



Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, (İSMUS), VI/2 (2021), s. 39-64

THE ORIENTALIST DISCOURSE LANGUAGE USED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES NEWSPAPER AFTER THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS

Sacide Nur AKKAYA*

Abstract

Language, which is the main communication tool between people, is a phenomenon that can turn into a political propaganda instrument that directs societies and affects the citizens of a country or the people of the world. In this context, this relationship between language and power can manifest itself clearly at various points in social and political life. Especially in the media world, according to various cases, it is seen that the language used has changed, while media organs meet certain events with the reader, they support different thinking structures and maintain an understanding of publishing that serves to adopt them. This directive style attitude can be observed in the news texts of the New York Times newspaper after 9/11 and the policy of America, which initiated a military intervention in Afghanistan on October 7 following the September 11 attacks, is legitimized not only through an act of terrorism, but also through Islam and orientalism, in accordance with some statements in this newspaper. In this study, firstly, the relationship between politics and language will be addressed, and then the forms of orientalist discourse and its equivalent in the New York Times on the axis of the analyzed news will be discussed.

Keywords: *Orientalism, Discourse, The September 11 Attacks, Press, The New York Times*

* Dr., İstanbul Üniversitesi PhD, e-mail: sna26@student.london.ac.uk (Dept: Politics and International Relations).
The Orcid: 0000-0002-1520-9937.

11 EYLÜL SALDIRILARINDAN SONRA NEW YORK TIMES GAZETESİNDE KULLANILAN TERÖR ODAKLI ORYANTALİST SÖYLEM DİLİ

Öz

İnsanlar arasındaki temel iletişim aracı olan dil, toplumları yönlendiren ve bir ülkenin vatandaşlarını veya dünya insanlarını etkileyen siyasi bir propaganda aracına dönüşebilen bir olgudur. Bu bağlamda dil ve iktidar arasındaki bu ilişki, toplumsal ve siyasal yaşamın çeşitli noktalarında kendini açıkça gösterebilmektedir. Özellikle medya dünyasında, çeşitli vakalara göre kullanılan dilin değiştiği, medya organlarının belirli olayları okuyucuya ulaştırırken farklı düşünce yapılarını desteklediği ve bunları benimsemeye hizmet eden bir yayıncılık anlayışını sürdürdüğü görülmektedir. Bu yönlendirici üslup tavrı, New York Times gazetesinin 11 Eylül sonrası haber metinlerinde gözlemlenmekte ve 11 Eylül saldırılarının ardından 7 Ekim’de Afganistan’a askeri müdahaleye başlayan Amerika’nın bu politikası, bu gazetede bazı açıklamalara göre, sade bir terör olayı olarak ele alınmamakta, hatta oryantalist bir söylem dili aracılığıyla meşrulaştırılmaktadır. Bu çalışmada öncelikle siyaset ve dil ilişkisi ele alınacak, ardından oryantalist söylemin biçimleri ve New York Times’taki muadili, incelenen haberler ekseninde tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Oryantalizm, Söylem, 11 Eylül Saldırıları, Basın, New York Times*

Introduction

Terror is an element that is the weapon of a group of minorities, namely the weak, trying to spread an extremist ideology. The most important feature of terrorism is the use of “extreme violence”. This term was first used as a phrase to describe state violence against citizens during the French Revolution. In the last 50 years, terrorism stands out as an element of war that a state or group uses to create political and economic instability in another country, using agents or proxies (Griffiths & O’Callaghan & Steven Roach, 2008, p. 310.). Behind these violent activities lies the motivation to spread the notion of fear among the society by killing and harming people. While the terrorist activities carried out by Marxist-Leninist groups across national borders in the 1970s occupied the world agenda, as a result of an important event in the 2000s, this situation became global and the most remarkable global problem. Following the attacks on the Twin Towers and Pentagon in the USA in 2001, the bloody action carried out by the terrorist group Al-Qaeda introduced to the world the concept of “militant Islamic terror” (Griffiths & O’Callaghan & Steven Roach, pp. 358-360). Although there were extremist acts before that, in the period after the September 11 attack, responsibility was not assigned to a certain group, and a series of terrorist adjectives such as “militancy, violence, extremism, barbarism” became a “clothing” for which Muslims were generally held responsible.

It can be said that this situation did not happen all at once, and its flow became a “form of perception” that continues to exist today as a result of a certain political processes. Although it is stated that the defense policy shaped by the USA after the September 11 attack was planned on a military operation to capture the terrorist Laden and eliminate the Taliban, these military processes were not basically a movement against Al-Qaeda, which was a single organization. Establishing on a “global jihad” incident that provides the legitimacy for the US to invade different parts of the East (Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, etc.); was the main reason for the perception pattern. The important point here is that the activity carried out by a terrorist organization is treated as an act of extremism required by Islamic law. The attitude that has risen from this in the US policy and media has both put the Muslims living in the USA into a difficult situation by turning them into potential terrorists and has caused a very negative perception of Islam on the US citizens (Griffiths & O’Callaghan & Steven Roach, p. 363).

This process, in which the religion of Islam and its members were transformed into a form of terror, actually emerged as a continuation of the external worlds that the American foreign policy had constantly invented in historical continuity in order to realize its imperial goals. Because, Western power in the form of European colonialism in the nineteenth century and American supremacy in the twentieth century brought Western culture to many parts of the contemporary World (Huntington, 2015, p. 124.), and a modernization process was experienced under the name of modernization, in which Western powers benefited from the assets of the Eastern natives. Defined as universality for the West, this American supremacy has meant imperialism for other civilizations. In order to keep this process alive and to preserve the superior status of the West in the context of expansionist movements, various arguments were kept alive, and the interests of the West were defined as the interests of the people of the world, and the colonialist global actions centered on West-America thus gained legitimacy (Huntington, p. 268). After the disintegration of the Soviet Union,

America, which put into effect the policy of spreading to every land that it has interests as the only Superpower of the world, continues to benefit from the resources located on the borders of other nations, while it is seen that the West, which was invented by orientalism, got support from the ways of defining the East. Especially in the period from the September 11 attack to the occupation of Afghanistan by the USA, it is seen that the intervention to these lands has been made legitimate by using the power of the media and the metaphor of "Islamic terrorism"; which was made legitimate by using the power of the media, and which was constructed through the country's leading media organs; was used in a framework that will serve the internalization of this concept in the eyes of the US public.

In this article, which was prepared based on these facts, the appearance of this form of discourse in the New York Times, which helped the occupation processes and ultimately served to create an "ordered terror perception" in the minds, was examined. In this context, the "orientalist discourse language" that can be observed in many areas of the American media is analyzed based on the news in the "World" news of the New York Times newspaper, one of the leading media organs of the country. In the news analyzed in this context, it is revealed that an objective journalistic language was not used after September 11. While describing and analyzing the attack, it was seen that in the background of the newspaper language, a single voice containing anti-Muslim rhetoric was dominated and the concept of terrorism was shown side by side with the religion of Islam within the framework of a specific discourse.

1. Methodology of the Study

Based on the news texts published in the New York Times in a certain period of time, this research, in which a form of discourse is discussed in detail, has been put forward by using the method of "critical discourse analysis" through media publications. Discourse analysis, which is a research method that deals with the meaning products formed through speech and texts, is a scientific approach that examines how the media positions and classifies reality, and then performs a categorization process over the language used. The ultimate goal of the analyst is to uncover discourse that has a social and political impact that will transform existing relations of power and domination (Çağlar, 2010, pp. 199-204). In this context, for this study, the framework in which the Western media's view of Eastern civilization is shaped and the manifestations of orientalist, domination-oriented, colonialist approaches in this point of view have been observed in the New York Times newspaper. The understanding of orientalism mentioned within the scope of the article is based on the scientific framework that Edward Said created in his book called "Orientalism". The date range, which is the subject of the review, is limited from the date of the September 11 attack to October 7, when the invasion of Afghanistan began. This date range has been chosen in order to be able to see more clearly and analyze the process of America's first official intervention against its new terrorist identity. In the said date range, all the news published in the "World" class were examined separately and it was seen that the contents that could be material for this article were included in the news on terrorism and defense policies, which are mostly given under the title "A Nation Challenged". Apart from these articles, the editorials of the newspaper or other classifications of the newspaper have not been addressed.

