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Abstract

After 9/11 Attacks, Americans held extremely negative and wrong perceptions of Islam and Muslims because of US media intervention. This descriptive research aims to demonstrate the powerful negative role of US mass media in shaping such perceptions and the implied conspiracy behind them, hoping to give a better understanding of Islam.

This investigation, using a wide range of primary sources, proved that since the events, US mass media have been using well managed rhetorical strategies intentionally to create an effective but pejorative coverage of Islam and Muslims. This coverage had a great impact on the American views and their attitudes towards Muslims.

The dominant negative representation, compared to the rare positive portrayals, proved to be under several external influences, while the purpose was mainly to serve political agendas of American policy.

A gradual increase in animosity thereafter was due to a shift away from this framing, especially by right-leaning talking heads. In 2006 the framing of right-leaning media shifted again, toward nativism. This analysis illustrates the influence of media framing and suggests opinion-makers should choose their frames with care.

This research aims to indicate to the deep relationship between the negative coverage of Islam and the changing of American public opinion, and also it gives explanation about the media and its effects and impacts on American public opinions about Islam.

This research gives more details about the discrimination that American-Muslims are facing, at work, at home and at public places, and also record the violations against American –Muslims. The ramifications of the attacks of September 11, 2001 are felt
throughout the United States. However, no minority community is as deeply affected as the American-Muslim minority. Since the attacks on the World Trade Center, Muslims residing in the United States have experienced violations of economic and political liberties, as well as ongoing social discrimination. Media stereotypes and government legislation continually exacerbate these human rights abuses and entrench institutional, social, and economic discrimination deeper in American society.
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Chapter One

1. BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH

1.1 Introduction

Since the event of September 11, 2001, Muslims in the United States of America (USA) have been under siege, while at least 700,000 Muslim have been interviewed by law enforcement. Not only Muslims in America have been under siege, but also Muslims in many countries around the world have been living in the same situation.

United States media played an important role by projecting a bad image about Islam; they created an environment of anti-Muslim sentiment similar to American attitudes toward Japanese–American during World War II. U.S. media created their own war against Islam; they predicted Muslims as criminals and terrorists. Many questions still need answers; the first question is what the root of Islam phobia is? The second is: what is the role of US media in this incitement against Islam? The last one is what is the role of US media in creating the public opinion towards Islam?

This research aims to expose the American media policy toward Muslims inside America and to record violations against them. Also to gather more information about American public opinion.

This research needs both historical and content analysis discourse.

The present thesis is divided into five chapters. The first chapter is a background of research (research question, hypothesis, problem of research, boundaries, limitation, justification of research ……etc) and related literature.

The second chapter deals with theories of democracy and mass communication.

The third chapter will give a background of Islam phobia (definition the concept, a brief history of this concept and examples about Islam phobia)
The fourth chapter explains the role of US. Media in the war against Islam inside America and the researcher gives examples to explicate that.

The fifth chapter role measures American public opinion post 9\11 and gives more details about this important topic

1.1.1. Justification of research

1) There is lack of researches about this important topic (researcher point of view)
2) Islamophobia is still a misunderstood concept, and one of the most important kinds of discrimination and racist.
3) Violations of Muslims rights in America and the increasing of hate-crimes against Muslims.

1.1.2. Significance of research:

4) It is very important to political science students, its important lays on understanding this concept.
5) This research will enable us to understand the root of Islam phobia.
6) This research will enable us to gather information about US. media and expose its role in reflecting a negative image about Islam.
7) This research will enable us to collect information about American public opinion and their attitudes toward Islam.

1.1.3. Objectives of research

8) This research aims to explore the historical roots of Islam phobia, its stages and its definitions from different point of views.
9) This research aims to study U.s media and to explain the way of these organizations in enhancing Islam phobia, and also to study the way Islam was covered after 9/11.
The research aims to measure American public opinion through international polls and surveys in order to record the effects of news media on their opinions, perceptions and attitudes toward Muslims.

1.1.4. Problem of research

Since the events of September, 11 everything has changed, Us. Government created its own war and invaded Afghanistan and Iraq, many innocents people were killed by using different kinds of weapons, but inside America there was a different war, it’s not a military war, it’s the war of words, ideas, beliefs and culture.

Since those events, American media has created its own enemy, which is Islam and its followers.

Us. Media reflected a negative image about Islam and entered into the public's mind and planted fear and hatred of Islam and Muslims.

A dangerous curve has occurred, the interior feeling of fears dramatically changed into anger, assaults, threats and destruction of worship places (masjed)

Due to these actions, hate-crime has increased and Muslims became unsafe neither at homes nor at works and discrimination against them surfaced.

Two questions still need answers: what caused this dangerous changing of American public opinions? and what is the role of Us. Media in promoting Islam phobia?

1.1.5. Hypothesis of research:

✓ Whenever the negative news about Islam increases, fear of slam will increase.

✓ Whenever fear of Islam increases, negative attitudes toward Muslims will increase.

1.1.6. Research questions

1) What does Islamophobia concept mean?

2) What is the history root of this concept?

3) What are the impacts of the events 9/11 on Muslims inside America?
4) How was the media coverage of Muslims post 9/11 comparing with the coverage before 9/11?

5) How was the media coverage of Islam after the first and 10th anniversary?

6) What is the influence of U.S media on public opinion?

7) How were the Americans' attitudes toward Muslims and their perceptions of Islam post9/11?

8) What is the relationship between the increasing of negative news about Muslims and the increasing of hate-crimes against them?

1.1.7. Methodology of research:
This research will set on both historical and content analysis methods. The research will go through history to gather information about Islam phobia and discuss this concept and its historical stages. It will deal with US. Media and discus its role in enhancing Islam phobia and also the researcher will discuss the U.s media coverage of Muslims at particular periods(after six months, after the 1st anniversary, after the 10th anniversary) then the researcher will analyze articles from NYT. Finally The research will give more details about the influence of mass media on American public opinions and collect more information about the attitudes of American people toward Islam post 9/11.

1.1.8. Boundaries of research:

Place:

✓ Inside the United States of America
✓ Time frame:
   ✓ Related to America (2001-2010)
   ✓ The first period (2001) is related to the events of September (post 9/11)
   ✓ The second period (2010) is related to the time of building a mosque on the ground zero yard
1.2 Related literature

In this part, the researcher will utilize and explain the books used in this research.

- The Islam phobia Industry How the Right Manufactures Fear of Muslims

Nathan Lean, September 2012

The Islam phobia Industry reflects the rising tide of anti-Muslim feeling sweeping through the United States and Europe.

Lean takes us inside the minds of the manufacturers of Islam phobia – a highly-organized enterprise of conservative bloggers, right-wing talk show hosts, evangelical religious leaders, and politicians, united in their quest to exhume the ghosts of September 11th and convince their compatriots that Islam is the enemy. Lean uncovers their scare tactics, reveals their motives, and exposes the ideologies that drive their propaganda machine. Situating Islam phobia within a long history of national and international phobias, The Islam phobia Industry unravels the narrative of fear that has long dominated discussions about Muslims and Islam.

“This concise, accessible and illuminating book meets one of the most urgent needs of our time. Nathan Lean has provided us with a compelling counter-narrative that reveals the stakes and highly organized networks of those who preach the virulent "Nathan Lean skillfully narrates an alternative history of the contemporary relationship between the Muslim world and the West, reminding his readers of the effects of Islam phobia in a moving and powerful way. This book is absolutely indispensable for building the more positive and shared future that still alludes us a decade into the War on Terror.

"Islam phobia is not only about ignorance and fear. Some people purposefully nurture it and use it as a political strategy.
In response to the events of 9/11, the Bush administration launched a “war on terror” ushering in an era of anti-Muslim racism, or Islam phobia. However, 9/11 did not create Islam phobia, an ideology which has become the handmaiden of imperialism. This book examines the historic relationship between Islam phobia and the agenda of empire-building.

This is a timely and crucial book. From historical roots to ideological causes, this important book sets out to debunk Orient list myths in particular that historical encounters between Islam and the West can be understood through clash of civilizations framework.

Islam phobia and the Politics of Empire will be indispensable to anyone wanting to understand one of the most persistent forms of racism in the US and Europe.

Kumar demonstrates that Islam phobic myths did not arise spontaneously after the end of the Cold War but are rooted in centuries of conquest and colonialism, from the Crusades to the 'War on Terror'. Arguing with precision and clarity, she shows how these myths have been systematically circulated by liberals as much as conservatives, and usefully lays bare the complex ways in which the US foreign.

This book is useful to this research in order to understand the history of Islam phobia.

**SLAMOPHOBIA:**

**The Ideological Campaign Against Muslims**

**By Stephen Sheehi**

Islam phobia: The Ideological Campaign Against Muslims examines the rise of anti-Muslim and anti-Arab sentiments in the West following the end of the Cold War through GW Bush’s War on Terror to the Age of Obama. Using “Operation Desert Storm” as a watershed moment, Stephen Sheehi examine the increased mainstreaming of Muslim-
bating rhetoric and explicitly racist legislation, police surveillance, witch-trials and
discriminatory policies towards Muslims in North America and abroad.
The book focuses on the various genres and modalities of Islam phobia from the works of
rogue academics to the commentary by mainstream journalists, to campaigns by political
hacks and special interest groups.
If the assertions of media pundits and rogue academics became the basis for White House
foreign policy Sheehi, therefore, concludes that Muslim and Arab-hating emanate from all
corners of the American political and cultural spectrum, serving poignant ideological
functions in the age of economic, cultural and political globalization.
This book considers a good reference for any study about Islam phobia, it will give the
researcher important information about this topic.


Orientalism can refer to several things. There is the orient list school of art which depicted
“oriental,” that is Arab, Persian, Indian, and various East Asian cultures, from a
romanticized, often sexualized, view point. Renowned scholar Edward Said's
“Orientalism” was a watershed book on the topic of western racism toward Arabs and
Muslims that first clearly defined the term in a specific way. Said’s book-length
description of the phenomenon extended well beyond western racism toward Arabs and
Muslims, however. He maintained that part of the bias existed in not differentiating
between different types of “Orientals,” and lumping all manner of East Asians, South
Asians, Middle Easterners and North Africans together under the rubric of oriental.
Said argued that there was a specific group of orient lists within the British Empire who
had specific goals. The orient lists’ method was to study the manners and customs of the
“oriental” world with the ultimate goal of best coping with the natives who were
indigenous to the British Empire’s colonized lands.
Islam phobia Chris Allen, University of Birmingham, UK

Despite numerous sources suggesting that Islam phobia is becoming both increasingly prevalent and societal acceptable in the contemporary world, there remains a lack of textual sources that consider either the phenomenon itself, or its manifestations and consequences. There is no authoritative text that attempts to understand or contextualize what might be seen to be one of the most dangerous prejudices in the contemporary climate.

Chris Allen begins by looking at ways of defining and understanding Islam phobia. He traces its historical evolution to the present day, considering the impact of recent events and their aftermath especially in the wake of the events of September 11, before trying to understand and comprehend a wider conception of the phenomenon. A series of investigations thematically consider the role of the media, the contemporary positioning of Muslims throughout the world, and whether Islam phobia can be seen to be a continuum of historical anti-Muslimism or anti-Islamism, or whether Islam phobia is an entirely modern concept. The issue of Islam phobia is considered from the perspective of the local, regional, and global.

