political to the metaphysical, to capitalistic speculation, to perversion of religious or nationalistic influence, to sovereignist fantasy (Derrida, 2002).

For Derrida 9/11 attacks were America's self imposed war. He considers 9/11 as event of suicidal paradox. He asserts that during Cold War era American policy was to support Afghanistan; by funding Afghan government and training and arming mujahedeen in Afghanistan, America prepared hijackers to carry out 9/11 attacks.

In the similar vein Noam Chomsky, a prominent linguist, political thinker and social activist, criticizes US foreign policies and military interventions around the world. He insists that America's domination in the form of authoritative manipulation particularly after 9/11 is unjustified and need be dismantled. He believes that humanity has been threatened with destruction and we should not forget that US is the leading terrorist state. In an interview with David Barsamian (2001), Chomsky asserts that "the US has supported oppressive, authoritarian, harsh regimes, and blocked democratic initiatives" (Barsamian, 2001). He blames US presidents for horrendous terrorist attacks during the past few decades and refers to numerous examples of US actions that resulted in massive killing of civilians. He mentions those areas where innocent civilians became victims of America's atrocities i.e. Beirut, Cambodia, Vietnam, Sudan, Nicaragua, Yugoslavia, Iraq and Afghanistan. He further states that despite of accusation for promoting international terrorism by the World Court, the US continues international terrorism and rejects "security council resolution calling on states to observe international law" (Barsamian, 2001).

Besides the concerns of philosophers and social critics, some political figures also responded to the geopolitical implication of 9/11 event. They confirm that 9/11 was a preplanned controlled destruction of world trade center building; accomplished by then United States' president George W. Bush as an alleged reason for initiating war on terror. For instance, Senator John Kerry, during presidential campaign in 2004, admits that world trade center building 7 was brought down intentionally through a controlled demolition, "I think that they made a decision based on the danger that it had of destroying other things they did it in a controlled fashion" (Vandita, 2017). In the same vein Larry Silverstein, leaseholder of world trade center, declares, "they made that decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse" (Vandita, 2017). The WTC building was terrorism ensured and Larry Silverstein got the lease just two months before the terrorist attacks. After 9/11, Silverstein was granted $4.55 billion (Emery, 2016). Signing a lease and purchasing terrorism insurance just two months prior to attacks was suspicious deed. It seems that everything was preplanned; on one side Larry Silverstein was benefitted from terrorist attacks while on other side America got reason to start war against Muslims.

Consequently, the event of 9/11 exasperates popular discourse on Islam in the west. American literature – after September 11 incident – has been preoccupied with the discourse of terrorism. It draws binary opposition between Islam and the West; and creates Islam as 'other' through discourse of othering and stereotyping. The novelists of post 9/11 period dealt with the issue of terrorism in their works and tried to associate this horrific event with Muslims. They attempted to stereotype Muslims as potential terrorists and through these stereotypes they constructed discourse about Islam and terrorism.

Western fictional writers, philosophers, and politicians responded the event of 9/11 in their own ways revitalizing old orientalist discourse and relating it with

Islamic radicalism and have further emphasized the inferiority of eastern cultures and people. Significant percentage of mainstream American literary response to 9/11 tragedy is to depict antagonistic approach of the west to Muslims. John Updike's *Terrorist* (2006), Robert Ferrigno *Prayers for the Assassin* (2006), Frederic Beigbeder *On the World* (2006), Don Delillo's *Falling Man* (2007), Lorraine Adam's *Harbor* (2006), Pear Abraham's American Taliban (2010), and Amy Waldman's *The Submission* (2012) are some of the notable fictional representations of the 9/11 event, highlighting different concerns from traumatic repercussion of the event to antagonistic relationships between Muslims and the West.

John Updike's Terrorist is an example of western hegemonic discourse. The most significant characteristic of *Terrorist* is the use of Oriental discourse, describing Islam from the standpoint of Occident and presenting orient as 'other' through stereotyping. Islam is presented as inherently violent, anti-west, backward religion. It is also presented as a threat to western civilizations. The novel is an attempt to depict Muslims as radical Islamic terrorists who fight the west collectively on the commandments emanating from the Quran and the sayings of Prophet Muhammad.