The discourse analysis made on these articles shows that although some unknown persons or organizations responsible for the attack, it is clear or possible to observe that there is quite detailed information around implicit expressions in the newspaper about the information related to the “fact” that this attack was carried out by a Middle Eastern group. It is possible to say that this form of discourse includes an expression structure dominated by the orientalist perspective, which is shaped by the West’s view of the East and includes colonialist aims, as we will discuss in this article. In this context, according to the language of discourse in the news of the newspaper; it can be stated that the framework which points to these issues are classified on such headlines and examined in a detailed way: “Muslims choosing members of other religions as a target in terms of terrorizing the West”, “members of the religion of Islam may be in the position of potential people who may be involved in terrorism” and “the obligation of America’s mission to bring peace to the barbarian Middle East.”

2. 9/11 Attack and US Policy: Initial and Concluding Discussion

The USA, which was at the center of a grouping of multi-civilizational countries in order to prevent the further expansion of the Soviet Union during the Cold War, continued its efforts to impose its own socio-political order and model on the World by using other states or groups with its policies of balance and fear. After the Cold War ended with the victory of the USA and its allies, the international system turned into a unipolar structure and the main actor of this “New World Order” was America. The USA, which has a military, economic and political power that cannot be balanced, greatly increased its freedom of action in the world geopolitics between 1990-2000 and aimed to become a global empire as the only superpower of the World. This strong structure acted within the framework of a system based on unilateralism, in which an expansionist understanding was adopted, instead of being built on the concept of multilateralism in accordance with the liberal understanding. In this new era, when the Cold War ended, Huntington expressed that the most important differences between peoples in the World are not ideological, political or economic, but cultural differences and he emphasized the use of politics in defining these identities in this process where peoples began to define themselves with cultural values, traditions and institutions. In this process, in which nation-states come to the fore as the main actors in world events, the behavior of nation-states is shaped by power and wealth, but also by cultural preferences and differences, as in the past. The most important state blocs are no longer developing around two superpowers as in the Cold War era, but around the world’s seven or eight basic civilizations. This means that the rivalry of the superpowers is replaced by the clash of civilizations. The main axis of post-Cold War World politics is the struggles between Western power and culture and the power and power of non-Western civilizations (Kantarıcı, 2012, pp. 50-68).

In this conflict, the West being the most powerful civilization and holding serious opportunities such as military and communication resources; it also meant the formation of a political process in which Western culture was the focus in shaping the new World order. In this context, the US policy developed after September 11 stands there as one of the most important example in the political history of how cultural codes are used politically in the

context of wars between civilizations. With the Bush Doctrine announced after the attacks, in the process when the USA started intercontinental operations with its great military power and the American foreign policy was shaped within the framework of a superpower phenomenon (Kantarci, p. 73), the expansionist movements were legally legitimized around this doctrine and it is seen that the concept of “Islamic terrorism” as an external enemy is presented as an argument for this approach against the people of the USA and other people in the world. This concept, which was activated with the September 11 attacks, as will be explained in detail in the following pages of this article, the idea that orientalism has formed over the past centuries, where the West naturally defends superiority over the East, has created a very suitable cultural basis and a vision around a vision in which civilizations are considered the enemy, not individuals. By developing a defense strategy, Islam and all its elements were considered as a part of this negative structure. The process in which the Clinton administration promoted cultural diversity in the 1990s evolved into another direction with the Bush doctrine after the September 11 attacks (Huntington, p. 459), and in this context, years of occupation practices, as in the case of Afghanistan, were carried out with arms, as well as the image of Islamic terrorism was institutionalized by using the power of the media.

After the September 11 attacks, a suitable ground was created with the help of certain cultural codes in order for the claims of the American-made “new world order” to come true after the Cold War, and the American foreign policy, which changed in practice after the attacks, was able to take any action that it perceived as potential or real for its national interests and placed the “preventive” and “pre-emptive” attack ideas against a threat at the center of its foreign policy trend. It is seen that this “more aggressive” and “one-sided” tendency of USA brings an excessive expansionism with it and at the same, the USA tries to legitimize by saying that it does this for the security of the whole world. The existing prejudice about Islam, the historical other of Western civilization, helped the Bush administration win popular consent for its aggressive foreign policy, and the Bush administration, with the support of the media and military, succeeded in reassuring the American public that the war on terrorism was necessary and inevitable. In this context, the invasion of Afghanistan that started about a month after the September 11 attacks and the invasion of Iraq that started in March 2003; in terms of its political, economic and social consequences, it has shown to the whole world that what has been done is the steps of a strategy aimed at globalizing and consolidating the hegemony of the USA. After the September 11 attacks, the USA, which followed a foreign policy plan to impose its absolute sovereignty on the entire international system, entered into a very aggressive and foreign policy orientation in line with this purpose, and for the first time in its history began to spread excessively.

The fact that the USA was exposed to a terrorist act that took place in its own territory created a unique ground both in the national and international arena for the US administration to follow unilateral policies, and this situation caused the local and global opposition to remain rather weak against the invasion of Afghanistan, which was legitimized under the name of the war against terrorism. In this context, the idea that states can benefit through expansionism and the exaggeration of this idea by the state administration, directs states to aggressive policies that harm themselves and their aims, and causes them to pass into the over-expansion stage as more aggressive. However, in this process, the state that implements the strategy harms itself and is constantly in expansionism towards the environment, causing the costs of expansionism to exceed the benefit obtained after a point. It is

stated that the USA has spent around 4.5 trillion dollars within the scope of military operations and other expenses since 2001 in order to fully establish its hegemony in Afghanistan, Iraq and other regions. In this sense, the USA faced financial losses and failed to ensure the security of its soldiers and superiors in Iraq, Afghanistan and other Middle Eastern countries. As a result of the operations carried out since 2001, according to official figures, 5,881 US soldiers died in Iraq and Afghanistan. The cost created by the US operations in Iraq and Afghanistan caused a major recession in the US economy and the US budget started to run continuously. This situation shows that; although the USA gains a great deal by controlling the natural resources of Iraq and Afghanistan; in fact, when considered in the short term, it had to bear a serious cost that exceeded its earnings (Ataman & Gökcan, 2012, p. 199-210). This process shows that a 20-year period of “intervention” did not bring more freedom or democracy to Iraq or Afghanistan, as the US initially claimed, and that the US presence even more damaged the concept of peace in these lands. This situation reveals that the concept of freedom should not be treated like a crusade, that it is only a suggestion and cannot be gained through expansionist activities. While the unwarranted intervention in Iraq increased the untimely chaos in the region, the Afghanistan operation took its place in history as a bigger failure. As a matter of fact, the “extreme expansionist” US policy that started in 2001 resulted in the surrender of these lands to the Taliban in 2021. This political failure has not only been a political defeat for a country, but has also condemned the people of Afghanistan, which it promised to bring peace, to an atmosphere of endless turmoil and insecurity of the Taliban, which is only united by hatred of America and has many conflicts within itself. On the one hand, the “crazy interventionism” attitude that started in the 21st century and then, the Biden administration’s extremely unorganized and evasive withdrawal from Kabul, causing a “mindless wholesale return migration”; it has taken its place in the historical process as the important examples of the American inconsistency, excessive expansion and the extreme retreat caused by it (Habertürk, 2022, “Future Ideas-How Will Migrations Change The World?”).

3. Orientalism and the Language of Discourse Created by This Structure

Ideologies that concern a society and affect the individuals of that society first of all enter people’s lives orally and then grow like an avalanche with the contribution of literary works and create sociological effects. The ideology of orientalism, which is the name given to all the studies conducted by Western researchers on issues such as the culture, language, religion, race and life styles of Eastern societies, has emerged as a simple thought for the first time, although it has reflected in all areas of life. Then, it has grown and developed with oral and written culture. Subsequently, with the power of countless works written, orientalism has become a reality that feeds Western countries and maintains its existence strongly today. This great literary diversity is visibly embodied in letters, diaries, memoirs, travel writings, historical-fictional texts, religious-literary texts, essays, novels, stories, poems and drama (Kula, 2011, p. XXXIII).