This book is both academically and socially relevant and necessary. His book is both timely and relevant and provides the depth of enquiry and investigation needed to deal with a highly contested phenomenon. This timely and accessible book rests upon many years of careful research by a scholar whose early career has been devoted to understanding and critically evaluating the complex notion of Islam phobia. It will become a standard work of reference,

For the general public in America and Europe today, Islam is ‘news’ of a particularly unpleasant sort, this is the conclusion of Covering Islam by Edward Said, who is, no exaggeration, one of the greatest thinkers and scholars of the 20th century. His point is that negative images of Islam continue to be very much more prevalent than any other, and that such images correspond not to what Islam ‘is’.

In one of his bestselling books, the writer argues that in many publications, periodicals, articles and media statements Muslims are portrayed as living in a ‘make-believe’ world, that the family is repressive, that most leaders are psychopathological and that the societies are immature

The 335-page book is replete with cases proving Mr. Said’s point.
Chapter Two

2. The theoretical conceptual framework

2.1.1 Introduction

"To explicate the key features of any democratic theory, it is useful to look at different aspects of democracy and the foundations the theory is based on. Democracy as a political system contains two different aspects which it is important to differentiate. First, democracy is an institutional arrangement for political decision-making, the form of democracy. Secondly, democracy refers to practice within the given form and is dependent on values, attitudes and activities of people. Two countries may have similar democratic institutions, but the other one may still be considered more democratic than the other. (Graziano, 1993).

Democratic theories are also based on certain pre-assumptions. In this sense it is important to differentiate democratic ideology, assumptions on conditions for democracy and democratic theory proper. Democracy itself cannot be understood without a theory, i.e., an analysis of how democracy works. (Graziano, 1993).

Democratic theory today is very much an American endeavor. It has been mainly Americans who have been eager to justify democracy theoretically as well as to evaluate its success in other countries. To say this does neither diminishes the European heritage of democratic thinking, nor does it deny that there are European scholars who write about democracy. However, the discussion is framed in many instances by Americans. "A good example is David Held's much acclaimed treatise on Models of Democracy (1987).

"Beginning with classical democracy in Athens and after rampaging through centuries of development of democratic theory in Europe, Held finally focuses on contemporary theories of democracy, which are mainly American: competitive elitist democracy, pluralism, neopluralism, legal democracy and participatory democracy. (Graziano, 1993).
"Of course, one can argue that many of these theories are the product of European scholarship and political activity. Even Held looks at Max Weber as a generator of competitive elitism and takes Joseph Schumpeter as its main representative (Graziano, 1993).

In addition, he discusses mainly the works of Carole Pateman, Nicos Poulantzas and C.B. Macpherson when dealing with theories of participatory democracy. But there is a difference. Many of these European thinkers have been critics of democracy or at least existing Western democracy. (Graziano, 1993).

And although, for instance, Weber was a monumental thinker, he was more interested in power than in democracy. Many of these European theorists have also been influenced by Americans. Take, for example, Joseph Schumpeter, who at the time his "Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy" (1942) was published, was already an American citizen, professor at Harvard University and, as Theodore Lowi has noted, "the foundations (of the book, E.B.) were laid almost entirely by ordinary American political scientists. (Graziano, 1993).

A preoccupation of Americans with democratic theory is an interesting question in itself. It is surely based on the heritage of America as the first new nation and on the idea of Manifest Destiny.

So much so that pluralism has often been discussed as it would be purely an American phenomenon, because no other country has so thoroughly adapted pluralist theory. (Graziano, 1993).

Tradition theory of democracy: The traditional theory of democracy promotes majority rules without violating minority rights, maintaining the willingness to comprise and recognizing the worth and dignity of all people.

Under the traditional theory, everyone has the right to participate in government.
In a democracy, government is only one thread in the social fabric of many and varied public and private institutions, legal forums, political parties, organizations, and associations. This diversity is called pluralism, Most democratic societies have thousands of private organizations, some local, some national. (Samuel, 1997)

"In an authoritarian society, virtually all such organizations would be controlled, licensed, watched, or otherwise accountable to the government. In a democracy, the powers of the government are, by law, clearly defined and sharply limited. As a result, private organizations are largely free of government control. (John, 1998)

2.1.2 The Pluralist Theory:

Politics is about interests. Citizens have different values, attitudes and opinions and somehow these differences must live together. In a sense, democracy is a difficult form of political organization, because it must produce legitimate outcomes out of this plurality of interests. This is also a basic meaning of pluralism, because "pluralism signals a theorized preference for multiplicity over unicity, and for diversity over uniformity" (Gregor, 1995).

It is no wonder that many political scientists after the Second World War defined pluralism as the process of group conflict and compromise. (John, 1995)

The Pluralist Theory involves a stress on immaterial power. Power can be in the form of many ideals such as political, religious, skilled or even persuasive power. This power is to be distributed to all members of the social contract, nobody is to have more or less say in the institution than any other. The Pluralist Theory goes even farther to suggest that no one controls the social contract as everyone has such an equal state in it. While some theories argue as to how a system should be run and who should be the head of said system, the Pluralist Theory challenges by arguing there be any system, let alone a head of a system, at all. Potential Power is also a recurring theme between the two theories, and Potential
Power, like abilities of the people, shall always outweigh the actual Present Power, such as Executive Rulers or rights of a central power. (John, 1995)

Pluralism has been advanced in many forms, but one of the basic themes has been the problematic relation between interests of individuals and interests of society in democracy and how this relation affects the proper functioning of the political system.

Pluralism in different versions runs through American political thought and science. Reasons for this may be found on the nature of American state and political system, in which the Federal government has always been weak, while states and cities have had a more important role for citizens. (McLennan, 1995)

The Hyper pluralism theory: is one of the great weaknesses of pluralism. It happens when the pluralistic society feels as if it doesn't give the people enough power and so they rise up against the government. It results in a complete crippling of government as the government bends to the will of all the interest groups.

It suggests that people who share interests form group to advance their causes and some groups wield too much power and influence on the government. (McLennan, 1995)

For example, when a group does not like a policy passed by congress, it can take its cause to court. Several important court decisions have been reached in civil rights and environmental cases thanks to the efforts of strong special interest groups.

However hyper pluralists argue that taking cases to court can undermine the political system by pitting the judicial process against the legislative process. (McLennan, 1995)

2.1.3 The Elite Theory of Democracy:

Maintains that the majority of political power and influence is held by a small number of individuals, groups and industries. People who support this theory argue that government policies disproportionately favor the elite over everyone else.
Elitism is a stress on material power. Superiority in the elites is the premise for the Elitist Theory.

According to Elitists, the common people are common due to a lack of superiority. Elitism recognizes the need for people to be governed, and decides that elitists should rule because of all the material power around, they have the most, and therefore have the most to be lost in the event of an unsuccessful social contract. (Parry, 1969)

Elitism has no agreed meaning inside or outside social science. One meaning, of course, is belief in or the practice of rule by elites, which implies focusing on them as the key political and social actors. A more diffuse and normatively colored meaning is consciousness of or pride in belonging to a highly selective or favored group. As an adjective, ‘elitist’ is routinely used by media commentators and politicians to denigrate anyone who questions egalitarian outcomes and values, who agrees with Weber that effective politics rest on talent (charisma) and professionalism, or who claims, as Pareto did, that people differ innately in ruling and non-ruling abilities and talents. (William, 1994)

The multiple meanings of elitism and elitist inhibit a usage tied directly to the elite perspective. Consistent with the perspective’s recognition of elites as inevitable and central elements of complex modern societies, elitism means identifying and promoting conditions that enhance elite effectiveness.

2.2 Theories of Mass Media

2.2.1 Introduction

The mass media are all pervasive but not particularly persuasive the statement summarizes the most significant of the currently accepted social facts and research findings about the mass media in America. Most significant, that is, until the emergence of the agenda-setting hypothesis. (William, 1994)
Though accepting the 'pervasive but not persuasive’ statement as a truism of mass communication in a modern democratic society, researchers of agenda-setting insist that the media are nevertheless very persuasive in their unique way.

But not as the long-discredited hypodermic-needle theory of media effects had warned. (Everett, 1973) in shaping and manipulating people’s public attitudes - their likes and dislikes, pros and cons regarding political, economic and social matters. Instead, the media are persuasive in focusing public attention on specific events, issues, and persons and in determining the importance people attach to public matters. (Everett, 1973)

People are aware or not aware, pay attention to or neglect, play up or downgrade specific features of the public scene. People tend to include or exclude from their cognitions what the media include or exclude from their content. People also tend to assign an importance to what they include that closely resembles the emphasis given to events, issues, and persons by the mass media.

2.2.1 Agenda theory

Agenda setting theory is basically a theory of strong media effects which suggests that with the passage of time the media agenda becomes the public agenda.

The power of the news media to set a nation’s agenda, to focus public attention on a few key public issues, is an immense and well-documented influence.

Newspapers provide a host of cues about the salience of the topics in the daily news – lead story on page one. (Maxwell, 2003)

The news media can set the agenda for the public’s attention to that small group of issues around which public opinion forms. (Maxwell, 2003)

Agenda Setting considers one of the most important media theories of the present times. This theory took its name from the idea that the mass media have the ability to carry the
salience of items on their news agendas and then transfer it to the public agenda. (Saqib,2008)

We are living in a global village where the mass media are an important source of information about what is happening in the world. In fact, the news media organizations seem more interested in some events than in others.

This is widely understood and accepted that the material presented by the media organizations is selective.

That selectivity is an outcome of its limited capacity to provide total surveillance. Some factors are imposed on the people who do the gate-keeping (reporters and editors), and some financial limitations and economic pressures are also placed on the media because they must survive as profit making commercial organizations.

These factors play a crucial role to decide which stories to select, follow up, emphasize, interpret and manipulate in particular and desired ways. (Saqib,2008)

According to the agenda-setting theory, the news media organizations are paying attention to some issues and ignoring some others, the mass media will have a great effect on public opinion. People will be disposed to know about those issues and things, which are highlighted by the mass media and they espouse the order of priority assigned to different issues.

This theory deals with learning and not with attitude or opinion change. Some of the empirical studies of mass communication had assured that the most expected effects to occur would be on matters of information. Usually, people learn what the issues are and how these are ordered in importance in the media agenda. (Saqib,2008)

"News media organizations are not just passive transmitters of information, repeating the words of official sources or conveying exactly the events in a way as they happened."
Through their daily selection and presentation of the news, editors and reporters focus attention of the public's perceptions about the most important issues of the day.

Hence, our attention is further focused and our pictures of the world are shaped and reproduced by the way journalists frame their news stories. (Saqib, 2008)

It was Lippmann's theory that the mass media create our pictures of the world. However, he understood that the pictures provided by the media were often incomplete and unclear. We can see only reflections of reality (not reality itself) in the news media. Yet, those reflections provide the basis for our pictures. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

After a long period of four decades, Bernard Cohen presented his idea in 1963 by saying: "Press may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling readers what to think about. (Saqib Riaz, 2008)

The idea that the news media influence the “pictures in our heads” was put to an empirical test in 1972.

