

MAKING AN ENEMY: DECONSTRUCTING LEWIS'S AND HUNTINGTON'S ISLAMOPHOBIA AND NEO-ORIENTALISM

¹Жұматай Ғабит Бекенұлы, ²Ысқақ Ақмарал Сыдығалықызы

¹gabit.zhumatay@narxoz.kz, ²akmaral.yskak@narxoz.kz

^{1,2}Narxoz Университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

¹Zhumatay Gabit, ²Yskak Akmaral

¹gabit.zhumatay@narxoz.kz, ²akmaral.yskak@narxoz.kz

^{1,2}Narxoz University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Abstract. This paper critically examines the ideological and conceptual roots and current state of being of Islamophobia in the United States and other Western nations. Drawing upon the relevant literature, the paper interrogates and deconstructs the neo-Orientalist Islamophobic narratives and discourses developed and promoted by Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington. In this regard, we critically analyze acclaimed studies and books penned by Lewis and Huntington to identify and uncover the intellectual and theoretical underpinnings of neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia in their discourses. We also look into how neo-Orientalist Islamophobic narratives and perspectives facilitated by Lewis and Huntington impacted the foreign policy of the United States under George W. Bush administration and on Islamophobic trends in American society. We specifically focus on Lewis and Huntington because the current Islamophobia in the US and other Western nations mostly draws on their narratives and views. Our study contributes to understanding of the intellectual and ideological roots and underpinnings of Islamophobia and neo-Orientalism in the West and beyond. The main results of our study demonstrate that Lewis and Huntington greatly contributed to neo-Orientalist Islamophobia in the West, steering the US and other Western nations into a perpetual war against Muslims and other people of color. We also observe that Islamophobic trends go beyond the West, manifesting itself in other countries, including in Kazakhstan. In this regard, we conclude that the so-called Western liberal democracies cannot be considered role models and emulated by other non-Western nations due to their religious intolerance, xenophobia, racism, hatred and hostility towards Islam, Muslims and other non-white people.

Keywords: Islamophobia, neo-Orientalism, Islam, Muslims, Lewis, Huntington, USA, West

Introduction

After the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, the West led by the USA was in search of an enemy that would replace communism and the USSR. Western policymakers and pundits started to promote hostility and hatred towards Islam and its followers around the globe and thus making Islam

and Muslims the enemy of the West [1]. Western pundits like Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington argue that Islam is not consistent with Western civilization, democracy, liberalism, freedom, human rights and other core values [2]. Comparing the Israelis and the Arabs, a leading Christian far right Brigitte Gabriel once said that “It’s barbarism versus civilization. It’s democracy versus dictatorship. It’s goodness versus evil” [3, p. 183]. The collective abomination, rejection, hatred and hostility towards Islam and Muslims in the US and other Western societies have been conceptualized by Nathan Lean as the ‘Islamophobia Industry’ in which right-wing xenophobic ethnoreligious Christian nationalists in the West systematically promote anti-Muslim sentiments [1].

In Kazakhstan, such perilous trends, developments and discourses about Islam in the USA and other Western nations are virtually understudied and there is a paucity of research into these contentious issues. The government of Kazakhstan has heavily invested in building a society premised upon religious tolerance, interethnic dialogue and peaceful coexistence. Moreover, the US and other Western countries are increasingly perceived in Kazakhstan as role models and highly civilized advanced liberal democracies that it should follow and emulate. Yet that is not the case. The rise of anti-Arab and Islamophobic racism, hatred, intolerance and even genocidal intent unequivocally demonstrates that the so-called role model Western nations have failed to overcome and discard their centuries-old deep-rooted racism, intolerance, colonial and Orientalist mindset, tribal racist culture and attitudes.

In this study we consider the historical roots, development and ideological underpinnings of Islamophobia or hatred of Islam and Muslims in the West by conducting a critical analysis of the works and concepts of prominent Western intellectuals and scholars such as Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington. Moreover, drawing upon literature on Islamophobia in the West we focus on identifying colonial, neocolonial and neo-Orientalist characteristics and dimensions of the ‘Islamophobia Industry’ in the West.

