

Political Propaganda as an Agent of Violence:

How the portrayal of Muslims in American media justifies inhumane counterterrorism policies

Introduction

The tragedy of 9/11 rattled the core of the United States. A nation of influence, wealth and power was found to also be vulnerable. It was vulnerable to hate and was essentially targeted. In the wake of this tragedy, many people understood that drastic measure had to be implemented in order to make sure something like this would never happen again. While this was understood to be necessary, the actions taken after 9/11 in the name of national security had consequences that threatened the lives of American people in detrimental ways. Counterterrorism policies were finalized and rolled out in war zones in the Middle East among other countries in order to fight the threat of Islamic violent extremists that threatened the security of this nation.

Yet, these policies harbored biases and an ill organized structure that stood as the law and order. They were explained and justified with rhetoric that painted all Muslims as the enemy. In order to garner support and justify counterterrorism policies that did not employ a human rights framework, the U.S government used the media to their advantage. This research will tie together Islamophobic rhetoric in the media, counter terrorism policies targeting the Muslim community and the rise in violence committed against Muslims in the US after 9/11. The portrayal of Muslims in the media reinforces Orientalist tropes used to justify inhumane counterterrorism policies to divert the attention from the violence the Muslim community faces in the US.

Subsequently, there are various factors that contribute to the violence committed against the Muslim community in the post-9/11 world. Islamophobia is sowed into the fabric of U.S

government policies designated to eliminate the threat of terrorism. They go hand in hand with anti-Muslim rhetoric which draws from colonial tropes used to repress people who identify as Muslim or are from Muslim countries. Before we examine how Islamophobia operates on a structural level which is implemented through state policies geared towards fighting terrorism, one must analyze the portrayal of a person who identifies as Muslim or comes from a Muslim country in American media. For this research, the purpose of this examination will serve to provide the reader with a better understanding of how TV shows and movies were turned in vehicles of political propaganda against the post 9/11 “enemy” in America.

*The “enemy” & the role of American media as the champion of political propaganda*

The dissection of American media requires a lense that recognizes the humanity of people so we can understand how their portrayal is rooted in stereotypes, it’s important to keep in mind that the use of identity politics to construct an enemy against America is not a new phenomenon to American culture. Ben Saul, a leading expert on global counter terrorism law, discusses how officials in the United States government who denounced agents of terrorism during the Cold war usually spoke of their identities when discussing their actions.

He writes “In 1965, states referring to terrorism were heavily influenced by Cold War politics. Charges were made that the Vietcong and North Vietnam were terrorists, and the countercharges that the Vietnamese were victims of terrorism. The US spoke of the infiltration of agents who terrorize innocent people and impose the will of a foreign government and ideology...some referred to Latin America as a victim of terrorism, while others condemned it for exporting terrorism”(Saul 195). This is not to negate the fact that during wars and eras where regional tensions are heightened due to security dilemmas, it is important to recognize where the threat is coming from. But prior research done on this topic, in my first short paper, proved that

US government officials like President Reagan himself have used rhetoric charged with identity politics designed to illustrate a picture of what the enemy looks like. As this research continues, a section that examines how the “othering” of a specific group in US politics is used to divert the attention from the violence the state itself is committing against a certain population in disproportionate and egregious numbers that violate human rights on multiple levels.

Similarly, the United States has conflated the identity of a person directly to the violence they have committed leading us down a slippery slope. Upon these conditions, the US is known for fighting wars on not just the military front but also through ideologies. The U.S National Security Strategy affirms that “From the beginning, the war on terror has been both a battle of arms and a battle of ideas- a fight against the terrorists and their murderous ideology... We need to fight it ideologically, in terms of our values and principles and alternative vision”(Echevarria 1). It’s no surprise that the war on terror found itself manifesting in all aspects of American society including the media. Hollywood and other mediums of disseminating information to the public became a driving force behind the anti-Muslim rhetoric that we see slathered upon political campaigns of American Presidents like Donald J. Trump.

In the following section, the types of roles that Muslims are portrayed in will be thoroughly examined through the production of *American Sniper* and the TV show *24*. Besides these two projects, a brief history of various tropes in relation to a Muslim character will also be explored. These will allow one to connect the portrayal of Muslims in the media as illustrations of political propaganda which will later be tied to counter terrorism policies based on such ideas.