Two researchers Maxwell McCombs & Donald Shaw from the University of North Carolina thought whether the topics selected by the news media to represent the world outside limited the kinds of events that people used to interpret the world. They also thought whether the public's perception of reality relied on the topics highlighted by the news media or not. (Saqib Riaz, 2008)

\[2.2.2.1 \text{Consequences of Agenda-Setting}\]

Attitudes and behavior are usually governed by cognitions – what a person knows, thinks, believes. Hence, the agenda-setting function of the mass media implies a potentially massive influence whose full dimensions and consequences have yet to be investigated and appreciated. (Kiousis, 2000)

To begin at the beginning, the salience of objects in the mass media is linked to the formation of opinions by the audience. With the increasing salience of public figures in the
news, for example, more people move away from a neutral position and form an opinion about these person.

An examination of US presidential candidates in all five elections between 1980 and 1996 found exceedingly strong correlations between the pattern of media emphasis, which varied widely across these elections, and the number of citizens who expressed ambivalent opinions about the candidates by checking the mid-point of various rating scales. (Kiousis, 2000)

Analogous links have been found between issue salience and people’s attitudes. In the German state of Baden-Wurttemberg, the personal salience of two major issues, the reunification of East and West Germany and East German migrants, was strongly linked to both the strength and direction of personal opinions. (Patrick & Michael, 2000).

2.2.3 Framing theory:

Framing is a concept which is commonly used to understand the media effects. It is regarded as the extension of agenda setting theory which prioritize an issue and makes the audience think about its effects.

The framing is based on the idea of how media base an event or an issue within a particular field of meaning which plays an important role in people’s decision making procedure.

Framing is used to represent the communication aspect which leads to the people’s preference by consenting one meaning to another. Framing stimulates the decision making process by highlighting particular aspects by eliminating the others. For e.g. the newspaper frames the news within a particular viewpoint. This can change the perception of the issue among the readers.

Framing is an important aspect where an issue can be highlighted to make sense of the events.
It can regulate the audience’s perception and also the acceptance of a particular meaning. As media plays an important role in the people’s perceptions, the negative framing can create a huge impact upon the people. For e.g. the sensitive issues that are coming in the media have been framed diplomatically by not supporting any principles and thus the people can make their own decisions.

But a biased media can frame an issue negatively and can influence the mass. Intuition and careful interpretation of the audience are inevitable when it comes to framing. Media is a powerful tool and so the content must be framed with values as it influences and controls the audience. (Scheufele, 1993)

The journalists select the news stories influenced by many factors such as news values, editorial policies, and interaction with the creamy layer of the society. These factors build the frame. With the interaction between the media and the preconceptions of the people, Framing plays an important role in how the particular issue is been presented before the people and how they perceive it. (Patrick &Michael, 2000)

Framing can be used for effective communication in all fields of media and other organizations. It is mainly applied in understanding media effects. Effective communication among a mass can be done with well-organized framing of meanings and issues. Politicians can frame their vision effectively so that the public can understand its significance and accept it.

The concept of framing is related to the agenda-setting tradition but expands the research by focusing on the essence of the issues at hand rather than on a particular topic. The basis of framing theory is that the media focuses attention on certain events and then places them within a field of meaning. Framing is an important topic since it can have a big influence and therefore the concept of framing expanded to organizations as well.
In essence, The theory was first put forth by Goff man, under the title of Frame Analysis. He put forth that people interpret what is going on around their world through their primary framework. This framework is regarded as primary as it is taken for granted by the user. Its usefulness as a framework does not depend on other frameworks. (Goffman , 1974 )

Goff man states that there are two distinctions within primary frameworks: natural + social. Both play the role of helping individuals interpret data. So that their experiences can be understood in a wider social context. The difference between the two is functional. (Goffman, 1974 )

Natural frameworks identify events as physical occurrences taking natural quote literally and not attributing any social forces to the causation of events.

Framing is in many ways tied very closely to Agenda Setting theory. Both focus on how media draws the public’s eye to specific topics – in this way they set the agenda. But Framing takes this a step further in the way in which the news is presented creates a frame for that information.

This is usually a conscious choice by journalists – in this case a frame refers to the way media as gatekeepers organize and present the ideas, events, and topics they cover. (Scheufele, 1993 )

Framing is the way a communication source defines and constructs a any piece of communicated information. Framing is an unavoidable part of human communication – we all bring our own frames to our communications.
Chapter Three

3. Islamophobia background

3.1 Introduction

Every human being possesses dignity which is protected by national legislation and universal norms of the fundamental human rights encompassing all nations, ethnic groups and religions. With regards to the human rights, an emphasis is placed on joint values and principles rather than differences. Every individual or community is entitled to the protection from discrimination, abuse or violence. (Peter Gottschalk & Gabriel Greenberg, 2008).

Elimination of all forms of discrimination, racism or intolerance is a significant achievement and a requirement of the contemporary democratic society.

Islam phobia—irrational fear against the Islamic religion—involves prejudice toward Muslims, and have led to hate attacks across the world.

United States especially has seen a nationwide spread of the term in the wake of 9.11. Even a decade later, notion still persists. there are various factors behind the prevalence of Islam phobia but when one considers the significant rise after the attacks in the attention paid to the Islamic world on newspapers, televisions, and Internet alike, one can assume that the media plays a large role in propagating Islam phobia within the country. (Peter Gottschalk & Gabriel Greenberg, 2008).

Fear and hatred of Muslims is as old as Islam itself, the term “Islam phobia” is a relatively recent neologism that is used to “draw attention to a normalized prejudice and unjustified discrimination against Muslims. (Étienne Dinet, 1922 )

The term has been popularized because of the resurgence in the post-Cold War and post-9/11 United States of the phenomenon it describes.
Islam phobia includes discrimination against Muslims in employment practices, the provision of health care and education; exclusion of Muslims from government, politics, and employment (including management and positions of responsibility); violence toward Muslims including physical assaults, verbal abuse and vandalizing of property; and prejudice against Muslims in the media and in “everyday conversation.

Although the term “Islam phobia” has gained a considerable degree of acceptance, the notion that an unjustified fear of Muslims exists is not without controversy, as will be seen in the subsequent discussion of closed-views of Islam. (Peter Gottschalk & Gabriel Greenberg, 2008).

Regardless of one’s feelings toward Islam, Muslims, and the term Islam phobia itself, anti-Muslim sentiment is an important issue for Americans to address, for reasons outlined by professor of religion Peter Gottschalk and his former student Gabriel Greenberg in Islam phobia: Making Muslims the New Enemy. First, the American Muslim population often is increasingly.

"The target of hate crimes and discrimination;" this violation of the civil rights of American citizens must be addressed. Second, the lack of differentiation between moderate and extremist Muslims is symptomatic of a broader danger not only to Muslims, but also to American society in general. Painting Muslims in broad strokes leaves Americans less equipped to identify and counter the actual threats which do exist". (Étienne Dinet, , 1922 pp: 6 )

Third, foreign Muslim populations feel increasingly threatened by American foreign policy and expanding global interests. Although the vast majority of these Muslims would not retaliate against civilians via violent means, a small number would justify doing so. Thus, a fourth reason why Americans need to address anti-Muslim sentiment is that Americans must develop a more nuanced understanding of Islam.
Accurately understanding Islam and the Muslim world will enable Americans to identify and react to real threats appropriately and not waste time and energy on scapegoating.

Lastly, Islam phobia is a self fulfilling prophecy and vicious cycle - it produces backlash by Muslims, which in turn makes Americans more Islam phobic. (Peter Gottschalk & Gabriel Greenberg, 2008).

3.2 The definition of Islamophobia

There are many definitions of the term Islam phobia, so many authors and researchers tried to define this term in order to end and solve this problem.

Let's first begin with Oxford definition of Islam phobia, the Oxford dictionary defined Islam phobia as "hatred or fear of Islam. (Oxford English Dictionary, 1980)

This short definition has two terms, hatred or fear, so it's very clear that this definition is incomplete and irrational because the two terms in the definition are related to each other, in another words fear causes hatred.

The UN special reporter defined Islam phobia as:

"A baseless hostility and fear vis-a-vis Islam, and as a result, a fear of an aversion towards all Muslims or the majority of them. Islam phobia also refers to the practical consequences of this hostility in terms of discrimination, prejudices and unequal treatment of which Muslims (individuals and communities) are victims and their exclusion from major political and social spheres.

The term was invented in response to a new reality: the increasing discrimination against Muslims which has manifested itself in recent years.

Dalal, Al-shammari" defined Islam phobia as:

"Islam phobia means acts of fear or hostility towards followers of Islamic religion. This unjustified fear has contributed immensely of Muslims across the global. It is a base point
for seclusion of Muslims in the political arena and affiliate social class in the society. (Dalal alshammari, 2013 PP: 15)

The Runnymede trust in its seminal report 'Islam phobia: a challenge for us all' defined Islam phobia as:

"Islam phobia is the shorthand way of referring to dread or hatred of Islam - and, therefore to fear or dislike of all or most Muslims. (UN Human Rights Council, Web)"

All the different definitions above "from more than one point of view" agreed that Islam phobia is irrational fears, hatred and hostility toward Islam and its followers.

Muslim phobia considers an act against liberty, freedom and it threatens the civil and social life in America.

Another definition of Islam phobia contained in the OSI report on ‘Muslims in Europe – A report on 11 EU Cities:

'Islam phobia - Irrational hostility, fear and hatred of Islam, Muslims and Islamic culture, and active discrimination towards this group as individuals or collectively. (Open Society Institute report . 2010, pp: 18)"

The different and wrongful interpretation of the real meaning of Islam and its principles or rules, that the American society has portrayed. (Islam phobia and Americanism book experts, 2013)

This wrongful interpretation was due to the negative coverage of American media about Islam and its followers.

The Runnymede trust in its seminal report 'Islam phobia: a challenge for us all' defined Islam phobia as a cluster concept, stemming from attitudes towards the religion and faith community that corresponded to open or closed views of Islam.

According to the RT report, Islam phobia was symptomatic of closed views of Islam.
The longhand description of Islam phobia by the Runnymede commission is represented in the table below, expanding on the different frames used to embody the closed or open views of Islam. (Runnymede trust, 1997, pp:1)

**Table 1. From Islam phobia:**

*a challenge for us all*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinctions</th>
<th>Closed views of Islam</th>
<th>Open views of Islam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monolithic \ diverse</td>
<td>Islam seen as a single monolithic bloc, static and unresponsive to new realities</td>
<td>Islam seen as diverse and progressive with internal differences debates and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate \ interacting</td>
<td>Islam seen as separate and other (a) not having any aims or values in common with other cultures (b) not affected by them (c) not influencing them</td>
<td>Islam seen as interdependent with other faiths and cultures (a) having certain shared values and aims (b) affected by them (c) enriching them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior \ different</td>
<td>Islam seen as inferior to the west – barbaric, irrational, primitive, sexist</td>
<td>Islam seen as distinctively different, but not deficient, and as equally worthy of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy \ partner</td>
<td>Islam seen as violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, engaged in a clash of civilizations.</td>
<td>Islam seen as an actual or potential partner in joint cooperative enterprises and in the solution of shared problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulated / sincere</td>
<td>Islam seen as a political ideology, used for political or military advantage,</td>
<td>Islam seen as a genuine religious faith, practiced sincerely by its adherents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of the west:</td>
<td>Criticisms made by Islam of the west rejected out of hand</td>
<td>Criticisms of the west and other cultures are considered and debated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected / considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination:</td>
<td>Hostility towards Islam used to justify discriminatory practices towards Muslims and exclusion of Muslims from mainstream society</td>
<td>Debates and disagreements with Islam do not diminish efforts to combat discrimination and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defended / criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam phobia seen as:</td>
<td>Anti – Muslims hostility accepted as natural and normal</td>
<td>Critical views of Islam are themselves subjected to critique lest they be inaccurate and unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural / problematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Islam phobia has in recent years been refined to more succinctly capture this anti-Muslim hostility with terms such as ‘anti-Muslim prejudice’ and ‘anti-Muslim racism’.