The protagonist of the novel is 18 years old Muslim named Ahmad, who plans to blow up Lincoln Tunnel after the guidance of Imam Masjid Sheikh Rashid. Sheikh Rashid is member of radical Islamic terrorist group planning to launch attacks on NY, for which they brain wash young people like Ahmad. He antagonizes Ahmad against non-believers and convinces him that it is his religious obligation to kill infidels.

Surprisingly, Updike quotes various verses from the Quran expressing God's hatred for infidels. These verses are incorporated out of the context and serve only the purpose of stigmatizing Islam and presenting it a religion that can never be in harmony with other civilizations of the world. The reinforcement of the argument is done through un-contextualized verses from Quran as promulgated by Imam in his lectures to Ahmad, "my teacher at the mosque says that all unbelievers are our enemies…that eventually all unbelievers must be destroyed" (Updike, 2006). This verdict is extracted from Surah An-Nisa of Quran; but incomplete and misinterpreted. This order is not about non-believers but about those hypocrites who partake in hostility against Islamic state, either living in or outside the Islamic state. According to the context of this Surah some people had outwardly embraced Islam but in reality they were not sincere with Islam. These were called hypocrites (Munafikeen) in the Quran. These hypocrites were covertly involved in hostile plots against Islam and the Muslims. But their killing is only accorded when they harm Muslims as Quran says, "If they leave you alone and do not fight against you and offer you peace, the Allah does not permit you to harm them" (Al-Quran, 4-90). But if they do not refrain from fighting you then you are permitted to slay them, "if such people neither leave you alone nor offer you peace nor restrain their hands from hurting you, then seize them and slay them wherever you come upon them" (Al-Quran, 4-91).

It is unjustified and non-scholarly on the part Updike to misquote Quran. He is unsuccessful in contextualizing it properly because of his lack of knowledge about Islam and the Quran. The irony of the situation is that Updike is not an expert in Arabic language nor does he have background knowledge of Islam or Quran; his interpretation of Quran is total unjustified and ridiculous. The purpose might be to give recognition and readership to his narrative, as Safeer Awan condemns Updike's excessive and un-contextualized use of Quranic verses, "it is merely his penchant for making his marketable commodity that he quotes profusely from Quran" (Awan, 2010). Updike himself realizes his inability to understand and interpret Quran in an authentic way because Quran is not easy to comprehend. In an interview with Charles McGrath he is confused with his attempt and confesses, "A lot of the Koran does not speak very eloquently to a Westerner, much of it is either legalistic or opaquely poetic" (McGrath, 2006). He further says, "My conscious was pricked by the notion that I was putting into the book something that I can't pronounce" (McGrath, 2006).

Amy Waldman in her novel *The Submission* (2012) examines the tragedy of 9/11 in terms of its psychological impact on the survivors. Though set in post 9/11 trauma, the novel becomes American political discourse when Waldman depicts anti-Muslim sentiments among Americans. Due to unjustified fear of Islam, Americans do not tolerate existence of Muslims in their society. Muslims face turmoil for their alleged association with 9/11 event. They face anti Muslim discriminatory practices from mainstream Americans. *The submission* is the story of Mohammad Khan, a Muslim architect who wins competition to design memorial for 9/11 victims. Being a Muslim he was not accepted to execute his architect plan. Even the governor hesitates to finalize Khan's nomination because of Americans' intolerance for Muslims.

I'm not sure I want it with the name Mohammad attached to it. It doesn't matter who he is. They'll feel like they've won. All over the Muslim world they'll be jumping up and down at our stupidity, our stupid tolerance (Waldman, 2011).

This shows discriminatory and biased structure of American society. Khan is detained responsible for attacks just because of his ethnicity though he never committed or supported terrorism. Although Claire Burwell initially stands with Khan against American intolerance, could not overcome prevalent biasness, as she states;

Followers of your religion have caused enormous pain…and for all of us, its very difficult to sort out what Islam actually means or encourages. What Muslims believe? A lot of Muslims who would never commit terrorism still support it, for political reasons if not religious ones. Or they pretend it wasn't Muslims at all who did this. So its not unreasonable for me to ask where on that continuum you sit. To learn at the hearing that you've never enounced the attack, I'll be honest, that was upsetting. Why haven't you? (Waldman, 2011).
The aftershocks of the 9/11 also reinforced binary relationship between Americans and the Muslims. American media infuriated public against

Muslims through news and talk show representing Muslims their potential enemies, "we know who the enemy is! He's naked! Radical Islam – naked radical Islam – is the enemy" (Waldman, 2011). Such expressions culminated in suspicious psychology of Americans and encourage hate crimes against Muslims;

Fourteen headscarf pulling across the country; twenty-five muslim self-defense squads patrolling in response. Eleven mosques desecrations in eight states, not counting a protest pig roast organized outside a mosque in Tennessee, but including the dog feces left at the door of a mosque in Massachusetts (Waldman, 2011).