#### *Portrayal of Muslims in Hollywood*

Renowned directors like Clint Eastwood directed films like *American Sniper* that attracted droves of people into movie theaters and smashed the box office when it became

the highest grossing film in 2014 (Guerrasio 2015). The central themes to the plot of the movie included God, family and patriotism. Except, the story of the most lethal sniper in U.S military history championed his service at the expense of Muslims and brown people that were included in the film. The film is told through the narrative of Chris Kyle, a US Navy SEAL, who struggles to reconcile with the repercussions of his actions as a “day shooter” when stationed in Iraq. Kyle’s perspective on the Muslims is that they are “savages” who are intent on destroying the world through violent ideologies rooted in the religion of Islam. Arabs and other brown people who are characterizes as Muslim are made out to be the enemy that is plummeting Kyle into a deeper battle within himself.

Eastwood has proclaimed that the film is supposed to be a neutral narrative shown through the eyes of a soldier fighting a war on behalf of protecting his nation and the American people. Yet, this gracious interpretation of the film is not one that is accurate or based in reality. Various critiques have explained that as the film is posing the audience to connect to the humanity of the soldier, but it gives us “little opportunity to recognize the humanity of the Muslims who cross his path. Eastwood shows now interest in problematizing the racism that animates this soldiers Manichean worldview” (Green 2015).

In the movie, all the targets that he is killing are Muslims. Given that it is set in the context of Iraq and is a war zone where the US military is fighting radical violent Islamic extremist groups, there are little to no identifier that differentiate between a Muslim person who is not a threat versus one that is. This portrayal groups all Muslims into the category of “enemy” or “threat”. While this may mimic the reality that soldiers had to face when on tour, it offers insight into how racism seeps even into the battle fields. This is not to invalidate the horrid reality of war and that when people are shooting at you, you must shoot back but the trope of

Muslims portrayed as a threat and as savages demonizes Muslims and the Muslim world as a whole (Alhassen 21). It's important to note that stamping Muslims as "savages" and inherently violent to the point that they as a whole must be eliminated is an Orientalist trope that dates back to the colonial era. The inaccurate and whitewashed portrayal of people with origins in the Middle East, South Asia and any other countries whose origins are tied to Islam can be pinpointed throughout American history.

The "Orient" was constructed by European nations and used to justify their agendas of colonizing various countries in the Middle East, Indian subcontinent and Africa (Alhassen 13). These stereotypes developed as the world changed yet the "othering" of people that were "Muslim-perceived" continued to evolve into new equally racist portrayals. For the sake of this research, the focus will primarily be on the depiction of Islam and Muslims in America media, but it is necessary to acknowledge that anti-Muslim sentiments are global. Islamophobia is an industry that when one nation as powerful as the U.S begins to capitalize on and stand by, it sends a message of approval to other countries that may also engage in such bigoted rhetoric.

Again, terrorism is not synonymous with Islam or with the people who practice it. In the backdrop of this movie, patriotism is a sham used to justify actions taken by the American military that did end up killing innocent civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan. Evidence as of November 2019 shows that "the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Syria and Pakistan have taken a tremendous human toll on those countries. 335, 000 civilians in these countries have died violent deaths as a result of U.S military operations" (Watson Institute of International & Public Affairs).

Yet, this view is rarely highlighted in movies on terrorism and neutralizing the terrorist threat is at the fore front of the narrative with no regard for the humanity of millions of Muslim

people in war zones that are disproportionately killed in the violence. This one-sided story has repercussions at home as well since this illustration that leaves out integral parts to the story which could be helpful in combatting the violence that Muslim Americans face today.

As the connection of rhetoric in the media in relation to violence experienced by the American Muslim community will be explored in depth later in this research paper, it's important to note that the movie *American Sniper* had a direct impact in the rise of violence and hate crimes committed against people that either practice Islam or are from Muslim countries. The American Arab Anti- Discrimination Committee (ADC) reached out to both Eastwood and Bradley Cooper, who played Chris Kyle in the movie, stating that "its members had become targets of violent threats since American Sniper went into general release" (Guarino 2015).