Delineating the rationale employed by those that evince hostile attitudes towards Muslims, Malik prefers the term ‘anti-Muslim prejudice’ to Islam phobia rejecting the pathos and seeming irrationality of the use of a ‘phobia’ to describe hostility towards Muslims in favor of a calculated prejudiced orientation. ‘Anti-Muslim racism’ transposes religion and belief onto old fashioned racism to distinguish the new form of a religiously-specific manifestation of hate which at times conflates race and religion (e.g. verbal assaults where
the target is visibly Muslim but where the slur used is racist) and at others evinces a clear hostility to Muslims (where the hate crime is religiously motivated),
while at the same time coheres with the traditional challenges posed to social cohesion by discriminatory attitudes towards a section of society.(GLA report, 2007)
The terms Muslim phobia and anti-Muslimism have also been coined to depart from a misplaced focus on religion (Islam) as the basis of hostility to Muslims.

Muslim phobia or anti-Muslimism both fail to take adequate account of the meta-narrative that posits Islam as a creed that is incompatible with values and way of life.

While noting that the term does divest its bearers of a rational bias to their hostility, the use of Islam phobia is significant precisely for its encapsulating the irrationality that often underlies such hostility and for its squarely placing Islam at the centre of such discriminatory attitudes.

recognized for some time with the increase in volume of academic research citing the counter-productive nature of casting Muslims as "suspect communities". (Kundnani Arun, 2009).

This problematisation of Muslims and the conflation of all Muslims with the violent few reinforces the duality of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ that permeates the nationalist cause. It also neglects the wider net of violent extremisms, excluding from analysis and policy action the threat posed to security and community cohesion by far right extremists. (Anna, 2009).

The Racial and Religious Hatred Act establishes different criteria for racial and religious incitement restricting the latter to acts that intended to stir up religious hatred.

3.3. A Short History of the Word Islam phobia

Islam phobia word passed through many historical stages, the first Islamophic action can be identified in the 7th century, during the rule of Islam in the West.
Many Muslims emphasized that anti-Islamic feelings toward Muslims in the United States are inherited from Europeans.

What is known from the history and pre-history is that people clinging on the shores of the Mediterranean remained friendly toward each other including the Greeks, Romans, French, and even the British; they have often collided with the Persian, Arabs, and the Turks living along this strategic sea.

Deepak Kumar said "The first known use in print of the French word Islamophobie appears to have been in a book entitled La politique musulmane dans l’Afrique Occidentale Française by Alain Quellien, published in Paris in 1910. (Deepa Kumar, 2012, pp: 22)

The context was a criticism of the ways in which French colonial administrators viewed the cultures of the countries now known as Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal and the word “islamophobia” in English in 1924. (Deepa Kumar, 2012)

Bravo Lopez points out that the concept of “Islamophobia” is created at the end of the First World War by Étienne Dinet and Sliman Ben Ibrahim.

In their La Vie de Mohammed, Prophète d’Allah (1918) the authors describe by “islamophobie” official French politics towards Muslim soldiers who are, in the depiction of the authors, inappropriately treated by the nation for their sacrifice in the name of the fatherland.

Dinet and Ibrahim repeated the concept during the following 20 years in several publications relating it also to the official French politics towards Algeria. Although there is an early translation of the authors Mohammed-biography into English language, the concept “Islam phobia” had not been established in a scientific discourse yet.(Bravo Lopez, & Allen Christopher, 2010)
Louise Gustvae Binger, a director at the French colonial office, wrote against misrepresentations of Islam in his book Le péril de l’Islam, published in 1906. He argued that Europeans should not see Islam as the obstacle to their expansion in the Middle East and Africa. There were some references to Islam phobia in the 1960s and 1980s, but these were some passing references rather than studies aiming to explicate and disseminate the concept.

The French word Islamophobie was registered in print in the 1920s and again in the 1970s, but in both instances, it referred to disputes and differences within Islam rather than as a phenomenon against Muslims.

Whoever first used the word in English was simply translating a French word that was already in existence, merely applying it to the hostile attitudes and actions of non-Muslims towards Muslims.

As regards its first use in print contemporarily, there is some debate about whether it was in an edition of the December 1991 American journal Insight or in a book review by Tariq Modood in The Independent newspaper around the same time. (Fernando Lopez, & Allen, Christopher 2010)

Whilst Modood used the term twice, on neither occasion there was the slightest indication that it needed explanation or definition, or that it was a word that he himself had coined. It is clear though that it did not appear in the book he was reviewing, Sacrilege and Civility: Muslim perspectives on The Satanic Verses affair. (Muhammad & Abdul Raheem 1991).

The word "Islam phobia" was again used without explanation in the 1993 report of the Runnymede Trust Commission on Anti-Semitism which led to the establishment of the Commission on British Muslims and Islam phobia three years later.
Islam phobia is therefore typically understood to be the “shorthand way of referring to dread or hatred of Islam – and, by extension, to fear or dislike of all or most Muslims.” (Runnymede Commission on Anti-Semitism, 1994)

However both the report and its model have failed to stand the test of time and a detailed analysis highlights a number of serious flaws. (Fernando Lopez, & Allen, Christopher 2010)

As phobias are irrational, such an accusation makes people defensive and defiant, in turn making reflective dialogue all but impossible. Likewise, Islam phobia as a separate and stand-alone concept implies that prejudice against Muslims is unrelated to other forms of prejudice.

The separateness of the concept can also imply that Muslims themselves want to be ‘separate’ or ‘different’ even, thereby failing to recognize or accept the ‘similarities’ and ‘overlaps’ that also exist.

As Halliday has argued, the key phenomenon to be addressed is an anti-Muslim hostility directed at an ethno-religious identity rather than the tenets of a religion. (Fred Halliday, 1999).

In terms of the Runnymede model and Rokeach’s Dogmatism Scale upon which it was based therefore, “the instrument does not measure up to the theory.” (Philippe Jacques-, 2002)

Most important therefore is the report’s categorical and justifiable conclusion that a “certain identifiable phenomenon” was evident. (Allen & Nielsen 2002).
Chapter Four

4. Media Coverage of Muslims post 9/11

4.1 Introduction

Mass media considers the most important source of information in this era, so the American people depends on mass media in order to be aware of the events that occur around them. (Marshall McLuhan, 1964)

The development of mass communication turned the whole world into a small village, everyone has the ability to communicate with the external world as fast as possible.

Mass media has many functions and roles such as: education, entertainment, persuade the people and also sharing and exchanging information. (Marshall McLuhan, 1964)

The media the media has turned the affairs into a war of words. Actually, today’s wars in the battle fields are the cumulative actions of what was designed, discussed, and persuaded through the media in molding a favorable public opinion. (Faatin, Haque, 1993)

Mass media has the power to change behaviors and attitudes of people, the power of live-actions video images on television has become even more intimidating.

The books, newspapers, magazines, video cartoons, movie, radio, television and internet based websites are now widely used to manipulate the information, facts and believes. (Faatin, Haque, 1993)

4.2 Role of the Us. Media after 9/11

The researcher has mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that the main functions of mass media are: education, entertainment and sharing information, but the events of September 11 the functions of the media have changed and the main function became distorting Islam as a religion, especially after the images of the world Trade Center were spread across the world and these images let the Americans made a comparison between the events of 9/11 with Pearl Harbor. (Thussu, Daya Kishan, &Desmond Freedman, 2003)
In order to study Muslims' framing in the news after 9/11 it is important to focus on two specific periods, after six months and after the first anniversary. (Francis Fukuyama, 1922) but from the researcher point of view it is also important to focus on the period after the 10th anniversary because in that period the fear of Islam changed into anger, assault and threats.

In these three periods, the frames of the news media totally changed, after six months of 9/11, the coverage of Muslims in the media was very positive and fair but in the other periods (after the first anniversary, after the 10th anniversary), Muslims in the news were covered in a negative way. (Francis Fukuyama, 1922)

In order to understand the changing that happened to the news framework at these periods, it's important to be able to distinguish between two important kinds of media framework: episodic framework and thematic framework. (Francis Fukuyama, 1922)

Episodic framework: focuses on individuals case studies and discrete events, but it reduces life to a series of disconnected events that happen randomly. (Francis Fukuyama, 1922)

Thematic news frame: focuses on isolated cases, trends and also it highlights the context and the environment in which the incidents happened

**4.3 Media Coverage of Muslims:**

Media is considered as the sole resource to other sources of information. According to Walter Lippmann, representations and ‘pictures in our heads’ are first and foremost reproduced in ‘pseudo reality’ from the coverage of the press.

These representations are dispersed to audiences as ‘clear and present’ data. This procedure takes place on a recurring basis by many media organizations. (Sayed, 2011)

The American media realized that many Muslims in this country do not do something worthy during one month of the year. It comes as a stimulating change from the concentration of the press on so-called “Islamic extremism” to find some thoughtful and
even grateful coverage of this vital time in the life of the Muslim population. Muslims themselves are devoting increasing attention in their media to share the importance of their issues with others.

The Western media’s representation of Islam and Muslims can be considered as a reflection or a mirror of reality; yet, depending on their forms, mirrors can deform reality. Halim Rane used a better metaphor when he painted the media as a window saying: “It does not so much distort reality as it limits the scope and range of view depending on the size, location, and direction of the window. (Jane Smith, 1999)

4.3.1 Muslims in the news in the first six months after 9\11

In the first six months, the news about Muslims changed from episodic to thematic.

It means that the news media highlighted the context and the environment in which the incident happened.

After six months of 9\11 events, Muslims were covered and interviewed in the news as sources more than before the events of 9\11.

During the first six months, thematic news about Muslims American increased to 19%, on the other hand the episodic news dropped to 21%. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

It's obvious from figure (1) that the coverage of Muslims in the news media increased especially in the four famous news organization (CNN, FOX, NYT, W.POST)

The aired segments on CNN increased from 23 segments before six months to 203 segments after six months.