In addition to fictional voices emerged on world's literary canvas, some political personalities also expressed biased comments about Islam and Muslims to contribute to heated atmosphere of islamophobia. In recent years the term islamophobia has been politicized. It is a negative conception of Islam and Muslims created by Euro-American discourse. The discourse of islamophobia is widespread and based on one sided judgment that Islam is an enemy and dangerous for Western civilization. Some western political figures used it as a tool to express their anti-Islamic sentiments and propagated hatred against Islam. For instance Donald Trump, during presidential campaign expressed his hatred against Islam in order to win the confidence of his voters. He affirms that Islam hates us and that Islamic radical terrorism must be destroyed. In his speech titled as *How to make America Safe Again* delivered in Youngstown Ohio on August 15, 2016, Trump illustrates various brutal incidents of terrorism in America and associates them with Islamic radicalism. He urges the need to resist against Islamic proliferation by emphasizing that Islamic radicalism is an evil threat and has to be smashed, "We cannot let this evil continue. Nor can we let the hateful ideology of Radical Islam, its oppression of women, gays, children, and nonbelievers, be allowed to reside or spread within our own countries" (Trump, 2016). Trump creates an idea that Islam encourages oppression of women, gays, and nonbelievers which is based on western prejudiced discourse of Islam.

Moreover he tries to convince his audience by comparing his stance of Islamic terrorism with that of former president Obama. He declares, "Anyone who cannot name our enemy is not fit to lead this country. Anyone who cannot condemn the hatred, oppression and violence of Radical Islam lacks the moral clarity to serve as our president" (Trump, 2016). He further criticizes Hillary Clinton's policy regarding Muslims immigration to the US and states that our administration "will establish a clear principle that will govern all decisions pertaining to immigration: we should only admit into this country those who share our values and respect our people" (Trump, 2016).

Trump continues his anti-Islamic stance even after winning the US 2016 election. He criticizes Obama for his apologetic stance towards Muslim world and not using the word radical Islamic terrorism. He continues demonizing Muslims and defends his immigration scrutiny against Muslim majority countries. In his address at Arab Islamic American Summit (2017) in Saudi

Arabia, he tries to soften his expression of Islam but could do complete impartiality. He refers to Islamic extremism by calling the "barbaric criminals".

This is not a battle between different faiths, different sects, or different civilizations. This is a battle between barbaric criminals who seek to obliterate human life, and decent people of all religions who seek to protect it. This is a battle between good and evil (Narula, 2017).

As a result of hatred against Islam – transmitted through western media discourse – white racist indulge in hate crimes against Muslims and blasphemous attacks i.e. cartoon controversy. Islam has ever been presented controversial in Western discourse, "derogatory or racist caricatures of Islam are to be found in the west" (Said, 1981).

Western media used political cartooning in order to express white racism and hatred against Islam. Cartoon is a form of humorous drawing including caricature that is aimed at arousing boisterous laughter through exaggerating some characteristics of a person. In modern era, political cartooning has become a very effective symbol for propaganda, promotion, and catharsis. Although there are multiple usages of cartooning, "cartoons are likely dynamic caps. They look harmless. But they are extremely dangerous when purposely set off" (Ashfaq and Shami, 2016). It becomes more infuriating when some sensitive issues like religious and sacred personalities are pointed out. The most notable and controversial incident pertaining to political cartoon was the publishing of humorous cartoons of Prophet Muhammad, the most sacred figure in Islam, in Danish newspaper in 2006. Even the more provocative was the fact that several of the cartoons depicted Muhammad as a terrorist with a bomb in his turban. Apparently, the event was regarded as a comic caricature, but it was purposefully used to stir religious sentiments of Muslims. The incident was taken seriously by the Muslims around the world. Outrageous Muslims agitated against all those involved in blasphemous act. The agitation was justified because Islam is a peaceful religion and does not favour blasphemy against any religions of the world, not just Islam. Thus it was unbearable for Muslims who never indulge in any blasphemy; and it led to political agitation and violence around the world. Western media politicized these agitations against Muslims and proclaimed them religious fanaticism against liberty of thought and expression. Through hegemonic stance, the western media publicizes dominant values and ideologies in the society.