All films have a perspective and perpetuate ideas along with biases that are intertwined with the subtle messages that it is sending to its viewers. Media is a state apparatus that distributes ideas which are considered to be normal or a representation of the world wrapped in story lines, cinematic cues and expensive production. Films like *American Sniper* or *Zero Dark Thirty* perpetuate a representation of a world that viewers may absorb as reality and harbor those beliefs rooted in racist ideology in their daily lives. They may spew hatred towards Muslims they see in their own neighborhoods adding even more pressure on communities that practice Islam or are from Muslim countries. This atmosphere that is supported by films like *American Sniper* can add fuel to the fire to the sentiments of mistrust which directly contribute to the alienation and repression of the Muslim community.

Outside of this specific film, the American public is receiving messages that the enemy is "Muslim" on a weekly basis due to the genre of law enforcement shows that also conflate Muslim with terrorist. One of these shows is the American action drama featured on Fox called

24. In this series, counter-terrorist agent Jack Bauer fights a national security threat within twenty-four hours. From destroying terrorist cells and attempting to stop a war waged on an innocent middle eastern country, not every episode included a Muslim affiliated with terrorism (Doward 2005). Still, the writers of the show simply could not resist to add a storyline that included a Muslim-American family that were affiliated with a fictional terrorist group called Turkish Crimson Jihad. Outside of this in Season 4 when they illustrated that this family were engaged in killing terrorists, they tried to turn the narrative around by depicting the mother and the son sympathetically later in the season. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) accused the TV drama 24 “of perpetuating stereotypes of Arabs and Muslims stating that the repeated association of acts of terrorism with Islam with only serve to increase anti-Muslim prejudice” (Alsultany 18).

Despite the writers of the show attempting to show Muslim’s in a sympathetic light, roles that solely place people with ethnic features of people from Muslim county’s send a specific message. A new binary as emerged in shows like this that construct the image of “Good Muslims” vs “Bad Muslims”. Network hits like 24 or Homeland use the cues of vilifying the “Bad Muslim” who is the traitor that is critical of U.S policies and military power. Research indicates that this view discredits and “rarely acknowledges the real anger behind such sentiments that in response to the destruction caused by U.S foreign and domestic wars on Muslim populations around the world” (Alhassen 25). On the other hand, the “Good Muslim” becomes an agent of the American government that willingly chooses the country over his own community because the values of American patriotism would never let him have both.

The frightening message in these tropes is that only the religion of Islam and Islamic extremist groups are characterized as capable of committing terrorist acts. This framework

ignores the large domestic threat of right-wing white supremacists and their bigoted agenda which terrorizes and spreads fear among the public. On top of this, it has a psychological impact on communities that are forced to be pitted against each other. As this research will observe in the section, the ideology in media that labels Muslims as suspicious or evil creates mistrust within the Muslim community itself and ruins community ties and relations that many people rely on when assimilating and settling in the U.S.

*Islamophobia driving counter-terrorism policies in the US*

Furthermore, this inaccurate narrative in TV shows like *24* or movies like *American Sniper* where a terrorist is mostly always a brown person who is Muslim is used to justify the gaps in various counter terrorism policies that contribute to the pressures placed on the Muslim American community. The impact of an industry that conflates Muslim with terrorist ties is supported by a very real legal and government sanctioned framework. Islamophobia is integrated into the structures of American policies and is driven by the same biases that are depicted in TV shows and movies mentioned before. Research published by Khaled A. Beydoun, a professor and leading scholar on anti-terrorism law and Islamophobia, writes that

“ Islamophobia is rooted in understandings of Islam as civilization’s antithesis and perpetuated by government structures and private citizens. Islamophobia is also a process- namely, the dialectic by which state policies targeting Muslims endorse prevailing stereotypes, and in turn, embolden private [and public] animus toward Muslim subjects” (28).

American media’s representation of Muslims and Islam mentioned in previous sections of the paper served as deliverers of political propaganda designed to propagate the idea that U.S’s counter terrorism policies were necessary to protect our national security from foreign terrorist

threats. Many of these policies were built on presumptions that the identity of Muslims and people from Muslim countries were directly associated with a national security threat.