Also the coverage of Muslims on fox news increased from one segment, before six months of 9\11 to more than 99 segments after six months of 9\11. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)
In print media, the articles published on NYT increased from 345 articles before six months of 9\11 to 1486 articles during the first six months of 9\11.( Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Also the numbers of articles published on W. Post increased from 120 articles during six months before the events of September to more than 600 articles after six months of 9\11.%(Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

The increasing of news about Islam and Muslims is the sign that Islam and its followers became an important source to the news organizations. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006 pp: 16)

Figure 1: Muslims in the news before and after 9\11
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4.3.2. Depiction of Muslim Americans in the News

Table (2) below shows us that the coverage of Muslims in the news was more positive during the first six months post 9\11 , about 42% of total segments and articles in the four famous news organizations (CNN, FOX, NYT, W. POST) were considered positive, while the coverage of Muslims during six months before 9\11 was only 25%.( Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)
It's obvious that positive and supportive of Muslims in the news declined from 42% to 22% in the first six months post 9/11. (Nacos, & Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Negative supportive of Muslims in the news considers a dangerous changing in the framework of the news organization and it illustrates that the positive news about Muslims was replaced by negative one.

With such a drastic change in coverage habit, there was a shift from stereotypical portrayal to more comprehensive and inclusive news presentation of Muslim Americans.

Table 2: Depiction of Muslim Americans in the News (Nacos, & Torres-Reyna, 2006 pp: 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Six months before 9/11</th>
<th>Six months after 9/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral /Ambiguous</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative /critical</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Media coverage of Muslims after the first anniversary of 9/11

By the first anniversary of September 11, the portrayal of Muslim Americans in both print and cable news had completely changed from the more frequent, positive, contextual, thematic, descriptive and comprehensive coverage to a more frequent, negative, stereotypical, episodic and exclusive coverage.

The share of reporting on Muslim Americans declined, hate crimes skyrocketed and the positive public perception of Muslims that was created in the immediate period after 9/11 diminished.

Eventually, this negative perception of Muslims manifested itself through anti-Islamic riots and hatred of Muslim Americans in upcoming years. (Nacos, & Torres-Reyna, 2006)
After the first anniversary of the attacks on the World Trade Center, thematic news was replaced by episodic coverage. “One of the old and valid journalistic tools used in thematic reporting is to provide answers to the five Ws – who, what, when, where and why. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Thematic news demands an answer to the five Ws and pays particular attention to explaining the “why” of whatever triggers the news. For example, a news report about a certain number of Muslim Americans that are held in detention facilities around the country based on tougher antiterrorism measures constitutes episodic reporting. Thematic coverage would report on every single case, ask why these people were detained and dig in for more background information about the detainees.

Muslim Americans were not covered with depth and description as they were in the first six months after 9/11. Instead, reports were mainly obstinate by people and commentators who did not know enough about the religion or Muslim American way of life. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Moreover, the coverage of Muslim Americans declined by 67 % in the six month period after the first anniversary of 9/11. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Figure (2) illustrates that CNN news segments declined from 203 to 67 news pieces after the first anniversary of 9/11. Similarly, articles about Muslim Americans in the Washington Post dropped from 568 to 187 during the same period. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Also articles about Muslims in the NYT declined from 1460 articles after six months of 9/11 to 660 articles after the first anniversary of 9/11. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

Fox news segments dropped from 120 to 30 news pieces after the first anniversary

Figure (2): Muslims in the news – 6 months before – sex months after 9/11 and after the first anniversary (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006 pp:16)
According to a content analysis conducted by Columbia University, table (3) shows us that positive news articles and news clips in CNN, FOX, New York Times and Washington Post dropped from 42% in the 6 months after 9/11 to 21% after the first anniversary of 9/11 and negative news increased from 22% in the six months after 9/11 to 43% after the first anniversary (Table 3). (Nacos, & Torres-Reyna, 2006).

**Table 3:** Depiction of Muslim Americans in the News after the first anniversary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>After six months of 9/11</th>
<th>After the first anniversary of 9/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive/ supportive</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, negative coverage of Muslim Americans increased by 21% during this same period.

In addition, unlike the first six months after the 9/11 incidents, many leaders and politicians did not appear to ask the public for unity with the Muslim communities. “This negative coverage was not simply the result of different choices on the part of the news media, but also a reflection of the behavior of political leaders and other influential figures in the United States. (Nacos, & Torres-Reyna, 2006).
4.3.4 Media coverage of Muslims after the 10th anniversary of 9\11

Nacos and Torres argued that several incidents happened in the United States after the 10th anniversary of 9/11, these incidents were a sign of rise in public anger towards Muslim Americans. Americans seemed intolerant towards Islam and their fellow Muslim Americans when the controversy over the Islamic Center in lower Manhattan erupted in the summer of 2010.

Hundreds and thousands of people came out on the streets of New York and other major cities around country to protest against the construction of a mosque that was located a few blocks away from Ground Zero. The media took this story and ran with it like never before.( Mohammad, Amiri 2012)

Protesters started asking questions like “Should Muslims be allowed to build a mosque at Ground Zero? Or Are Muslims anti-American? .( Mohammad, Amiri 2012)

While it is the right of every American to build a house of worship anywhere in this country, Muslim Americans were considered an exception. It came as a surprise to see how many people were out on the streets chanting against the right of their fellow Muslim Americans.

In addition, on the ninth anniversary of the September 11, a non denominational church in Florida decided to host an “International Burn a Quran Day.” The event was hosted to remember the 9/11 victims and to take a stand against Islam. US media gave so much attention to this event that it became a national news headline.

Also, in March of 2010, Peter King - Republican Congressman from New York - hosted a hearing of Muslim Americans.

They had not targeted a specific group of Americans for a certain cause or a problem before, except Joseph McCarthy’s anti-Communist hearing in the 1940s.
Peter King argued that Muslim Americans do not cooperate with law enforcement agencies in arresting potential terrorists, although the Obama administration denied his claims. (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

While Peter King’s hearing was covered extensively, Muslim Americans were not given a fair share of air time to counteract King’s claim that all Muslim Americans is a threat to this country.

The question remains why the public anger towards Muslim Americans grew substantially after almost 10 years since the 9/11 incidents? (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006)

The most central literature is by Edward Said when he wrote about the Iranian Hostage Crisis in his book covering Islam (1981). He pointed out that the American media and its experts have failed to understand and explain the Arab and Muslim world to the American public. More specifically, he argues that:

"Muslims and Arabs are essentially covered, discussed, apprehended either as suppliers of oil or as potential terrorists. Very little of the detail, the human density, the passion of Arab-Muslim life has entered the awareness of even those people whose profession it is to report the Islamic world.(Edward Said, 1981, pp:22)

As Lippmann said," one must distinguish between news, and truth. Not all reporting is necessarily poor or biased. However, sometimes media tends to report news with explanatory frames that give clues and ideas to readers, listeners and viewers, and puts events, problems, and people into contextual frameworks of reference" (Nacos, &Torres-Reyna, 2006, pp:2)

According to Abid Amiri, the four mass media corporations, CNN, FOX, the New York Times, and the Washington Post, obviously had an agenda to follow.

Another research project is required to explore about their agendas, but it is obvious that they shaped a platform for the Iraq War in 2003. American public was continuously
nourished with biased, improper, and subjective news coverage to increase the status of fear from Muslims in public minds.

As Cultivation Theory proposes, exposing public to repeated negative pictures about Muslims led to convince Americans that the threat from Muslims is actual. Therefore, this agenda driven anti-Islamic rhetoric in the media added to public hate and anger towards Muslim Americans, which eventually led to public uprising against Muslims in recently over the Ground Zero Mosque in Manhattan. (Mohammad, Amiri 2012).

4.5 Arab Americans and Muslim Americans and the New York Times

4.5.1 Introduction

The idea of common enemy is visibly anchored in American history and nowadays Arab and Muslim Americans and Arabs and Muslims in general are considered these public enemies.

Since the fall of the Soviet Union, Arabs and Muslims in general and Arab American and Muslim American citizens by association and by direct action have become increasingly targeted for discriminatory policies and practices in the United States, fuelled by the “war on terrorism” media frenzy.

We live in dangerous times, the media and public authorities drum daily. No threat is more imminent than that of Islam, no site more at risk than the American homeland, and no enemy more fearful than the enemy within, we are told. (Jamal, & Nadine, 2008)

Unfortunately, one of the most influential US newspapers and also one of the most influential newspapers in the world, the New York Times (NYT), and some of the most influential TV networks like Fox News, CNN, and NBC narrates Arab Americans and Muslim Americans in ways that enable racial policing by associating them with terrorism and a demonized, globalized Islam. (Mohammad, Amiri 2012)
The *NYT* is widely considered a liberal newspaper, known for advocacy of civil and human rights, therefore such narrative makes it a critical site for examining and representation of Arab Americans and Muslim Americans in print news media.

Since the attacks, Arabs and Muslims have been frequently represented in the U.S. media as “other”. The media have increasingly represented Muslim Americans and Arab Americans as if they are not true members of the USA, not even part of the national community.

### 4.5.2 analysis of NYT articles

The marginalization of Arabs and Muslims prompted the council on American-Islamic relations to place numerous ads in the NYT and other media in the aftermath of 9/11 with photographs of Muslims of all ethnicities and colors, declaring them to be “American.

(Jamal, & Nadine, 2008)

While the rhetorical maneuvers used by the media are at times explicitly racial in their grammar, their organization of racial investments through other categories, such as religion, ethnicity, and nation have the effect of rationalizing religion, ethnicity, and nation.

Another problem with the representation of Arabs and Muslims in the media is that they rarely differentiate between “Arab” and “Muslim” as if these terms were both the same. In the newspapers, the titles of the articles often suggest that they are about Arab Americans but the text concerns non-Arab people.

In this part, the researcher will analyze some articles published on NYT.

Choosing these articles will be randomly.
4.5.2.1 Laurie Goodstein's September 12, 2001, article, “In U.S., Echoes of Rift of Muslims and Jews

connected the 9/11 attacks to Muslims and Arab Americans, while it linked the events”

significance to Israel and Palestine.

It is also important to note that “there was no definitive information yet about who was behind the terrorist attacks that struck New York City and Washington yesterday, (Goodstein, Laurie) which clearly shows that all aggression against Arab Americans was caused only by the speculations of the media that the terrorist attacks were committed by Muslim Arabs.

Although the article itself stresses that there was no definite information available at that time, it also links the attacks with Israel – Palestine problem and by doing so it indirectly suggests that the attacks were actually committed by the Muslim Arabs.

Also the connection between the attacks and Israel – Palestine conflict as suggested by the American Jews is absolutely irrational and implies that the people involved in the Israel – Palestine conflict are somehow responsible for the 9/11 attacks. Therefore, it should be stated in the article that such assumptions are illegitimate.

This shows that the common wave of antipathy against Arab and Muslim Americans was may be intentionally, may be unintentionally supported by the public media and this contributed to the general, negative view of Arabs and Muslims.

4.5.2.2 MUSLIMS; The 2 Worlds of Muslim American Teenagers written by SUSAN SACHS and published on NYT on October , 2001

This article is about the life of American –Muslims teenagers in America, and the problem they are facing of being American and Muslims at the same time. (SUSAN SACHS, 2011)
In her article, Susan is talking about the opinions of those teenagers about particular issues and problems such as the war on terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The author tried to make her article looks like an interview with some American – Muslims teenagers.

Susan tried to convey an important message that American – Muslims teenagers belong in the first place to their religion and to their country in the second place. Susan started her article with:

“They are Americans who feel duty-bound by Islam to obey American laws. But some of them say that if their country called them to war against a Muslim army, they might refuse to fight.