The basis of the concept of orientalism, which entered *Dictionnaire De L’Academie Française* in 1838 with the meaning of “Oriental study”, is that Western orientalist perceive the data about Eastern lands and people in a way that will serve their own benefits and, based on this perception, develop an orientalist and dominant logic of attitude. In this logical framework, the East is the great “other” that helps the West justify its reality (Kömeçoğlu, 2007, p. 141). Considering orientalism as a model of thought, Bryan Turner states that this model

is based on a special epistemology and ontology that creates a radical distinction between Orient and Occident, Western and Eastern. According to Turner, this concept can also be regarded as a set of institutions, disciplines and activities specific to Western universities interested in the study of oriental societies and cultures. In other words, it is possible to see orientalism as a unified institute that basically deals with the Orient (Turner, 2002, p. 148). Putting all studies on the Orient into a definition of “the East produced to serve the West”, does not mean that all of these studies serve against the Easterner. However, the fact that a significant part of the Eastern image in the European-American media is full of deliberate errors and distortions, and this known false information is passed down from generation to generation, can be seen as a situation that shows that orientalist products are produced on a large scale for the disadvantage of non-Western societies (Turner, p. 435).

Orientalist activities, in the 11-17. centuries, while topics such as Eastern originated book translations and language education developed intertwined with branches such as literature, sociology, and theology, the Western orientalism's effort to recognize Eastern societies, became an expansionist activity carried out with some political initiatives and actual wars between the 18-20. centuries. In the 21st century, it is possible to say that orientalist representations are expressed through a visual language that directly affects the cultural hegemony manifested through art, literature, design and communication, and that orientalist studies have become works for political benefit, directly involving the governments of the countries. This means that the great states, which have colonial aims against other states, transform orientalism according to their needs in the new age. By creating state-funded funds for these studies, comprehensive studies on the East are carried out and this information is used in these expansionist processes. An example of this is the Middle East Studies Association, founded in Washington in 1966, operating partly under the control of the Federal government. In this article, as a reflection of the orientalist mindset in the American media, a detailed analysis of the juxtaposition of the concepts of terrorism and Islam will be made through newspaper language.

4. Presence of “Directive Political Discourse and Image” in the Media

According to Foucault, who examines the relationship between knowledge and power, “truth” depends on the power systems that produce and sustain it in a circular relationship, and the powers that create it and then expand it. So that, the political problem is not wrong, illusion, alienated consciousness or ideology; it is “the information itself” (Kahraman, 2002, p. 159). In this context, orientalism, which we define as the ideological beginning of the expansionist political policies of some states, represents an important part of the relationship between knowledge and power. Edward Said explains this situation as “putting everything that has been thought, said or even done about the East in certain patterns in an intellectual approach” (Said, 1998, p. 27). That is, discourse languages serving specific purposes can be seen as an intellectual part of the expansionist activities of states.

Today's representation of “orientalism”, which we define as one of the behaviors of governments, does not progress as linearly as it used to be, and it is shaped to create universal and multifaceted effects with the strong use of the media & culture industry. In fact, how certain political social events today will be perceived by the society can be guided/directed by images provided by the media. In this respect, American-European television programs and series, which can be considered as an important example, stand out as productions watched

in the world with their strong infrastructure. As a matter of fact, it is seen that there is always a “Great Enemy” in line with US foreign policies in the politically fictional Hollywood cinema: the Japanese and Nazis in the Second World War, the Russians during the Cold War and the Arabs after the Cold War (Güngör, 2011, p. 3). Here, it would be appropriate to state that the orientalist attitude, which we will examine mostly towards Muslims and Middle Easterners in this article, is an approach not only towards the members of the Islamic religion but also towards the whole world except itself.

As a branch of orientalist activities in the construction of cultural identity, especially in the depiction of the modern Middle East, Hollywood cinema is used as a powerful cultural production tool. Lina Khatib concluded that in a total of 70 American and Arab films released between 1980 and 2005, Hollywood films presented a uniform Arab identity focused on religion and extremism, and different aspects of Arab individuality were depicted only in Arab productions (For more information: Khatib, 2006). Khatib also states that while there is an emphasis on sexism in these productions, this issue is used to demonize Arabs and to legitimize America’s actions. For example, in *The Mummy* movie released in 1999, American characters were portrayed as civilized, while Egyptians were clearly portrayed as ignorant and barbarian.

In this context, since the beginning of the 20th century, the perception of the Easterners and Muslims shaped around the image of the “barbarian Oriental” in the American media, after the September 11 attack in 2001, as a continuation of this process and with the “information production policy” carried out through the media, has transformed into “terrorist Eastern”. As a matter of fact, a military campaign called “War on Terrorism” was launched under the leadership of the USA to eliminate the threat of terrorism, and around this global campaign, US officials described 9/11 attacks as “war actions” against the Western civilization. As a result, this new type of war against terrorism has turned into a campaign that transcends state borders and operates outside the scope of international criminal law in many respects. It is possible to list the general strategic priorities of the “war on terrorism”, which is at the center of the Bush administration’s foreign policy, as the seizure of all the financial assets of terrorists, the intervention of the states hosting terrorists, and the spreading of democracy to the regions in the Middle East where authoritarian governments have long been suppressed. In this context, the US-led invasion of Afghanistan was the first official intervention of the “war on terror”. The second was the Iraq war, which the UN and the international community define as a “unsuccessful and unnecessary war.”

These military interventions took their place in the pages of history as processes in which the peace, security and rights of citizens were never protected. This process which needs to be questioned clearly whether it is a just war or just a legitimate defense (Griffiths, O’Callaghan & Roach, pp. 331-332) and the global “War on Terror” campaign, contributed to the strengthening of the fear of Islam (Islamofobia) which has escalated into Western societies today and has become widespread by turning into an industry and sometimes causing severe acts of violence. The disastrous events of September 11 made it difficult to notice many positive developments; in contrast to the classical American legal maxim, Islam and Muslims have become “guilty until proven innocent”. Islam is often seen as the cause, not the context, of radicalism, extremism, and terrorism. Because Islam was not well known in the West, the first encounter with Islam for many Americans coincides with a recent history based on the Iranian Revolution in 1978 and the hostage crisis in the American embassy;

the feeling of insecurity and fear stemming from terrorism, allowing Islam to be used as a reflection of certain areas of concern by some state policies; with the effect of a certain form of discourse used through the media, the anxiety felt towards Muslims fed their thoughts of hatred and discrimination (Lean, 2015, pp. 7-20). Of course, it is not possible for a distorted image of Islam to affect the masses objectively and positively.

As a matter of fact, although the president of the period George Bush, in many statements emphasized the mission of “bringing peace to the East” as the main purpose of the war waged by the USA against Afghanistan, which was blamed for the attack and later against other Middle Eastern countries; in the following years, the humanitarian crises experienced and the extremely negative perception of Muslims in Western societies stand out as concrete facts showing the formation and outcome of these orientalist goals in the Eastern lands. In this context, orientalism has turned into a phenomenon that has not ended with the colonial process and is used for the purpose of producing information that will provide a basis for legitimacy for some political movements. This conscious structure, which directly or indirectly controls the power and sovereignty of a nation over other spheres, includes the “forms of discourse” that are the subject of this article.

5. Orientalist Discourse Language in the New York Times After the September 11 Attacks

The New York Times, which has been one of the leading media organs of the American State since 1851, is a mirror of the political and social events of the period with its extensive news content and deep-rooted journalism culture. The New York Times, which is an important branch of the American media with its wide readership and deep-rooted structure, stands out as an archive that should be examined in terms of observing the political and social ideas of the American society and its administrators. In this context, when the newspaper archives belonging to the September 11 attack are examined, it is seen that a certain discourse language is used about the Eastern phenomenon, which is positioned as an opposing target around the said attack. In the newspaper, which covered many news about the responsibilities of the post-attack process, this negative process was not attributed to a certain terrorist organization, but in the style of language used, the East was terrorized globally around this terrorist act and Islam, which is seen as belonging to the East, is also organically positioned side by side with the concept of terrorism.