The orientalist tropes derived from colonial agendas of Western nations determined to dissect non-western civilizations to further their own economic and political interests are embedded within the US government agencies like the Department of Homeland Security along with other anti-terror law enforcement (Beydoun 32). When the identity and the religion a group of people like Al Qaeda or the Taliban is mentioned continuously, it brings those associated with that religion into the public sphere which can harm their wellbeing.

While former President George W. Bush hailed how “nobody should be singled out because of their ethnic background or religious faith” in his visit to the Islamic Center in Washington, this type of language partially served the political agenda of his re-election campaign (Greenwald 2015). The Bush administration after the attacks of 9/11 engaged in rhetoric that stayed away from proclaiming all Muslims as the enemy, yet their actions told a completely different story that cannot be ignored. Counter terrorism policies which were implemented after the 9/11 attacks focused on monitoring, prosecuting and denying the entry of people that identified as Muslims or lived in Muslim communities.

For the purpose of this research, there are multiple counterterrorism policies that operate on inaccurate biases and Islamophobic ideas but only the impact of two will be explored in depth. The PATRIOT act along with the mass surveillance that took place under it and the flawed Countering Violent Extremism programs (CVE) will be the focus of this section. The idea is to help connect how counterterrorism policies are built on Islamophobic presumptions that are supported by Hollywood productions which disproportionately target the Muslim

American community and add to the violence members of this population are subjected to in contemporary America.

For instance, studies explain that “the PATRIOT Act legally enabled an unprecedented degree of government encroachment on Americans civil rights by...expanding the electronic surveillance powers of the government, which disproportionately targeted Muslim subjects” (Beydoun 32). The standard for law enforcement to detain and question Muslim Americans reinforces the idea that only Muslims commit acts of terrorism. With the PATRIOT Act, the mass surveillance of Muslim American communities created an atmosphere where it was okay for people to be suspicious of the Muslim family in their neighborhood because their law enforcement encouraged them to report any suspicious activity.

This activity could have been something as small as being Muslim and criticizing the American government. Then, the TV shows like *24* that are sending messages of what a “Bad Muslim” can directly impact how somebody who isn’t Muslim perceive those who don’t fit that category. Counter terrorism policies like such blatantly operated on grounds that not only reinforced such racist stereotypes regarding Muslims but justified them when questioned. When respected members of the government and prestigious institutions in the United States like Paul Sperry of the Hoover Institute can argue that profiling is necessary to protect our national security since “police should target the high-risk population”, this type of rhetoric becomes normalized in American society (Harcourt 73).

If the agents of the state are not shying away from finding anything wrong with policies that surveil populations solely because of their religion and ethnic background, then there is no accountability for the violence committed against Muslims in any space whether that is at the hands of other American citizens or law enforcement.

Using the PATRIOT Act, law enforcement agencies bypassed constitutional safeguards when the subject was Muslim. These protections were created to provide due process to all citizens who under the law are “innocent until proven guilty” except when their Muslim. The U.S government is committing such acts in the public sphere when it ignores to take into consideration the basic human rights of Muslims who are detained on the “suspicion” of being affiliated with terrorist organizations. NYPD officers methodically monitored, surveilled and ran programs at individual mosques around the city, in Muslim neighborhoods and even school campuses. They made assumptions about an individual’s propensity for terrorism solely based on whether they read Islamic literature related to jihad or if they fundraised money for their local mosques. These examples are used because in a variety of cases, many Muslim men have been arrested because doing these things made them targets.

In the documentary, *Terror*, the experience of an FBI informant exposes the cracks in this system. The FBI used this informant’s need for financial stability and exploited his criminal record so he would find targets for them that were connected to terrorist plots. The informant, Saeed, would ask the man in he was sent to surveil, Khalifah al- Akili, if he was interested in shows on the subject of Islamic fundamentalists or extremists. If Khalifah said that he was interested in watching a show about this topic or if he studied literature in relation to Jihad, Saeed would use this information to infer that he could be a “terrorist”. Clearly, this documentary showed how the standard of what it takes to decide if a Muslim man is a terrorist or not is realistic or reasonable.