They cannot be shaken from the conviction that America is intrinsically anti-Muslim. Yet they see it as the one place where Muslims are free to be themselves.(SUSAN SACHS, web 2014, NYT)

She finished her article with:

Several of the young men said they could fight against a Muslim if they were convinced that the Muslim had committed a crime.

They all said they were not convinced that Osama bin Laden -- or any Muslim, for that matter -- was behind the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, attacks that they condemned as violating all precepts of Islam.(SUSAN SACHS, 2001)


In this article, the author tried to give a proof that the attacks on the World trade center arose somehow from Islam. he said: There's just one thing that most Americans and Osama bin Laden seem able to agree on: that the attacks on the World Trade Center arose somehow from Islam. Whether the purest form of Islam or the most perverted, it so
enveloped the hijackers in religious zeal that the centrality of Islam to the attacks is hard to deny. (Nicholas kristof, 2002)

Nicholas D. Kristof, also made a comparison between Islamic community and south Asia countries like Japan and Korea according to the kind of defiant and violent antagonism to the West: "It is easier to try that here in East Asia. The kind of defiant and violent antagonism to the West that we now associate with Islamists was for centuries linked instead to places like Japan, Korea and China. (Nicholas kristof, 2002).

5.5.2.4 Bigotry in Islam -- And Here; NICHOLAS D. KRISTOF, July 9, 2002

In this art article the author claimed that the Islamic world represses women and considers undemocratic he also said; "The Islamic world represses women, spawns terrorism, is prone to war, resists democracy and has contributed remarkably few great scientists or writers to modern civilization. (Nicholas kristof, 2002)

And about Islam as a religion Nicholas D. Kristof said: "Islam is, quite simply, a religion of war," Paul Weyrich and William Lind, two leading American conservatives, write in a new booklet titled "Why Islam Is a Threat to America and the West." Mr. Lind said of American Muslims: "They should be encouraged to leave. They are a fifth column in this country. (Nicholas kristof, 2002)

We notice from both quotations that the author has convinced that Islam is a religion of repression, war and terrorism and he wanted to convey his message to all the Americans.

4.5.2.5 Homegrown Osamas, Nicholas D. Kristof, March 9, 2005

This article is another example of negative coverage by the US media. The following excerpt is from an article titled written by an op-ed columnist for the New York Times.

He wrote this article on in response to a terrorist plot in America by a Muslim American. (Nicholas kristof, 2005)
It is important to point out that at the end of the article he writes, “So we don't have to go to Saudi Arabia to find violent religious extremists steeped in hatred for all America stands for. Wake up - they're here.” The article is problematic in a sense that while Kristof is making his point about homegrown terrorists, he is also adding to the conscious minds of the public about the danger of Muslim.

4.5.2.6 Is this America, Nicholas D. Kristof, September, 11 2010 and published on New York Times

This article is about a blog post in the New Republic, written by Martin Peretz, the magazine's editor in chief.

Kristof began his article with a quotation written by Martin Peretz about Muslims, he said: "Frankly, Muslim life is cheap, most notably to Muslims. (Nicholas kristof, 2010)

Kristof considered that beginning as a glimpsed of how venomous and debased the discourse about Islam has become. (Nicholas kristof, 2010)

The author gave another quotation of the blog post written by Peretz

He said: Mr. Peretz added: “I wonder whether I need honor these people and pretend that they are worthy of the privileges of the First Amendment, which I have in my gut the sense that they will abuse.

In his article, kristof said about the bigotry in America:

In America, bigoted comments about Islam often seem to come from people who have never visited a mosque and know few if any Muslims. In their ignorance, they mirror the anti-Semitism that I hear in Muslim countries from people who have never met a Jew. (Nicholas kristof, 2010)

The author finished his article with a statement of cardinal Theodore Maccarrick, put in this way: this is not America. America was not built on hate. (Nicholas kristof, 2010)
And also said: ‘Shame on you,’ the Rev. Richard Cizik, a leading evangelical Christian, said to those castigating Islam. ‘You bring dishonor to the name of Jesus Christ. You directly disobey his commandment to love your neighbor.’ (Nicholas Kristof, 2010)
Chapter five

5. The Effects Of Mass Media On Americans' Perceptions And Attitudes

5.1 Introduction

The American public depends on the mass media to keep them apprised of important events and developments at home and abroad.

Often, media stories are the only source of information the public has on a subject, and thus are the basis of opinions and views on issues and world events.

Through story selection and reporting practices, the media has great influence over public opinion, which in turn drives government policy in some areas. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

The power of the news media to set a nation’s agenda, to focus public attention on a few key public issues, is an immense and well-documented influence.

Not only do people acquire factual information about public affairs from the news media, readers and viewers also learn how much importance to attach to a topic on the basis of the emphasis placed on it in the news.

Newspapers provide a host of cues about the salience of the topics in the daily news – lead story on page one, other front page display, large headlines, etc.

Television news also offers numerous cues about salience – the opening story on the newscast, length of time devoted to the story, etc. (Walter Lippmann, 1922).

These cues repeated day after day effectively communicate the importance of each topic.

In other words, the news media can set the agenda for the public’s attention to that small group of issues around which public opinion forms. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

The principal outlines of this influence were sketched by Walter Lippmann in his 1922 classic, Public Opinion, which began with a chapter titled “The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Heads.”
As he noted, the news media are a primary source of those pictures in our heads about the larger world of public affairs, a world that for most citizens is “out of reach, out of sight, out of mind. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

What we know about the world is largely based on what the media decide to tell us. More specifically, the result of this mediated view of the world is that the priorities of the media strongly influence the priorities of the public. Elements prominent on the media agenda become prominent in the public mind.

Social scientists examining this agenda-setting influence of the news media on the public usually have focused on public issues.

The agenda of a news organization is found in its pattern of coverage on public issues over some period of time, a week, a month, an entire year. Over this period of time, whatever it might be, a few issues are emphasized, some receive light coverage, and many are seldom or never mentioned. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

It should be noted that the use of term “agenda” here is purely descriptive. There is no pejorative implication that a news organization “has an agenda” that it relentlessly pursues as a premeditated goal.

The media agenda presented to the public results from countless day-to-day decisions by many different journalists and their supervisors about the news of the moment.

5.2 The impact of the agenda – setting on public's minds

The agenda-setting influence of the news media is not limited to this initial step of focusing public attention on a particular topic.

The media also influence the next step in the communication process, our understanding and perspective on the topics in the news.
If you think about the agenda in abstract terms, the potential for a broader view of media influence on public opinion becomes very clear. In the abstract, the items that define the agenda are objects.

For all the agendas we have discussed, the objects are public issues, but they could be other items or topics, such as the agenda of political candidates during an election. The objects are the things on which the attention of the media and the public are focused. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

In turn, each of these objects has numerous attributes, those characteristics and traits that describe the object. For each object there also is an agenda of attributes because when the media and the public think and talk about an object, some attributes are emphasized, others are given less attention, and many receive no attention at all. This agenda of attributes is another aspect of the agenda-setting role of the news media. (Maxwell McCombs, 2003)

"The agenda of attributes presented for each of these issues, public figures, or other objects literally influences the pictures themselves that we hold in mind." (Walter Lippmann, 1922 PP: 2003)

Although the influence of the media agenda can be substantial, it alone does not determine the public agenda. Information and cues about object and attribute salience provided by the news media are far from the only determinants of the public agenda. This substantial influence of the news media has no way overturned or nullified the basic assumption of democracy that the people at large have sufficient wisdom to determine the course of their nation, their state, and their local communities.

In particular, the people are quite able to determine the basic relevance – to themselves and to the larger public arena – of the topics and attributes advanced by the news media. The media set the agenda only when citizens perceive their news stories as relevant. (Maxwell McCombs, 2003)
"The inspiring failure in the U.S. of the intensive news coverage on the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal to set the public agenda and sway public opinion, an effort that failed despite gargantuan and persistent coverage frequently described as “All Monica, all the time,” (Maxwell McCombs, 2003 PP:12) speaks in a loud voice about the limits of media influence.

The presence – or absence – of agenda-setting effects by the news media can be explained by a basic psychological trait, our need for orientation. Innate within each one of us is the need to understand the environment around us. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

Because it is a psychological trait, the degree of need for orientation varies greatly from one individual to another. Need for orientation is defined by two components: relevance and uncertainty. Relevance is the initial defining condition that determines the level of need for orientation for each individual.

For individuals among whom the relevance of a topic is high, their degree of uncertainty about the topic determines the level of need for orientation. If this uncertainty is low, that is, they feel that they basically understand the topic, then the need for orientation is moderate. (Walter Lippmann, 1922)

5.3 Media Framing and Public Opinion after 9/11

Another change in the framing employed by right-leaning media came in 2006, after offensive caricatures of the prophet Mohammed published by a Danish magazine set off an overflow of violent protests in the Muslim world. (Ammitzbøll & Vidino, 2007)

On March 2006, a modest raise in American belief that Islam encourages violence, but also a dramatic growth of unfavorable feeling toward the faith which is not fully explainable by its heightened association with violence.
This unfavorable sentiment in fact continued several months later, even as the association with violence declined. The decoupling of unfavorable sentiment from concerns about Islamic violence reflects a change in right-leaning discourse to a new emphasis on Islam’s incompatibility with Western values. Islam – and the multiculturalists embrace of it – now represented a cultural threat to free speech and other Western democratic values.

In 2006, several high-profile books about the demographic danger posed by Muslim immigration were published, including Bruce Bower's While Europe Slept (released in February), Melanie Phillips’s Londonistan (released in May) and Mark Steyn’s America Alone (released in September).

Muslims and the political left were depicted as partners in a plot to Islamize America and institute sharia law.(Nathan Lean, 2012)

"Unfavorable opinion of Islam continued its unmatched rise through 2009, even as Iraq achieved stability and Americans’ association of Islam with violence reached a five-year low (table 4). (Obama's speech, New York Times, 2009)

Unfavorable opinions seems to have been connected to a sense of cultural threat, as encoded in the popular speed rumors that popularized during Barack Obama’s presidential campaign and early presidency claiming that he was a foreign-born Muslim. (Pew Forum Poll, 2010)

Even some who refused this theory nevertheless exploited the administration’s politically-correct language about Islam to portray the President as an accomplice to terrorism. (Klein, J.2010)

As one might expect, partisan difference in opinion toward Islam was then at its highest point since 2005
According to Pew center Partisan difference was stronger in August 2010, regardless of the height of controversy over the planned construction of the Park51 community center in New York, “Ground Zero Mosque. (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, 2012)

Both favorable and unfavorable sentiment toward Islam declined sharply during this controversy as Americans moved in large numbers to the undecided category. This actually represented an increase in partisanship, however, because the people who became undecided were almost exclusively those with views atypical for their party – Democrats with an unfavorable view and Republicans with a favorable one. The partisan narratives seem to have been attached strongly enough to expel these independent thinkers from their unconventional views. (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, 2012)

This argument, was the high point of partisan difference for the complete decade. It seemingly struck at the heart of the points at issue between Republicans and Democrats in their assessments of Islam during the 9/11 decade: whether Islam as a whole bears guilt for 9/11, and whether its presence in the United States threatens to co-opt and devastate America’s most sacred values. (Robert Schlesinger, 2010)

The changing of media framing has its effect on public opinion especially after the events of 9/11.