This situation brings to mind that the culture of orientalism develops an appropriate ideology in alliance with political and economic methods against the wide geography it wants to intervene, and in this direction, it uses the power of writing to influence the social mindset with concepts such as the press and the media, and positioning a certain “other” about the East. In this picture, the West, which is positioned against the backward East due to its organic qualities, is placed as a phenomenon that has to intervene in this barbarian way of life. The effect of this historical-cultural accumulation (Kula, p. XLII) that develops around the attitude of orientalism on individuals and the state of the West representing the East and dominating the East “naturally” is transferred to future generations through a collective consciousness (Kula, p. XXXV). In this context, when the literary language of the New York Times is examined, it is seen that the September 11 attack is handled within the framework of this “specified language of discourse”, as we will present the examples below.

5.1. Which one is the “Real Target”; Terror or the Islamic World?

The terror acts carried out against the Twin Towers and Pentagon in the USA on September 11, 2001, with their destructiveness and difference in attack dynamics, caused serious changes in American defense policy. In the statements made by the State, it was pointed out that the terrorist-oriented acts the country has been subjected to actually made a “new enemy” visible. Stating that it is faced with a new terrorist identity, the American government set out to develop new policies in this context. Now, this policy of America, which declared that it was having a new perspective on terrorism, was reflected in newspaper reports with the statement that “the approach to issues such as missile defense, globalization and terrorism will change”: (John Vinocur, 2001, “The New World Order Is a Clash of Civilizations”).

“As de facto acts of war against America on its soil, the terror raids not only demanded a committed response from the world community but altered how Americans and their allies would approach issues like the Israeli-Palestinian struggle, missile defense, globalization and terrorism itself.”

Stating that it will make new and different moves against terrorism and even change its defense policy based on this issue, the American government began to give signals about the responsible people of the attack. Although these signals seemed to be related to the states that America saw as the source of terrorism, in fact, the target was not a specific land or country that was thought to protect the terrorist organization; it was the whole of the Middle East. Nearly a month later, although the US will carry out a military intervention in Afghanistan on the grounds that it was protecting the chief responsible of the terrorist act, the news in the NY Times newspaper stated that the target determined as “against the new terrorist identity”; was referred as the “Middle East” where “rogue” regimes took place: (Joseph Fitchett, 2001, “Like the Attack in 1941, Air Terrorism Could Provoke Severe Repercussions: For Washington, a Modern Pearl Harbor”, The New York Times).

“Bush administration and European officials and analysts generally took the view that the anti-U.S. attacks originated in the Middle East, probably with backing from the regimes in rogue states.”

In line with the statements of Richard Perle, a former Pentagon official, it was explained that terrorist attacks were carried out with the “assistance of governments supporting terrorists”; and also stated that, as the new terrorist policy of the state, a “systematic retaliation policy” will be implemented against all governments that helped this terrorist activity:

“This could not have happened without the help of governments that back terrorists,” according to Richard Perle, an adviser to President Bush and a former Pentagon official in the Reagan administration.

The shock of the attack, Mr. Perle said, would galvanize U.S. policy into a systematic policy of retaliating severely against any foreign governments that have helped terrorists working against the United States. Other sources, who declined to be identified, predicted quick U.S. military strikes against targets in the Middle East, probably against Afghanistan, the operating base of the bin Laden network.” (Fitchett, 2001).

In the news published on the following dates, it is seen that the title of “Islamic” was added to the geographical positioning, which is stated to host the terrorist network. When talking about Laden, who is seen as the chief responsible of the actions, it is frequently emphasized that this person is a “Muslim militant” instead of talking about himself as a simple terrorist. While the intervention in this terror network, which is claimed to cover “a number of Asian and African countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Pakistan”, is presented as America’s only chance; with this form of discourse, a terrorist act is not attributed to a certain group or organization and it is understood that these acts are evaluated over a “geographical region” and the American attacks, which may include the whole of “Asia and Africa”, are legitimized through these terrorist attacks:

“Senior officials cast aside the niceties of diplomatic language and the military restraint that the United States had manifested in dealing with past terrorist attacks, promising that the response to Tuesday’s suicide missions in New York and near Washington would be “a campaign, not a single action,” that might last a year or more.

Such a campaign could involve American forces in protracted fighting against a number of Asian and African countries, like Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan and even Pakistan, which occupies a vital strategic position south of Afghanistan, where the Islamic militant Osama bin Laden is believed to be based” (R. W. Apple Jr., 2001, “No Middle Ground”, The New York Times).

The question that comes to mind here is, “Is the target set by America after the 9/11 attacks terrorism or the entire Islamic world?” Because, while trying to clearly identify those responsible for a bloody terrorist act; the focus is not on a terrorist organization, but on all members of a religion and region. In some news in the newspaper, it is clearly stated that in order to deal with terrorism, it is necessary to “deal” not with Laden and his organization but with the “Islamic world”. As a matter of fact, this policy has brought about consequences (Lean, p. 21) such as profiling Muslims, the requirement of a special identity card for American Muslims, and questioning the loyalty of all Muslim citizens:

“As for terrorism, it was no longer an American obsession that some could dismiss as an excuse for incompetence and one-sidedness in dealing with the Islamic world.

A visitor talking to Mr. Schroeder just minutes after the attacks first became known saw a horror-struck man who knew that the world had experienced a monumental event.” (Vinocur, 2001).

It is also mentioned in another news in the newspaper that the source of terrorism is seen as the whole understanding of Islam and not specific for certain countries. America, which has to protect itself against bloody actions, will have to go through a process “full of danger and will come into conflict with a large part of the Islamic world” while fighting against Laden. These expressions work in the reader’s consciousness as a religion that has an organic connection with radical terrorism, by moving away from associating Islam with peace:

“Such steps might fall short of a knockout blow to the Taliban. Complicating the administration’s planning, the element of surprise has been lost. The Taliban and Mr. bin Laden’s men are expecting a bombing attack and have been evacuating their camps and bases, according to American intelligence.

But there is a recognition that to go further by carrying out a Soviet-style occupation with thousands of troops would place the United States at odds with much of the Islamic world and is fraught with danger” (Michael R. Gordon, 2001, “After: The Strategy; A New War And Its Scale”, The New York Times).

As a matter of fact, this “total” point of view is not limited to the newspaper reports or the foreign policy discourses of the USA. The terrorist act carried out by a radical and minority group brings a race and religion to the new terror defined by the West. Because, while fighting against terrorism, Central American governments have also initiated the process of “examining the bank accounts of Arab residents”, regardless of whether they are related to terrorism or not. Although it is stated that a total defense was made against Laden and his supporters within the scope of the fight against terrorism, it is seen that the process in question diverged from this, and an entire race is blamed through a terrorist minority group:

“Representatives of Central America’s governments announced that they would create a comprehensive regional security plan to combat terrorism and organized crime. The heads of state, who met soon after the Sept. 11 attacks in New York and Washington, proposed that the Central American Security Commission present a plan in 20 days to coordinate security, intelligence and border control activities in the region. Several nations are already examining bank accounts held by Arab residents, while Nicaraguan officials are investigating claims that immigrant smugglers provided false documents to scores of Arab immigrants” (David Gonzalez, 2001, “World Briefing The Americas: Honduras: Regional Anti-terrorism Project”, The New York Times).

5.2. The Empire of Fear

The negative perception of the East shaped around the concept of terrorism after September 11 was not only an official policy of the state, but also turned into a form of discourse that would negatively affect members of the society. In the articles we examine in the newspaper, it is observed that within the scope of the fight against terrorism, an empire of fear has been established on the society. It is a certain fact that the September 11 attacks are a very scary, sad and bloody act of terrorism for American and world history. In the face of this reality, instead of fighting terrorism in a balanced way that does not frighten the society; it is seen that the language of discourse in the newspaper is based on the perception that the American people are facing “an Eastern enemy who should be afraid and cautious at all times”. It can be said that this perception has two different faces, within the American society and in the international arena. In this context, thanks to the language of discourse in the newspaper, rather than reporting the issue by emphasizing the terrorist act carried out by a certain group; the news of pro-terrorism Muslim societies that see Western countries as targets are presented to the readers, and the American indigenous people, who do not belong to the religion of Islam, are dragged into an atmosphere of fear.