This directly leads into examining another policy that the US stands by to counter terrorism and quell the fear of Muslim “radicalization” which is CVE policing also known as Countering Violent Extremist programs. Initially, these programs are designed to weed out any

suspicious terrorist activities in American cities, neighborhoods and communities but they tend to focus largely only on Muslim populations. The goal for law enforcement agencies is to prevent terrorism before it happens by using the structure of community policing developed in the 1990s to combat the rise in crime in inner city communities (Aziz 147). But, there a variety of issues with this policy because it further stigmatizes Muslims, reinforces Islamophobic tropes and creates rifts within the community itself.

CVE policing functions on the basis that there is a specific process through which individuals are indoctrinated to become terrorists and that there are visible signs that community members and law enforcement can use to identify who is a terrorist or affiliated with a terrorist plot. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, “the FBI and NYPD identified common Muslim religious behavior as a predicative indicator of terrorist tendencies, theories that were thoroughly debunked” (“Countering Violent Extremism: Myths and Fact”). CVE policies target Muslim communities since the pilot programs in Boston, Los Angeles and Minneapolis only conducted community outreach to Muslim communities.

They did not contribute any resources or efforts to address other forms of domestic terrorism like the threat of right white-nationalist groups. This form of selective policing and programs that only conduct searches in Muslim communities in the name of national security place even more pressure furthering alienating the community. These are counter-productive because policies like these cause my harm than good. Community policing requires trust between local law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The trust of the American Muslim community is consistently broken because of the fear that the names of their fathers, sons or brothers can end up on an FBI watch list simply because of their commitment to their community. From Academic scholars to attorneys, this research

acknowledges the substantive amount of work done in this arena that proves how counter terrorism directly discriminate against Muslims and those of Arab, Middle Eastern and South Asian descent. The ideas on which many of the counter terrorism policies implemented after 9/11 are based in Islamophobic rhetoric that makes people in these communities vulnerable to attacks on all fronts. The violence faced by people of South Asian, Arab and Middle Eastern descent and the Muslim American community is explained in depth in the next section of this research.

As we examine these numbers and patterns, it's important to keep in mind that this research does not fully expand on the violence faced by Black Muslims in America. The violence many Black Muslim American communities face requires an intersectional framework coupled with an historical analysis of institutional racism faced by Black Americans which goes beyond the scope of this research. Although this will not be explored in depth, it is necessary to acknowledge that Muslims in America are also Black and the violence they face is different than the violence non-black people of color who identify as Muslim face.

#### *Rise in violence against Muslims in America after 9/11*

Moreover, the pressure placed on the Muslim community where people identify as Arab, Middle Eastern or South Asian lead to a rise in violence committed against people perceived to be Muslim. The violence that many people of this ethnic and religious background face comes from a variety of sources. Counter terrorism policies of the American government leave Muslims and people perceived to be Muslims more vulnerable to hate crimes carried out by non-state actors. These are your common citizens that have vowed to take matters in their own hands because they believe that "sharia law" is taking over your schools, malls and communities. According to the FBI's hate crime statistics, "In 2016, records showed that crimes motivated by

anti-Muslim bias jumped to 307 incidents, up from 257 in the previous year, an approximate 19 percent increase” (Beirich 11).

Hate crimes fueled by anti-Muslim beliefs are supported by Islamophobic rhetoric that has been used for decades by American media. Except, the language used to depict Muslims by right-wing organizers and groups that have a bigoted agenda is rooted entirely in fiction and is much more graphic. Anti-Muslim hate groups define Islam as a monolithic and evil religion therefore categorizing all Muslims as inherently bad with an agenda to subvert the rule of law in the US and impose on American values. This type of rhetoric is emboldened in contemporary America where the Trump administration engages in reinforcing Orientalist and bigoted stereotypes and tropes that were also sowed into the foundation of counterterrorism policies.

Hate groups around the country that are determined the end the threat of the Muslims terrorist have burned mosques, harassed and killed Muslim women who wear the hijab and threatened the lives of many people who they “perceive” to be Muslim. Many members of the Sikh American community who wear the turban, to preserve the identity and ideologies of their religion, have been targeted because they were perceived to be Muslim. When in fact, Islam and Sikhism are two completely different walks of faith. Valarie Kaur, a Los Angeles-based lawyer and Sikh activist, says “We are five times more likely today to be targets of hate than before 9/11” (Gumbel 2018). The ignorance around the message that is being disseminated to the American public that the enemy of America right now is brown and from a Muslim country has cost lives.