The increasing of negative news about Islam gave misinformation about this religion, so these misinformation also gave a misconception of Islam.

Unfavorable attitudes toward Muslims began to grow by degrees but not rapidly, let me be fair in that point, so this slowly spreading as due to the number of news about Islam.

5.3.1 Americans' opinions of Muslims American

Americans' opinions were mostly favorable before the events of 9/11, table (4) shows us that 50% of the Americans have favorable opinions about Muslims on Aug. 2000 and only
21% were mostly unfavorable, where 29% undecided. (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life Surveys, 2001, 2003, 2007)

American unfavorable opinions raised from 21% to 25% on Mar.2001, this increasing of negative opinions was due to the negative news about Islam and Muslims. (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life Surveys, 2001, 2003, 2007)

As mentioned in previous chapter, the negative news about Islam increased after the first anniversary and this illustrates the increasing of unfavorable opinions about Muslims and Islam.

It's clearly obvious that unfavorable opinions increased on Mar.2007 and favorable opinions declined from 55% to 45%. (Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political Surveys, 2000, 2001, 2007)

This increasing of unfavorable opinions considers a normal results of negative news about Islam in all news organization. Table (4)

**Table 4** Americans' opinions of Islam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly favorable</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly unfavorable</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Americans' opinions of Islam

Americans' opinions and attitudes toward Islam dramatically changed from favorable to unfavorable. Since the events of 9/11 unfavorable opinions and attitudes surfaced and the number of hate-crimes increased.

Table (5) shows us that unfavorable opinions of Islam increased month by month and year by year. Unfavorable opinions about Islam declined from 39% on Oct. 2001 to 25% in the same year, then it raised on Feb. 2002 to 39%.

On Jun. 2003 unfavorable opinions increased to more than 36% unless they reached to 49% on Sep. 2010. (ABC News Polls, 2001, 2002 & 2006)

There is a deep relationship between what happened during the 10th anniversary and the increasing of unfavorable opinions and attitudes toward Muslims. After the 10th anniversary of 9/11 events, public opinions and attitudes toward Muslims changed from just an internal fear and hatred to anger, threats and assault.

This changing of public opinions from favorable to unfavorable illustrates what happened during the 10th anniversary when hundreds and thousands of people came out on the street of New York and other major cities to protest against the construction of a mosque that was located a few blocks away from Ground zero and in the same year more than 54% of American said that Islam encourages violence. Table (5)
Table 5: Americans' opinions of Islam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep 010</th>
<th>Aug 010</th>
<th>Sep 009</th>
<th>Mar 2006</th>
<th>Jul 004</th>
<th>Sep 003</th>
<th>Jan 003</th>
<th>Feb 002</th>
<th>Jan 002</th>
<th>Oct 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.3.3 Americans' opinions about whether Islam encourages violence

As a result of a negative coverage of Muslims in the news and misinformation about Islam and its principles, American public opinion changed into a negative way.

The number of Americans who said that Islam encourages violence increased after the events of 9/11. (ABC News Polls, 2003 & 2006)

On Jun. 2002 only 15% of Americans said that Islam encourages violence but on Oct. 2002 the number increased to more than 25%. (ABC News Polls, 2003 & 2006)

The rate of Americans who said that Islam encourages violence increased to more than 35% on Sep. 2003.

It's noticeable that the number of Americans who said that Islam is a peaceful religion declined from 57% on Jan. 2002 to 54% on Sep. 2010. (ABC News Polls, 2003 & 2006)
The number of Americans who said that Islam encourages violence reached its peak on Mar. 2006, about 38% said that Islam encourages violence especially after London 7/7 bombing on July 2005 but this rate declined to 32% on Sep. 2010. (ABC News/Belief Net Poll, 2002, 2009 & 2010)

This increase refutes what Smith argued that Americans opinions of Islam were more favorable when the sense of threat was highest and when the fear retracted when it became less favorable. Table: (6)

Table (6): Americans’ opinions about whether Islam encourages violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.3.4 Negative perception about Muslims

Due to the negative depiction of Muslim Americans in the media, public perception of Americans about Muslims changed dramatically.

According to a Pew Research Center survey, public’s negative perception about Muslims continued to increase.

They asked the survey participants this same question in 2002, 2003, 2005 and 2010 “Do you have a general favorable or unfavorable opinion of Islam and Muslim Americans?”
Each year more and more people said they had unfavorable opinion about Muslims. In 2002, only 33% of the participants had negative perception. In 2003, the negative opinion increased to 34%, in 2005 negative opinion increased to 36% eventually in 2010 to 38%.(Pew Research Center, 2010)

Figure (4) Negative perception about Muslims

According to a content analysis conducted by Columbia University in 2002, American public in general viewed Muslim Americans more favorably after September 11 than before.

Fewer people responded to the survey saying that they had never heard of Muslim Americans or could not judge their attitude towards their Muslim fellows.

Everyone had something to say about Islam and the people who belonged to this religion in the first six months after 9/11. As a result, the public attitude towards Muslims shifted positively in the immediate period after 9/11.

According to Pew Research Center, survey shows that there was an increase of 5% in Americans favorable attitude and a decline of 3% in unfavorable attitude towards Muslims in November of 2010 (Table 4) (Pew Research Center, 2010)
These behaviors, attitudes and trends tell us that media coverage of certain group of people or issues has an impact on public’s perception about these people and problems. The period right after September 11, 2001 was a period of understanding this unknown religion and people who perpetrated the attacks which forced the media to cover Muslims more frequently. Amiri Mohammad, 2012. (Mohammad, Amiri, 2012)

The press started to paint a full-scale picture of Muslims by giving them more access on air.

The limited news about Muslims and the more episodic framing patterns before 9/11 that added to negative stereotypes suddenly changed to more thematic news framing patterns in the six-month period post- 9/11. (Pew Research Center, 2010)

This thematic and regular coverage of Muslims improved American’s perception of their Muslim neighbors. However, this positive sequence was not long lasting. The pattern quickly changed by the first anniversary of 9/11, which will be discussed in the following segment. (Pew Research Center, 2010)

In addition, according to the survey, more Americans said that they knew less and less about Islam as each year passed since 9/11. This ignorance of Islam proved that media’s negative portrayal not only changed American public perception but also gave the public less and less information or misinformed them about Islam.

According to a Pew poll, in 2002 only 29% of Americans did not know enough about Islam to form their opinion about Islam and Muslim Americans. That number increased to 26% in 2003 and to 32% in 2010. (Pew Research Center, 2010)

As a result of these negative opinions, hate crime and assault rates against Muslim Americans increased after the first six months of 9/11. The numbers of hate crime incidents were 481 in late 2001. (Number of Anti-Muslim hate crimes, 2010)
Religious intolerance was at its peak during this time. In the following years the number of anti-Islamic hate crime incidents declined to 155 in 2002 and 149 incidents in 2003.

However, public anger did not appear until 2009 and 2010 when Americans walked down the streets shouting anti-Islamic slogans and revolting against the basic rights of Muslims, such as building a Mosque. Quran book was threatened to be burned, and they were subjected to a hearing in congress.

In a Pew Forum survey conducted August 1-18, 2007, 32% of Americans says that media have a great influence on their opinions of Muslims, compared to only 18% apiece for education and personal experience, tied for second place.

This is consistent with a wealth of other evidence, both anecdotal and experimental, that public opinion and prejudice are heavily influenced by media.(Iyengar, Peters, & Kinder, 1982)

5.4 The relationship between American public and Islam

Six million Muslims live among an American population of about 300 million. This small minority is the subject of deep social worry towards Islam, known as Islam phobia.

Muslim minorities in the United States are seen through the sphere of “otherness,” which many Americans relate to stereotypes that are perpetuated through popular media and literature.

Many polls conducted between 2001-2009 echo American misconceptions regarding Islam.

A 2003 Pew poll shows that nearly 45% of Americans believed that Islam is more likely than other religions “to encourage violence among its believers.” In addition, a 2009 survey indicated that 36% of Americans could not recall basic facts about Islam.
The fear of Islam is so palpable that during the 2010 elections, Oklahoma voted to ban sharia law from being used in judicial matters. Americans continue to see Islam and Muslims as one-dimensional caricatures. (Philippe Jacques, 1994)

The reasons behind the American misunderstanding of Islam can be related to media stereotypes that have permeated American pop culture.

The two most typical Muslim stereotypes are the images of the Muslim-Arab, terrorist male and the oppressed, veiled Muslim woman.

In most media, Muslim men are portrayed in traditional Arab dress indicating fundamentalism. Almost all Muslims are portrayed as Arabs, despite the fact that only about 20% of the worldwide Muslim population identify themselves as Arabs. Muslim women are most often portrayed wearing the veil, burqa, or niqab. These images conjure ideas that Islam oppresses women. (Philippe Jacques, 1994)

These stereotypes fail to account for the pluralistic character of the Muslim community.

In fact, American Muslims have their own peerless nature illustrated by varying origins, ethnic and racial make-up, and political beliefs. totally, Muslims from nearly 80 nationalities and cultural backgrounds constitute today’s American-Muslim residents.

5.5 Discrimination against American Muslims

According to Steven Greenhouse, Muslims in America face many kinds of discrimination such as institutional discrimination, social discrimination and economic discrimination, below the is a brief discuss this discrimination.

5.5.1 Institutional Discrimination

In the wake of the World Trade Center attacks, the U.S. government cracked down on immigration policy and national security measures. In October 2001, the U.S. Patriot Act was signed into law with almost no Congressional debate.
The Patriot Act allowed the attorney general to detain non-citizens suspected of terrorism without a warrant, and authorized new surveillance guidelines for U.S. law enforcement agencies.

Additionally, in July 2003, the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act (CLEAR) was passed to give local law enforcement the power to enforce federal immigration laws.

The combined implementation of the Patriot Act and the CLEAR Act resulted in increased surveillance of Muslims. Muslims (citizens and non-citizens) have been denied council and formal charges while being detained for extended periods of time. (Steven Greenhouse, 2010)

5.5.2 Social Discrimination

In addition to legislative violations of civil liberties, American Muslims face physical abuses and social discrimination.

The Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice reports that claims of abuse include: telephone, internet, and face-to-face threats; minor assaults; vandalism; shootings; and bombings of homes, businesses, and places of worship.

Building of Islamic center near Ground Zero has caused a culture war that spread across the United States.

Many Americans believe that the establishment of this center is a disrespectful to the memory of those who died in the WTC attacks to have an Islamic religious center so near the site that Islamic fundamentalists destroyed.

The building of mosques has been controversial throughout the United States. Unfortunately, this has led to severe attacks on Islamic centers, including bombings in Texas and Tennessee (Steven Greenhouse, 2010).
5.5.3 Economic Discrimination

After the 10th anniversary of 9/11, Muslim workers have reported that they have been victims of employment discrimination.