To conclude, West emerged as adversary to Islam through the development of language and discourse by depicting and presenting difference between itself and the Islam. Since 9/11, western hegemonic discourse has been preoccupied with the racialization and stigmatization of Islam. It draws binary opposition between Islam and the West; and creates Islam as 'other' through discourse of othering and stereotyping. According to Foucault discourses are not mere social expressions; and serve a particular intend that is the exercise of power. Some discourses in our society are so entrenched that it is difficult to

challenge them. These dominant discourses are embedded in various kinds of institutions and social practices.

Islam is presented as incompatible and threat to western civilization in dominant discourses. This heated debate about Islam has taken place in various prejudiced discourses such as literary, political and media discourses. These discourses attempted to stereotype Muslims as potential terrorists through expressing biased representations of Islam and contributing to heated atmosphere of islamophobia.

REFERENCES:
Al-Qur'an, Surah An-Nisa 4-90, 91.

Ashfaq. A. and Shami, S. (2016). Freedom to Political Cartoons: Charlie Hebdo and Ethical Dilemmas. *Journal of Research Society of Pakistan*, 53:2.

Barsamian, D. (2001). The United States is a Leading Terrorist State. An interview with Noam Chomsky by David Barsamian. *In Monthly Review*, 53:6, 10-20.

Derrida, J. (2002). *Fichus.* Paris: Galilee.

Emery, D. (2016). *Did a WTC Leaseholder buy terrorism insurance just before 9/11?* http://www.snopes.com/fact-check/wtc-terrorism-insurance/. Accessed on February 22, 2019.

Fisk, R. (2001). Think-Tank Wrap-Up. United Press International, September 15, 2001: Public Enemy No. 1, a title he always wanted. *The Independent,* August 22, 1998.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other writings 1972-1977*, edited by: Colin Gordon. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1996). What is Critique? In *What is enlightenment? Eighteenth-century answers and twentieth-century questions*, Edited by: James Schmidt. 382-398. Berkeley: University of California.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge.* London: Penguin.

Hall, S. (1992). *The West and The Rest: Discourse and Power." In Formations of Modernity, Edited by Stuart Hall & Bram Gieben. 275-33.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Huntington, S.P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs,* 72:3.

McGrath, C. (2006). An interview with John Updike: in 'Terrorist', a Cautious Novelist Takes On a New Fear. The New York Times, May 31, 2006. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/31/books/31updi.html/. Accessed on may18, 2019.

Merriam Webster Dictionary, retrieved from http://www.merriam – webster.com/dictionary/discourse. Accessed on April 25, 2019.

Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse:The New Critical Idiom, 2nd ed.* New York: Routledge.

Narula, S.K. (2017). This is a battle between good and evil": Donals Trump's speech to the Muslim world. The Quartz. http://qz.com/988418/donald-

trump-adresses-the-muslim-world-without-referring-to-radical-islamic-terrorism/.

Rashid, A. (2010). *Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil, and Fundamentalism in Central Asia,* 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rose, G. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Interpreting Visual Objects.* London: Sage.

Rosenblum, M. (2001). Bin Laden once thought of as 'freedom fighter' for United States. *Chattanooga Times/Chattanooga Free Press.*

Safeer, M.A. (2010). Global Terror and the Rise of Xenophobia/Islamoiphobia: An Analysis of American Cultural Production since September 11," *Islamic Studies,* 49:3.528.

Said, E. (1981). *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Expert Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Pantheon.

Shadid, W. and Pieter van. Koningsveld. (2002). The Negative image of Islam and Muslims in the West: Causes and Solutions. *Religious freedom and the neutrality of the state: The position of Islam in the European Union.* Leuven: Peeters, 1:3.

Trump, D. (2016). *Donald Trump's Speech on fighting terrorism*. http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-terrorism-speech-227025/. Accessed on April 9, 2019.

Updike, J. (2006). *Terrorist.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Vandita. (2017). John Kerry admits: WTC7 on 9/11 was brought down in a controlled fashion. http://anonhq.com/john-kerry-admits-wtc-7-911-brought-controlled-fashion/. Accessed on March 8, 2019.

Waldman, A. (2011). *The Submission*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Zizek, S. (2002). *Welcome to the Desert of the Real*. New York: Verso.