In this atmosphere of fear and alienation, all Muslims across the country say that it has become harder to be a Muslim in the US and “48% say they have experienced at least once incident of discrimination in the past 12 months” (Pew Research Center 2017). The reality of

violence that Muslims have to face in this country has only worsened since 9/11 and in contemporary America continues to escalate. Outside of the Muslim community being targeted as a whole, there is a large portion of the population whose experiences are not nearly analyzed enough. Muslim women are a part of the conversation that needs to be had when one talks about violence that the community is facing. Since Muslim women are often easy identifiable because many wear the hijab, this visible indication of faith makes them more susceptible to harassment and assaults. It marks Muslim women as representatives of the suspicious, inherently evil and foreign “terrorist” that soldiers in *American Sniper* had to be weary of and eliminate. Scholars have argued that “ A general consensus among community leaders was that federal government policies [after 9/11] disproportionately targeted men while hate crimes and incidents of harassment in the public sphere disproportionately targeted women” (Alimahomed 77).

The representation of Muslim women in the media ascribe traits of powerlessness to Muslim women which shape how dominant groups perceive them. Laura Bush’s radio address in the November of 2001 encouraging American troops to save the Muslim women directly influenced the perceptions of many Americans regarding the Muslim world. The agency of Muslim women is stripped through media roles that portray them as victims leaving them at the crossroads of oppression.

### Conclusion

There are so many factors that have contributed to the rise of violence committed against Muslims in this country since 9/11 that go beyond this paper. The key takeaway of this research is to denounce all language stemming from ignorance that depict Muslim men, women and the Islamic world in an inaccurate way. Much of the storylines in various American movies and shows recycle the Orientalist tropes that dehumanize people who identify with religions and

ethnic backgrounds illustrated. While Arabs, Muslims and South Asians are portrayed in the media as such, in reality; they are being detained, discriminated and violated. The human rights of Muslims in contemporary America are violated when they are subjected to policies that demonize their existence and identity. The institutions in America include such rhetoric in overt and subtle ways in their own systems and are part of the problem. Muslims are targets in nearly all, public or private, spaces in the U.S. The Muslim community in America deserves their humanity to be recognized and respected wherever they go in this country. How can we say that this country represents freedom and liberty when the people who helped protect it are not free?

## Bibliography

- Saul, Ben. *Defining Terrorism in International Law*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Sabrina Alimahomed-Wilson. "Invisible Violence: Gender, Islamophobia, and the Hidden Assault on U.S. Muslim Women." *Women, Gender, and Families of Color* 5, no. 1 (2017): 73-97. Accessed May 9, 2020. doi:10.5406/womgenfamcol.5.1.0073.
- Guerrasio, Jason. "How 'American Sniper' Became the Highest-Grossing US Film of 2014." *Business Insider*, Business Insider, 11 Mar. 2015, [www.businessinsider.com/american-sniper-highest-grossing-us-film-of-2014-2015-3](http://www.businessinsider.com/american-sniper-highest-grossing-us-film-of-2014-2015-3).
- Alhassen, Maytha. "Haqq and Hollywood: Illuminating 100 Years of Muslim Tropes And How to Transform Them - Pop Culture Collaborative #HaqqAndHollywood." *Pop Culture Collaborative*, [popcollab.org/haqq-and-hollywood/](http://popcollab.org/haqq-and-hollywood/).
- Echevarria II, Antulio. "WARS OF IDEAS AND THE WAR OF IDEAS." *Strategic Studies Institute*, U.S Army War College, June 2008.
- "2016 Hate Crime Statistics." *FBI*, FBI, 13 Nov. 2017, [www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2016-hate-crime-statistics](http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2016-hate-crime-statistics).
- Green, Todd. "American Sniper and the Muslim 'Savage'." *HuffPost*, HuffPost, 11 Apr. 2015, [www.huffpost.com/entry/american-sniper-and-the-muslim\\_b\\_6634768](http://www.huffpost.com/entry/american-sniper-and-the-muslim_b_6634768).
- Guarino, Mark. "Group Says 'American Sniper' Film Spurs Threats against Muslims." *Reuters*, Thomson Reuters, 24 Jan. 2015, [www.reuters.com/article/us-film-americansniper-threats/group-says-american-sniper-film-spurs-threats-against-muslims-idUSKBN0KX0RB20150124](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-film-americansniper-threats/group-says-american-sniper-film-spurs-threats-against-muslims-idUSKBN0KX0RB20150124).
- "Civilians Killed & Wounded." *Civilians Killed & Wounded | Costs of War*, [watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians](http://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians).
- Doward, Jamie. "Muslim Anger at Terror Plot in TV Drama 24." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 30 Jan. 2005, [www.theguardian.com/media/2005/jan/30/broadcasting.religion](http://www.theguardian.com/media/2005/jan/30/broadcasting.religion).
- "Challenging the Terrorist Stereotype." *Arabs and Muslims in the Media: Race and Representation after 9/11*, by Evelyn Alsultany, NYU Press, 2012, pp. 18–46. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qfv0k.5](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qfv0k.5). Accessed 8 May 2020.