Workers report name calling by co-workers, such as “terrorist” or “Osama,” and complain that employers prevent them from wearing the headscarf or participating in prayer times. Complaints like these in 2010 are up nearly 60% from 2005. Mary Jo O’Neill, regional attorney of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, remarked, “There’s a level of hatred and animosity that is shocking. (Steven Greenhouse, 2010)

Astonishingly, while Muslims make up only 2% of the U.S. population, they compose nearly one quarter of religious discrimination claims filed by the EEOC in 2010. Economic discrimination in the U.S. against Muslims is predicted to climb as the retraction continues. (Steven Greenhouse, 2010)
6. Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Islam phobia:

Islam phobia is not a new term. Between the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, various authors detected the presence in Europe of an attitude towards Islam and Muslims that some of them designated with the term “Islam phobia”. Although the present debate on Islam phobia has hitherto ignored their contributions, these were important and are still useful.

Many authors used the term to refer to the belief that Islam and Muslims were the implacable, absolute and eternal enemies of Christianity. Islam phobia engendered, nurtured and conveyed an ‘enemy image’ of Islam and Muslims, insofar as they are perceived as the incarnation of Islam.

Islam phobia would be a hostile attitude towards Islam and Muslims based on the image of Islam as an enemy, as a threat to America wellbeing and even survival.

Islam phobia, then, would be neither a form of religious intolerance nor a form of racism or cultural racism, although in certain circumstances it could be mixed with these other forms of rejection.

the relationship between Islam phobia and racism or cultural racism: they may be elements worth considering in certain instances of Islam phobia, but again, they are not the sine qua non of its existence.

Islam phobia can effectively be confounded with a form of racism or cultural racism because it occasionally targets minorities that are effectively racialized.

But it is the perception of Islam as a threat that engenders the racialization of the Islamic identity. It is the need to identify the threat, to identify the Islam incarnate in Muslims, that causes the Islamic identity to be transformed into an involuntary identity: the Muslim will
be identified not on the basis of his beliefs but rather on the basis of his origin, his ancestry and a series of ethno-cultural traits.

It is equally true, however, that these minorities can fall prey to racism or cultural racism without the Islamic reference coming into play.

when Islam phobia is used to reject or discriminate against Muslims who are identified as such on the basis of a series of ethnic features —rather than their beliefs— that confusion sets in.

Islam phobia is a very important issue in our world today because at a point in time where equal treatment is beginning to become so heavily valued, it is an example of how a group of people can still be hated due to prejudice and fear.

The discrimination that is directed towards Muslim people is atrociously accepted in the twenty first century and has even become normalized in many societies.

Political leaders are openly blaming Muslim people for the problems of their nation.

The many negative misperceptions of Islam and its followers have been heavily amplified by the media and shared around the world. After 9/11, Islam phobia began to increase because the attack was so publically and extensively linked to the religion.

The anti-Muslim mindset has been present for centuries but the terrorist attacks in 2001 have proven to be the trigger event for Islam phobia in the modern world. The major focus on the negative stereotypes of Islam and the heightening of prejudice toward Muslims has resulted in the fact that Islam phobia is no longer simply a mindset; it is now a tool as well.

The first known use in print of the French word Islamophobie appears to have been in a book entitled La politique musulmane dans l’Afrique Occidentale Française by Alain Quellien, published in Paris in 1910.

Bravo Lopez indicates that one of the first recorded use of Islam phobia was by Etienne Dinet and Slimane ben Ibrahim. Dinet was a French painter who later converted to Islam.
Their book, L’Orient vu de l’Occident, published in 1925 is devoted to the criticism of some orient lists’

6.2 Mass media, theories and public opinion:

Democracy is a simple word to everyone to say it but really it's very difficult to be understood.

It's very easy to say that you are democratic person and you are applying this norm but if we analyze your actions or your behavior we will find that you are far away thousands miles from democracy.

Many persons understands democracy in a wrong way and also some governments.

Everybody claims to be a democrat. Every political decision and action is justified in the name of democracy. Democracy is obviously a “trump card”, which can be utilized in any constellation and situation. Indeed, democracy is one of the key concepts of the theory and practice of politics. But is the concept of democracy really so vague or are there some certain ideas behind it? Democracy is one of many political systems that deal with planning and running the affairs of society. It is, however, from historical point of view, the latest and the most modern political formation. In last few years, in the light of new developments in world politics it has been explored, criticized and attacked. The most recent political developments throughout the world provoked interests in the theory of democracy.

Democracy may be a word that familiar to most, but still I would like to mention the fact that demos means pertaining to people and kratios means to rule. Thus this word original coined by the Greeks means rule of people as a whole and not by an individual or a privileged soul. It is a concept still misunderstood and misused in some parts of the world.

By the dictionary definition, democracy is government by the people in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised directly by them or by their elected agents
under a free electoral system. In a famous phrase of Abraham Lincoln, democracy is a
government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Freedom and democracy are often used in place of each other, but the two are not the
same. True, democracy is a set of ideas and principles about freedom, but it also consists of
a set of practices and procedures that have been founded through a long history. In short,
democracy is the institutionalization of freedom. For this reason, any society must possess
time-tested fundamentals of constitutional government, human rights, and equality before
the law to be properly called democratic.

Democracy is always preferable to the alternatives, and the United States has freedom of
assembly and expression, pluralism fails as a general theory because it is really based on a
projection of the institutions and attitudes within a market system to the historical past. It
fails in the case of the United States because there is class domination and class conflict
even though everyday citizens have the right to speak out and vote. It further fails because
it celebrates the pluralism of the United States in a context where people in Canada and
Western Europe have far more electoral power, and the benefits thereof, than they do in the
United States. It ignores the wealth and income distributions, and emphasizes the many
political conflicts on specific short-run issues, highlighting the relatively few cases where
the corporate community does not get exactly what it wants.

Pluralist theory is first of all a statement that advanced capitalist countries are not
monarchies or dictatorships, which is not really necessary. It also emphasizes that there are
freedoms and electoral possibilities in democratic capitalist countries that are not present in
most societies.

The pictures in people’s minds about the outside world are significantly influenced by the
mass media, both what those pictures are about and what those pictures are. The agenda-
setting effects of the mass media also have significant implications beyond the pictures
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created in people’s heads. In the original, traditional domain of agenda-setting, the salience of public issues, there is considerable evidence that the shifting salience of issues on the media agenda often are the basis for public opinion about the overall performance in office of a public leader. Beyond attitudes and opinions, the pictures of reality created by the mass media have implications for personal behaviors, ranging from college applications to voting on election day.

Theories of mass media play a crucial role in shaping, making the public opinion and also effecting on it.

It is right to say that based on the trends shown above, the US media has played a major role in shaping public perception about Muslim Americans. In the immediate six months after 9/11, the positive, contextual, and thematic portrayal of Muslims in the news helped improve public perception of Muslims. The four mass media corporations, CNN, FOX, the New York Times, and the Washington Post, clearly had an agenda to pursue. Right after the first anniversary of 9/11 in 2002, cable news coverage and newspaper articles pursued a different framing style – a negative propaganda style that injected misleading information into public sphere about Muslims.

The mass media plays a crucial role in shaping American public opinion. The mass media has its power to set a nation agenda, to focus public attention to anything it wants and to deliver it to the public.

The agenda-setting influence of the news media is not limited to this initial step of focusing public attention to a particular topics.

The presence or absence of agenda setting effects by the news media can be explained by a psychological trait, our need for orientation.

American attitudes toward Muslims changed in the opposite of the predicted direction immediately after 9/11.
Unfavorable attitudes surfaced even as the sense of threat from terrorism subsided. The largest number of American said that Islam encourages violence. American public opinion was more favorable after 6 months of the events of September, but it dramatically changed into unfavorable. Those unfavorable opinions turned into unfavorable attitudes. Due to the influence of media on public minds, unfavorable attitudes surfaced and American opinions began to grow more negative. The main reason of this dramatically change was the increasing of negative and bad news about Islam.

As we mentioned, the number of articles published on NYT was raised from 300 to 1460 articles after 6 months of the events.

The increasing of negative news created a misconception of Islam and unjustified fear and hatred.

This unjustified fear created negative attitudes toward Islam and Muslims. The consequences of this unjustified fear, more than 500 hate crimes against Muslims inside America were recorded after 6 months of 9/11, and the number increased.

According to the hypothesis of this research; the more negative news, the more fear and the more fear of Islam, the more negative attitudes.

**Recommendations**

When I began writing this research I faced a lot of difficulties one of these obstacles was the lack of studies written in Arabic language, so I decided to write this thesis in English language because I did not find Arabic researches.

All the researches that I have found talking about the concept without dealing with the reasons of Islam phobia and what promotes this concept and feeds it.
After the discussion of my thesis, I decided to translate it to Arabic language to help anyone who decides to write about Islam phobia from another point of view and to become a reference to any future studies.

I recommend to do more researches about this important topic because we have to show the world that Islam is not a religion of war, nor a religion of killing and terrorism, but a religion of tolerance and peace.

Any future researches shall deal for example with two newspapers or more and shall make a comparison between them, in this case the researcher shall gather more information about Islam phobia.
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دور وسائل الإعلام الأمريكية في تعزيز مفهوم الإسلاموفوبيا

إعداد: وسام لوباني

إشراف: د. سمير عوض

الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى تعريف القارئ على الوضع الصعب الذي يعيشه المسلمون في أمريكا خصوصا بعد أحداث الحادي عشر من سبتمبر عام 2001 ودور وسائل الإعلام الأمريكية في زراعة الكراهية تجاه المسلمين في جميع بقاع الممورة وفي الحرب الأمريكية على الإرهاب والارتباط الوثيق بين السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية والإعلام في تهيئة الرأي العام الأمريكي في الحروب التي تشهدها المنطقة العربية.

يستخدم هذا البحث المنهج التاريخي ومنهج تحليل المضمون ويقوم هذا البحث بتفسير ظاهرة الإسلاموفوبيا عن طريق تعريف هذا المفهوم من أكثر من وجهة نظر وأيضا التعرف على المراحل التاريخية لظهور هذا المفهوم.

يسلط هذا البحث الضوء على الدور التي تقوم فيه مؤسسات الإعلام الأمريكية في تشويه صورة الإسلام والمسلمين أمام الرأي العام الأمريكي عن طريق نقل صوره سلبية ومشوهة.

يقوم هذا البحث على ثلاثة مراحل زمنية، حيث تعتبر هذه المراحل مهمة جدا وغنية بالأحداث والهتداث، وهذه المراحل هي:

- التغطية الإعلامية للمسلمين بعد ستة أشهر من أحداث أيلول والتغطية الإعلامية بعد سنة من أحداث أيلول والتي تعتبر المراحل الأولى والتغطية الإعلامية للمسلمين في الذكرى العاشرة لأحداث أيلول.
ومن أبرز الأحداث كانت المظاهرات التي خرج فيها الأمريكيون تنديدا ورفضا لبناء المتحف الإسلامي مكان مبنى التجارة العالمي إن وسائل الإعلام الأمريكية لعبت دورا مهما في تحريض وتعبئة الرأي العام الأمريكي ضد المسلمين وخصوصا مسلمي أمريكا.

إن لأحداث الحادي عشر من أيلول 2001 نتائج سلبية وآثار سلبية على المسلمين في أمريكا بشكل خاص وفي العالم بشكل عام. فالكراهية والعنف ضد المسلمين أصبح واضحا وملموسا والكثير من الشعب الأمريكي أصبح يعتبر الدين الإسلامي على أنه دين يشجع على العنف والإرهاب.