5.2.1. Terrorist Muslims Who Have Targeted the West

Although it was announced that Laden, who was the patronage of Afghanistan, was targeted as the responsible of the attacks and that revenge activities were built on it, both the geographical positioning of the newly defined terrorism refers to the whole of the Middle East and that these new type of terrorists actually exist all over the world. As a matter of fact,

US Defense Secretary Rumsfeld saying that “The terrorist organization Al-Qaeda headed by Mr. bin Laden can operate in 50 to 60 countries and this network is only one of many networks that President Bush has promised to defeat” (R. Gordon & Eric Schmitt, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: The Combat; Scarcity of Afghanistan Targets Prompts U.S. to Change Strategy”, The New York Times) indicates an international network that has chosen West as a target. The striking point in the news in the newspaper is that although the relationship between Islam and terrorism is mostly expressed through the Middle East, “militant Muslims” in other countries are referred to and this process is described as an “Islamic terror network” covering the whole world. Russia, Indonesia and China are presented as the other countries that have suffered from the Islamic militancy that threatens America. Even Indonesia, a Muslim country, is ready to cooperate with America in intervening in this terrorist network, while the emphasis on “militant Islamic violence” instead of radical terrorism is clearly stands out in newspaper reports:

“When the presidents of the United States and Indonesia meet in Washington on Wednesday, they will share an urgent concern: the threat of militant Islamic violence” (Seth Mydans, 2001, “Bush Meeting Jakarta Leader; Islamic Militancy Is Likely Topic”, The New York Times).

“Al Chaidar, a researcher at the University of Indonesia and a member of a militant Islamic group, said thousands of Indonesians did join the war against Russia in Afghanistan a decade ago” (Mydans, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: The Pacific; Indonesia Radicals Issue Threats of Holy War”, The New York Times).

While explaining the concept of violence and terrorism in Indonesia, not only the problem of terrorism in the country is emphasized; also referring to the “concern arising from the increase in the last few years” of terrorist acts originating from Islam; the existence of these acts of violence is verified by the reader. As a matter of fact, according to these news, some negative situations such as “instability, lawlessness and economic difficulties” in Indonesia facilitate the “root and growth of radical Islam”:

“Western officials have been expressing increasing concern over the past couple of years that instability, lawlessness and economic hardship in Indonesia are making it easier for radical Islam, with support from like-minded groups abroad, to take root and grow” (Michael Richardson, 2001, “Anti-Terror Effort May Provoke Her Foes: Megawati Faces Risk In Backing the U.S.”, The New York Times).

While it is being explained that the “Muslim terrorism” faced by America is not only the problem of the USA; The Chechen struggle in Russia is also defined as “Islamic terrorism”. In this way of expression, intervention in this “religious” terror network is made quite legitimate. In the news about Russia’s open support for this struggle, religion of Islam and extremism are again stand side by side:

“In a brief speech on nationwide television, Mr. Putin said that “it goes without saying that we are prepared to make a contribution” to an international antiterrorist campaign, and that other forms of cooperation with outside states in that battle are possible as well.

The nature of that cooperation, he said, “will depend directly on the general level and quality of our relations with these countries and on the mutual understanding in the sphere of struggle against international terrorism.”

That was a clear and pointed reference to Russia’s own problems with Islamic extremists in the breakaway province of Chechnya, where the Kremlin has been repeatedly accused by the West of sanctioning brutality and even criminal behavior by its own troops” (Michael Wines, 2001, “Putin Offers Backing to U.S. for Anti-Terror Operations”, The New York Times).

Another country where Islam and terrorism are mentioned together is China, the most populous country in the world. Terrorist activities in many different parts of the world are defined around a similar definition and targeting only a certain religion. Indeed, “like Russia, China too” has “practical reasons” to support the US campaign against these violent “Islamist fundamentalists”:

“Like Russia, which has also performed a stunning about-face, China has practical reasons for supporting a campaign against violent Islamic fundamentalists. Though it has been spared any bloody conflict comparable to that in Chechnya, China fears the emergence of unrest and terrorism at home, most immediately in the largely Muslim frontier province of Xinjiang, where a stewing separatist movement has occasionally set off bombs or attacked the police” (Erik Eckholm, 2001, “China’s About-Face: Support for U.S. on Terror”, The New York Times).

5.3. Barbarian Eastern

One of the basic thinking structures on which the productions of orientalism, which has a hegemonic and reductionist approach on the East, are built on, is the relationship of “East and barbarism”. In this context, the Eastern lands are seen as organically backward and in need of civilization. It seems impossible for a civilized and developed mindset to take place in this depiction of barbarian human societies defined by orientalism. As a matter of fact, it is seen that the news in the New York Times articles published between 11 September and 7 October contain traces of the mentality that implies that the East was “definitely uncivilized”. One of the most obvious examples of this comes to life in President Bush’s statements. In a press release a week after the attack, the President made a statement with an “unusually rough voice” about the capture process of this “militant Islamic leader”. In this speech, which blends the relationship between religion and violence, the way of behavior defined as Islamic terrorism is explained with the words “cutting, hitting and hiding the throats of women on airplanes”, according to Bush. Indeed, it is clear that the attack in question was monstrous. The point we want to draw attention to is that the President emphasizes Islam and bigotry along with terrorism:

“Mr. Bush used blunt language in describing the enemy in what is expected to become the most sweeping international assault ever against terrorism.

“There are no rules,” Mr. Bush said during a visit to the Pentagon on Monday. “It’s barbaric behavior. They slit throats of women on airplanes in order to achieve an objective that is beyond comprehension, and they like to hit and then they like to hide out” (Brian Knowlton, 2001, “Terror in America / ‘We’re Going to Smoke Them Out’: President Airs His Anger”, The New York Times).

The juxtaposition of the religion of Islam with barbarism, apart from terrorism, shows its presence in many different news items in the newspaper. It is an obvious fact that the scenes conveyed in the context of the backwardness of the East can be correct on the basis of individuals and regions. Indeed, there is nothing humanistic in turning a full passenger plane into a 150-ton missile and aiming it at New York’s skyscrapers. What is meant to be made here is that this monstrous attitude and the concept of extremism, carried out by 19 terrorists, is not a concept that belongs to any faith, not just one religion. Just as the attack of a Christian fundamentalist does not mean that all Christians are like that, the same is true of the Islamic faith. However, the narrative language of the news stories seems to present the concept of barbarism as a common feature of all Muslims of different races.

Around the news about the perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, it is seen that not only Afghanistan supporting the criminal Laden, but also various stories about the whole East are reflected in the news texts. As a continuation of the radicalism in Afghanistan, a similarly militant group of people from Pakistan is mentioned and the process in question is not specific to a certain radical group, but as a situation that represents all Muslims. Describing the belief that “Muslims are all equal in front of the God” through a scene from daily life, the reporter expresses that for these people who are so poor having empty pockets, the religion is seen as a “shelter”. The origin of this comment is the result of the reporter’s observation of the East:

“Islam is the great refuge of Pakistan’s masses. In mosques, in the fields, on the roadsides, men drop to their knees and perform their daily prayers. However empty their pockets, they are equal in these genuflections before God.” (Barry Bearak, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: News Analysis; In Pakistan, A Shaky Ally”, The New York Times).

The idea of the backwardness of the East is reinforced by the expressions of the natives of these lands who have been educated in the West (Rick Bragg, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: The Classes; Pakistan Is 2 Worlds: One Urbane, One Enraged”, The New York Times). Added to that, it is stated that these barbaric attitudes proceed in the same way on the state level. The situation of the absolute monarchies in Europe comes to mind with this newspaper report, which is stated to be no alternative to authoritarian governments in the Muslim Middle East:

“But perhaps none of that, scholars said, would be perceived as so burning if there were other outlets for discontent. Nowhere in the Muslim Middle East, not in Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia or anywhere else, is there a true alternative to what are essentially authoritarian governments.” (Douglas Jehl, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: The Muslims; More Extremists Find Basis for Rebellion in Islam”, The New York Times).