- Greenwald, Glenn. "Let's Not Whitewash George W. Bush's Actual, Heinous Record on Muslims in the U.S." *The Intercept*, 30 Nov. 2015, [theintercept.com/2015/11/30/lets-not-whitewash-george-w-bushs-actual-heinous-record-on-muslims-in-the-u-s/](http://theintercept.com/2015/11/30/lets-not-whitewash-george-w-bushs-actual-heinous-record-on-muslims-in-the-u-s/).
- "Countering Violent Extremism: Myths and Fact." *Brennan Center For Justice*, New York University School of Law.
- Warsi, Samar. "Stigma and Suspicion: NYPD Surveillance of Muslims: ISPU." *Institute for Social Policy and Understanding*, 21 June 2019, [www.ispu.org/stigma-and-suspicion-nypd-surveillance-of-muslims/](http://www.ispu.org/stigma-and-suspicion-nypd-surveillance-of-muslims/).
- Beydoun, Khaled, and Heidi Beirich. "Countering The Islamophobia Industry, toward More Effective Strategies.--The Carter Center." *CERIS*, [www.cerisnet.org/resource/countering-the-islamophobia-industry-toward-more-effective-strategies-the-carter-center](http://www.cerisnet.org/resource/countering-the-islamophobia-industry-toward-more-effective-strategies-the-carter-center).
- "FBI Informant Exposes Sting Operation Targeting Innocent Americans in New '(T)ERROR' Documentary." *Democracy Now!*, [www.democracynow.org/2015/4/20/fbi\\_informant\\_exposes\\_sting\\_operation\\_targeting](http://www.democracynow.org/2015/4/20/fbi_informant_exposes_sting_operation_targeting).
- Aziz, Sahar F. "Policing Terrorists in the Community." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2013, doi:10.2139/ssrn.2222083.
- Gumbel, Andrew. "The Violence Is Always There': Life as a Sikh in Trump's America." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 19 Sept. 2018, [www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/19/sikh-in-america-hate-crime-surge-trump-religion](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/19/sikh-in-america-hate-crime-surge-trump-religion).
- "U.S. Muslims Concerned About Their Place in Society, but Continue to Believe in the American Dream." *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, 31 Dec. 2019, [www.pewforum.org/2017/07/26/findings-from-pew-research-centers-2017-survey-of-us-muslims/](http://www.pewforum.org/2017/07/26/findings-from-pew-research-centers-2017-survey-of-us-muslims/).
- Samaha, Albert. "Four Mosques Have Burned In Seven Weeks - Leaving Many Muslims and Advocates Stunned." *BuzzFeed News*, BuzzFeed News, 28 Feb. 2017, [www.buzzfeednews.com/article/albertsamaha/four-mosques-burn-as-2017-begins#.ftzDXdYODd](http://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/albertsamaha/four-mosques-burn-as-2017-begins#.ftzDXdYODd).