Another point that draws attention in the Eastern portrait in the newspaper is that people who do not support Laden’s terrorist acts, despite being a member of Eastern society, also

have negative moral characteristics. It can be said that the story of an educated and decent Muslim is not included in these news texts, which include Muslims from different parts of the world such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Indonesia, China and Russia. When talking about the commander named Ahmed Shah Mesud, who resisted the Taliban, it is stated that he was a person who respected some human rights and had a reasonable stance against the West. This person, who bears the rare traces of modernity among the people and administration of Afghanistan, actually does not seem so modern when “examined more closely”. Indeed, he grows the poppy crop used for drug making “like every Afghan”, and follows conservative Afghan traditions as his point of view on women:

“Thousands of Afghan fighters streamed through the dusty mountain trails of the Panjshir Valley today to bury Ahmed Shah Massoud, their legendary commander who held together the last remaining resistance to the Taliban government. ...

As the Taliban grew internationally notorious, banning television and imposing beards, sheathing women head-to-toe and amputating the hands of thieves, Mr. Massoud enjoyed presenting himself to the West as a “reasonable” Muslim.

“I am for the rights of women,” he said. “Women can work. Women can go to school.”

He made a good impression on Westerners - and he knew this. He spoke French. He liked to reflect on his study of architecture. More than anything he cut a dapper figure, with a forehead full of deep furrows, with a tightly tailored jacket, with the cocked pakool.

But upon closer inspection he did not always seem a man of modernity and enlightenment. When the Taliban banned the growing of poppy last year, Mr. Massoud allowed the crop to flourish in his own domain. And once asked if his own wife wore the head-to-toe burqa, he smiled sheepishly and replied, “Yes, this is the custom” (Barry Bearak, 2001.09.17, “Rebel Chief Who Fought The Taliban Is Buried”, The New York Times).

Another person condemning the violent acts of Laden, the head of the terrorist organization, is a Muslim named Bakri. The Syrian-born Omar Bakri Muhammad, who condemned the attacks and declared his opposition to violence, is in line with the profile of the Muslim “who is not modern and does not see peace as a solution” in the context of ideological ideas. Indeed, although he says he is against terrorism, according to Bakri’s Islamic thought, “armed struggle” is the only way to save Muslim lands. It is noteworthy that the views of Bakri, the founder of the “Salafi jihadist network” called Al-Muhajiroun, are also included in the profile against Laden’s terrorist acts. Against terrorism, an example is set that highlights the relationship between Islam and violence:

“Mr. Bakri, the Syrian-born judge, sat for an hourlong interview in a modernistic office building housing mostly high-tech businesses in rundown Tottenham.

While his group disavows violence in free societies, its manifesto, which is distributed to visitors, says its members believe that jihad (i.e. armed struggle) is the only Islamic way to liberate Muslim land under occupation, e.g. Palestine, Kashmir, India, Chechnya and Bosnia, etc.

“We carry Islam as a political belief, as a complete system; we don’t carry Islam as a religion,” said Mr. Bakri, 43, a bearded and exuberant man clad in black robes and a black fez. “It’s an ideology,” he said, adding that its aim was to restore the Islamic caliphate as a mighty power.

Al Muhajiroun is banned by Britain’s National Union of Students from many college campuses because, as Mr. Bakri acknowledged, it pursues vigorous campaigns to find new followers -- though not, he said, to seek recruits for military purposes. Mr. Bakri also said he opposed Mr. bin Laden’s violence and condemned the Sept. 11 attacks.” (Alan Cowell, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: Suspects; Britain Tracing Trail Of One More Jihad Group”, The New York Times).

In the time interval included in our analysis, in another report published in the New York Times, the hegemonic perspective defined as orientalism and presented in the American media in a veiled language, comes to life with the statements of a European leader. Silvio Berlusconi, the prime minister of Italy at the time, stated in a statement that “Western civilization was superior to the Islamic world”. According to Berlusconi, terrorism, which is responsible for the 9/11 violent attacks, is not an attack by a specific group; on the contrary, it should be handled as a struggle of Easterners and Westerners that “will require Europe to rebuild its Christian roots”. In this struggle, again according to Berlusconi, while the West consists of “a value system that gives people widespread welfare and guarantees respect for human rights and religion”; opposite this, part of the Islamic world lacks civilization to the extent that it is “1,400 years behind.” These preconditions of the Italian prime minister remind us of the distinction between East and West on which orientalism is built:

“The Italian prime minister, Silvio Berlusconi, in a briefing for journalists, praised Western civilization today as superior to that of the Islamic world and urged Europe to “reconstitute itself on the basis of its Christian roots.”

Mr. Berlusconi, here to discuss international cooperation against terrorism with the Russian president, Vladimir V. Putin, and the German chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, gave vent to views likely to outrage Turkey and other Islamic allies of the West and infuriate antiglobalization protesters, besides.

As it designs a strategy against terrorism, Mr. Berlusconi said, the West should trust in the supremacy of its values.

“We should be confident of the superiority of our civilization, which consists of a value system that has given people widespread prosperity in those countries that embrace it, and guarantees respect for human rights and religion,” Mr. Berlusconi said. “This respect certainly does not exist in Islamic countries.”

The West “is bound to occidentalize and conquer new people,” he said. “It has done it with the Communist world and part of the Islamic world, but unfortunately, a part of the Islamic world is 1,400 years behind. From this point of view, we must be conscious of the strength and force of our civilization.” (Steven Erlanger, 2001, “Italy’s Premier Calls Western Civilization Superior to Islamic World”, The New York Times).

5.4. America Brings Peace to the Barbarian East

The examples of news we have covered up to this point of our study, shows that, in America, where the decision to intervene in Afghanistan was decided after 9/11, the situation was not only a military movement for defense against a bloody terrorist act, but it was handled as an all-out struggle against a “religious terrorism brand.” This type of enemy, which is stated to be pro-violent, have no civilized means, and has fundamentalist and barbarian qualities, inevitably because of its radical mindset and lack of civilization; seems to already deserve an American intervention. The next question from this stage is who will carry out this important mission in these regions that have to be intervened. This question will not remain unanswered in the newspaper reports. It is stated by the Islamic terrorism expert Gerecht that the USA should give a real answer to this new terrorist identity:

“We need to send a signal to the Taliban and the rest of the world that they are going to lose power,” according to Reuel Gerecht, a former intelligence specialist on Islamic terrorism.” (Joseph Fitchett, 2001, “U.S. War on Terrorism: It’s Likely to Be Long, Dangerous and Harsh”, The New York Times).

It is also stated in the news that fighting with a violent and radical group will cost the USA a number of costs, and there may be problems with “a large part of the Islamic world” due to the war against terrorism. Again, violence and Islam are side by side; solution and peace lie quite far from this equation:

“Such steps might fall short of a knockout blow to the Taliban. Complicating the administration’s planning, the element of surprise has been lost. The Taliban and Mr. bin Laden’s men are expecting a bombing attack and have been evacuating their camps and bases, according to American intelligence.

But there is a recognition that to go further by carrying out a Soviet-style occupation with thousands of troops would place the United States at odds with much of the Islamic world and is fraught with danger.” (Gordon, 2001).

This inevitable intervention mission of the USA is frequently voiced by President Bush. Bush invites the people of Afghanistan to rescue them from an “incredibly repressive” government. National security adviser Condoleezza Rice promises that the Afghan community will be “better off” without the Taliban government. Historical facts, on the other hand, show that the interventions made by the USA in the Eastern lands, citing 9/11 as the reason, did not have positive results and caused humanitarian crises that will radically affect the lives of the people living here. However, as a result of the preferred and elaborate discourse language in the media language, the intervention mission of a strong state in the region is legitimized:

“President Bush came close to telling the Afghan people today to overthrow the Taliban government, encouraging them to rid Afghanistan of what he called “an incredibly repressive” administration.” (Elisabeth Bumiller & Thom Shanker, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: The White House; Bush Steps Up Appeal to Afghans To Rid Their Country of Taliban”, The New York Times).

In another speech, Bush also stated that to “undermine the Taliban government and bring peace to the region”, he would provide various aid to the Afghan people. His National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, supports these words by stating that America, “friend of the Afghan people”, is making efforts “to contribute to the reconstruction of Afghanistan”. These words of President Bush remind us that Iraq was invaded in parallel with the 9/11 process. According to the US, the executive lost the innocent Iraqi civilian life and take the social structure seriously. In 2003, as a result of the occupation of the region by the United States on the grounds that Iraq killed its own people with chemical weapons and would soon carry out an attack on the USA (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003, p. 55), thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians lost their lives and the social structure of the region suffered serious damage.

As a matter of fact, the occupation process, which is expected to lead to peace, has not been able to provide a robust democratic process to Iraq, nor did it cause a serious reform in the region (Baylis, Smith & Owens, p. 75). In the Intelligence Committee Report of the American Senate published in 2008, the process will be defined as a “strategic mistake” by stating that “there is not enough information” (Glenn Kessler, 2016, “The Pre-War Intelligence on Iraq: Wrong or Hyped By the Bush White House?”, The Washington Post) regarding the chemical weapons that Iraq may have. In this respect, based on the development of historical processes, it can be thought that some military interventions made in conjunction with elements such as violence and terror involve different power motivations in the background. When the Iraq war enters its fourth year, in the Washington Post survey, half of Americans declaring negative views on Islam (Claudia Deane & Darryl Fears, 2006, “Negative Perception Of Islam Increasing Poll Numbers in U.S. Higher Than in 2001”, The Washington Post) does not appear to be an accidental rate in this context:

“President Bush announced today that the United States would try to deliver \$320 million in food and medical supplies to help Afghanistan’s population survive the approaching winter. The announcement appeared aimed at winning over the Afghan people even as Mr. Bush tries to undermine the Taliban government and perhaps deal it a military blow for harboring Osama bin Laden.

Hours later Mr. Bush’s national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice, promised a much broader American effort to contribute to “the reconstruction of Afghanistan” once the Taliban was replaced by a government that did not repress its people.

While American officials have stopped short of declaring the overthrow of the Taliban an explicit goal of the administration, the president told a cheering crowd of State Department employees today that the food aid is our way of saying that while we firmly and strongly oppose the Taliban regime, we are friends of the Afghan people.” (David E. Sanger & Jane Perlez, 2001, “A Nation Challenged: Food And Medicine; Bush Plans to Send \$320 Million In Food and Medicine to Afghans”, The New York Times).

Conclusion and Evaluation

The terrorist attacks carried out in the USA on September 11, 2001 were a turning point in world history and brought about a change process in which the international system was directly affected by the consequences. In this period when US security strategies were restructured due to terrorist acts, the most important goal of American foreign policy was to protect national interests and, in this context, to fight terrorism wherever in the world. The USA, which carried out interventions in certain countries in the Middle East on the grounds that it supported terrorism in the future, took the first step in this way by initiating a military operation in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, on the grounds that it protected terrorists. Rather than bringing peace and stability to the region, this process, which caused a political atmosphere in which innocent civilians were killed and chaos prevailed, was handled in the American media in line with the policy determined by the state. Not only was it media propaganda, but also in this process, this situation was legitimized within the state by legal decisions.

In the process of making the world accept the perception of “Islamic terrorism”, which the USA claimed to have been exposed after the September 11, both this legal legitimacy situation and media organs were used strongly by the US political authorities. This approach, also known as the “Bush Doctrine”, left the enemy undefined and thus created the opportunity for the USA to hit any target it wanted in line with the aim of globalizing its hegemony. The Bush Doctrine was clearly expressed in the principles contained in the “US National Security Strategy” report, which was made public in September 2002. The principle of using the preemptive attack method against rogue states and terrorist organizations that possess or try to possess weapons of mass destruction, which is included in the National Security Strategy, has ensured the legitimization of military interventions. In addition, preventive attack has been seen as a method to promote democracy, peace and human rights all over the world, especially in the Islamic World (Ataman & Gökcan, p. 220). This state-centered attitude, developed through the use of the legal order, has shown the seriousness of the United States to the whole world. In the context of using the media as the second tool in this process of “adoption”, the US and European media were used in depth to legitimize the event, high-investment TV series such as Homeland containing the idea of Islamic terrorism were shot and awards were presented to them by the then President Obama. The use of victimization as a strategy and thus the legitimization of the offensive was thus achieved. As a result, the terrorist muslim metaphor has become an ordinary image that is recognized not only by the American citizen but also by the whole world.

After this strong policy of the USA, European countries also gave the necessary support, and after the USA administration sent forces to this country on the grounds of fighting terrorism, after the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers on September 9, 2001, on the grounds that the attacks originated from Afghanistan, NATO became one of the “allies” for the first time in its history and introduced Article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact, which considers an attack on one to be done against all Allies. NATO has kept the International Afghanistan Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in this country for a long time. NATO forces had just over 9,500 troops in Afghanistan as of February 2021. Of these, 2,500 were American soldiers, and the rest were world country soldiers, including NATO’s mission in Afghanistan (Anadolu Agency, 2021, “Uncertainty prevails after the US decision to withdraw from Afghanistan” (ABD’nin Afganistan’dan çekilme kararı sonrası belirsizlik hâkim). Despite

the fact that the world states support the expansionism of the USA in Afghanistan with such a strong force, the US President Joe Biden independently announced his plan to leave Afghanistan and announced that the troops will begin to withdraw from Afghanistan from May 1. The decision of the US to withdraw from Afghanistan alone, without meeting with its allies, has created a state of concern among all the countries of the world, but the main US allies such as European countries, in fact, should not trust the US too much and they realized that how the US will react in case of possible attacks was a question mark. European leaders, who were of the opinion that soldiers from 36 countries were endangered during the withdrawal in Afghanistan, a NATO mission, due to the lack of coordination of their US allies, and reevaluated their expectations about the US, began to build a future that is less dependent on the US (BBC News, 2021, "Afghanistan crisis: How Europe's relationship with Joe Biden turned sour")

Despite the fact that the years-long Afghanistan occupation resulted in a defeat in the eyes of the countries that supported the USA and these countries experienced a state of awakening in the context of the individual policy of the USA; as a result of these years, Islamophobia has become ingrained in the USA and Europe today and has become a prejudice that complicates the daily life of Muslims. In other words, the contents of the New York Times in 2001 included in this article seriously served today's perception of "anti-Islam and fear". Because, the articles in The New York Times, the long-established US media organ, did not objectively mention terrorist acts in some of the the news published between September 11 & October 7, and these attacks were considered as a terrorist movement against the West by the Muslim Eastern community. Orientalist elements such as not perceiving terrorists as an independent violent group and focusing on the entire Middle East as the center of these acts of violence, discourses of the perception of Muslim Easterners that will cause an atmosphere of fear on US citizens, positioning Muslims side by side with barbarism and the emphasis on the peace-making mission of USA for the solution of problems in the Middle East, appear in newspaper articles as part of a particular discourse. This approach, which brings along the fear of Islam called Islamophobia, does not seem compatible with an objective understanding of news.

In the context of the development of global understanding and the continuity of universal peace, especially on the leading media organs of the great states, it is obvious that a discourse language framing a certain religion and region around various attributes will have a negative impact. Racism and extremism are not an inherent characteristic, and the organic association of any religious or race member with backwardness and violence should not be seen as a reasonable form of understanding. As a matter of fact, the data we have obtained from the articles we have examined shows that the language of journalism in the New York Times consists of discourses that serve to perceive the process as a "war of religion" by commemorating terrorism and Islam side by side, a constant "flow of bad news" is ensured and this inevitably affects the American people's approach to Islam and the Middle East negatively. The negative consequences of the US interventions in different Middle Eastern countries, especially Afghanistan, by citing September 11 as the reason, bring to mind that these political processes can be carried out with the aim of legitimizing different goals. In addition, it is obvious to what extent the orientalist and terror-oriented discourse language, which we put forward in the example of The New York Times newspaper, has served in the escalation of Islamophobia in Western countries in the last 20 years.

References

BBC News, (03.09.21). Afghanistan crisis: How Europe's relationship with Joe Biden turned sour, <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-dunya-58437578>, accessed on 09.04.22.

Ataman, M. and Gökcan, Ö. (2012). The U.S. Foreign Policy of the Bush Era: An Attempt for Over-Expansion, *Journal of Academic Inquiries*, Sakarya: University of Sakarya, Institute of Social Sciences, 7, N. 2, 199-229.

Baylis, J., Smith, S., Owens, P. (2014). *The Globalization of World Politics*, 6. ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Çağlar, Ş. (2010). *Media Analysis Methods (Medya Analiz Yöntemleri)*, Istanbul: University of Istanbul, Open and Distance Education Faculty Publications.

Deane, C. and Fears, D., (03.09.2006). Negative Perception Of Islam Increasing Poll Numbers in U.S. Higher Than in 2001, *The Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2006/03/09/negative-perception-of-islam-increasing-span-classbankheadpoll-numbers-in-us-higher-than-in-2001span/83e140eb-edb2-40ec-b9ff-ccadf42e3c79/>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Habertürk, (8.01.22). Future Ideas-How Will Migrations Change The World? (Gelecek Fikirler-Göçler Dünyayı Nasıl Değiştirecek?, <https://tv.haberturk.com/tv/programlar/video/gelecek-fikirler-28-ocak-2022-gocler-dunyayi-nasil-degistirecek/753134>, accessed on 09.04.2022.

Griffiths, M., O'Callaghan, T., Roach, S. (2008). *International Relations The Key Concepts*, 2. ed., New York: Routledge.

Güngör, F. S. (2011). *Orientalism and the Reflections of the United States' Perspective on the Middle East on Cinema*, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.

Huntington, S. P. (2015). *The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of World Order (Medeniyetler Çatışması ve Dünya Düzeninin Yeniden Kurulması)*, Translate: Mehmet Turhan, Cem Soydemir, 14. ed., Istanbul: Okuyan Us.

Kahraman, H. B. (2002). İçselleştirilmiş, Açık ve Gizli Oryantalizm ve Kemalizm (Internalized, Open and Hidden Orientalism and Kemalism), *Doğu Batı, Oryantalizm I*, 20, Ankara: Doğu Batı Publishing: 153-178.

Kantarıcı, Ş. (2012). The Structure of Post Cold War International System: Is The Name of The New Era "Period of Coalitions, *Journal of Security Strategies*, Istanbul: Turkish National Defence University, Atatürk Institute of Strategic Studies, Vol. 8, No: 16, 47-85.

Kessler, G. (13.12.2016). The Pre-War Intelligence on Iraq: Wrong or Hyped By the Bush White House?, *The Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2016/12/13/the-pre-war-intelligence-on-iraq-wrong-or-hyped-by-the-bush-white-house/>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Khatib, L. (2006). *Filming the Modern Middle East: Politics in the Cinemas of Hollywood and The Arab World*, New York: I. B. Tauris.

Kömeçoğlu, U. (2007). The Echo of Orientalism or Orientalism That Reverberates, *International Orientalism Symposium*, Istanbul: IMM Directorate of Culture Publications: 131-156.

Kula, O. B. (2011). *Batı Edebiyatında Oryantalizm-I (Orientalism in Western Literature-I)*, Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bank Culture Publishings.

Lean, N. (2015). *İslamofobi Endüstrisi (Islamofobia Industry)*, 2. ed., Ankara: DIB Press.

Mearsheimer, J. J. and Walt, S. M. (2003). An Unnecessary War, *Foreign Policy*, 134 (Jan/Feb): Washington: 50-59.

Said, E. (1998). *Oryantalizm (Orientalism)*, Istanbul: Irfan Publishing, Translated by Nezih Uzel, 4. ed.

Turner, B. S. (2002). *Oryantalizm, Postmodernizm, Globalizm (Orientalism, Postmodernism, Globalism)*, Istanbul: Anka Publishings, Translated by İbrahim Kapaklıkaya.

Anadolu Agency, (15.04.2021). Uncertainty prevails after the US decision to withdraw from Afghanistan (ABD'nin Afganistan'dan Çekilme Kararı Sonrası Belirsizlik Hakim), <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/abdinin-afganistandan-cekilme-karari-sonrasi-belirsizlik-hakim/2209973>, accessed on 09.04.22.

The New York Times Articles

Apple Jr., R. W., (14.09.2001). No Middle Ground, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/14/international/no-middle-ground.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Bearak, B., (02.10.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: NEWS ANALYSIS; In Pakistan, A Shaky Ally”, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/02/world/a-nation-challenged-news-analysis-in-pakistan-a-shaky-ally.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Bearak, B., (17.09.2001). Rebel Chief Who Fought The Taliban Is Buried, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/17/world/rebel-chief-who-fought-the-taliban-is-buried.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Bragg, R., (01.10.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: THE CLASSES; Pakistan Is 2 Worlds: One Urbane, One Enraged, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/01/world/a-nation-challenged-the-classes-pakistan-is-2-worlds-one-urbane-one-enraged.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Bumiller, E. and Shanker, T., (26.09.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: THE WHITE HOUSE; Bush Steps Up Appeal to Afghans To Rid Their Country of Taliban, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/26/world/nation-challenged-white-house-bush-steps-up-appeal-afghans-rid-their-country.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Cowell, A., (04.10.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: SUSPECTS; Britain Tracing Trail Of One More Jihad Group, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/04/world/a-nation-challenged-suspects-britain-tracing-trail-of-one-more-jihad-group.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Eckholm, E., (30.09.2001). China's About-Face: Support for U.S. on Terror, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/30/world/china-s-about-face-support-for-us-on-terror.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Erlanger, S., (27.09.2001). Italy's Premier Calls Western Civilization Superior to Islamic World, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/27/world/italy-s-premier-calls-western-civilization-superior-to-islamic-world.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Fitchett, J., (12.09.2001). Like the Attack in 1941, Air Terrorism Could Provoke Severe Repercussions: For Washington, a Modern Pearl Harbor, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/12/news/like-the-attack-in-1941-air-terrorism-could-provoke-severe.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Fitchett, J., (14.09.2001). U.S. War on Terrorism: It's Likely to Be Long, Dangerous and Harsh". *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/14/news/us-war-on-terrorisms-likely-to-be-long-dangerous-and-harsh.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Gonzalez, D., (29.09.2001). World Briefing | The Americas: Honduras: Regional Antiterrorism Project, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/29/world/world-briefing-the-americas-honduras-regional-antiterrorism-project.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Gordon, M. R., (17.09.2001). AFTER THE ATTACKS: THE STRATEGY; A New War And Its Scale, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/17/world/after-the-attacks-the-strategy-a-new-war-and-its-scale.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Gordon, R., and Schmitt, E., (19.09.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: THE COMBAT; Scarcity of Afghanistan Targets Prompts U.S. to Change Strategy, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/19/world/nation-challenged-combat-scarcity-afghanistan-targets-prompts-us-change-strategy.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Jehl, D., (22.09.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: THE MUSLIMS; More Extremists Find Basis for Rebellion in Islam, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/22/world/nation-challenged-muslims-more-extremists-find-basis-for-rebellion-islam.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Knowlton, B., (19.09.2001). Terror in America / "We're Going to Smoke Them Out": President Airs His Anger, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/19/news/terror-in-america-were-going-to-smoke-them-out-president-air-his-anger.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Mydans, S., (29.09.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: THE PACIFIC; Indonesia Radicals Issue Threats of Holy War, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/29/world/a-nation-challenged-the-pacific-indonesia-radicals-issue-threats-of-holy-war.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Mydans, S., (19.09.2001). Bush Meeting Jakarta Leader; Islamic Militancy Is Likely Topic, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/19/world/bush-meeting-jakarta-leader-islamic-militancy-is-likely-topic.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Richardson, M., (24.09.2001). "Anti-Terror Effort May Provoke Her Foes: Megawati Faces Risk In Backing the U.S.", *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/24/news/antiterror-effort-may-provoke-her-foes-megawati-faces-risk-in-backing.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Sanger, D. E. and Perlez, J., (26.09.2001). A NATION CHALLENGED: FOOD AND MEDICINE; Bush Plans to Send \$320 Million In Food and Medicine to Afghans, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/05/world/nation-challenged-food-medicine-bush-plans-send-320-million-food-medicine.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Wines, M., (24.09.2001). Putin Offers Backing to U.S. for Anti-Terror Operations, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/24/international/putin-offers-backing-to-us-for-antiterror-operations.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.

Vinocur, J., (13.09.2001). The New World Order Is a Clash of Civilizations, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/13/news/the-new-world-order-is-a-clash-of-civilizations.html>, accessed on 04.08.21.