Methodology

Our study based on an extensive review of relevant literature on Islamophobia and neo-Orientalism. Moreover, we employ theories and paradigms of neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia to critically engage with existing literature. Specifically, we analyze, and critique the works penned by Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington. Besides, we examine the essential works of Edward Said and Mubarak Altwaiji on Orientalism, Islamophobia and neo-Orientalism. Underlying issues pertaining to how the so-called West constructed the knowledge about the East and how Westerners perceived and portrayed Muslims were first examined in depth by Edward W. Said, a prominent Palestinian-American intellectual, in his numerous studies, especially in his 1978 book “*Orientalism*” [4]. In “*Orientalism*”, Edward Said indicated that the imaginary ‘Orient’ was constructed in a binary Manichean thinking by the West in relation to itself, depicting the Orient as uncivilized, inferior, and backward [4]. Such deeply prejudiced and racial constructs were leveraged

to justify and legitimize structural violence, including colonial conquest and imperialism against Muslims [5]. In Yaser Ali's view, Orientalism as the process of Arab racialization served as the precursor for Islamophobia because the racial hatred and hostility of the West towards the Arabs has been extended to all Muslims and other people of color [5]. According to Mubarak Altwaiji, classical Orientalism morphed into neo-Orientalism which is a binarism between the civilized superior West and the savage inferior Orient [6]. Leveraging the precepts of neo-Orientalism, neo-conservatives in the US pushed for 'civilizing' Arab and Muslim societies through large-scale American intervention and violence [7].

Although anti-Islam and anti-Muslims sentiment, hatred, prejudices and hostility had long been ingrained in Western societies and in Westerners' mentality, Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington with their seminal works, expertise and knowledge reignited Islamophobic hysteria in the United and other Western nations. Deploying classical Orientalism and neo-Orientalism, this study focuses on a critical in-depth analysis and breakdown of anti-Islam and anti-Muslim views and paradigms of Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington. Through an analysis of Lewis's "*The Roots of Muslim Rage*" (1990), "*What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*" (2002), and Huntington's essay "*A Clash of Civilizations?*" (1993) and "*The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*" (1996), we uncover their Orientalist and neo-Orientalist Islamophobic views and assumptions. Moreover, we focus on what implications and impacts of Islamophobic narratives promoted by Lewis and Huntington have had on the US foreign policy since 9/11 as well as on public opinion within the US, on how their anti-Islamic views and beliefs crystalized into hegemonic foreign and domestic policy discourses leading to the American invasions of the Middle East and racialization of Muslims within and beyond the US.

Bernard Lewis's Construction of an Enemy Image of Islam

Orientalist and neo-Orientalist Islamophobia, anti-Islam and anti-Muslim sentiment run deep in Western Christian societies whose roots go back to history [2, 8]. Bernard Lewis, a distinguished scholar of the Middle Eastern Studies in the West in his numerous works, including in his essay "*The Roots of Muslim Rage*" (1990) and in his 2002 book "*What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*", examined the roots of the hostility and confrontation between Europe and Islam [9, 10]. To gain a proper understanding of the intellectual, conceptual and theoretical roots and underpinnings of the 'Islamophobia Industry' in Western societies, we need to have a closer look at Bernard Lewis's neo-Orientalist paradigms. Lewis was one of the pioneers who drew attention to the rise of religious fundamentalism among Muslims. By exploring the civilizational crisis within the Muslim world, Lewis became one of the instigators of Islamophobia in the West, explicitly misrepresenting and exaggerating the reality on the ground, inventing notions of 'Muslim rage', Muslim resentment, anger, and hate of the West.

Lewis considers Islam to be a formidable force “in its worldwide distribution, its continuing vitality, its universalist aspirations” that can be compared to Christianity [9, p. 48]. When referring to Europe, the West or Christian world, Lewis deploys the term ‘we’. The presence of the dichotomous Manichean concept ‘us vs them’ and ‘othering’ is heavily present in Lewis’s assertions about Islam and the Islamic world. He admits that despite the existence of an imaginary Islamic world and millions of Muslims who admire and emulate the West, he brings attention to the presence of Muslims and Islamic countries whose hatred of the West goes beyond hostility in their rejection of Western civilization not only in sense of what it does but in terms of its identity, way of life, the principles and values and so on [9, p. 28]. Lewis points to how certain Muslims and Muslim nations perceive the West and its values as innately evil and Westerners and their Muslim allies as the “enemies of God” [9, p. 28].

The mindset and worldviews of such Muslims are so backward and primitive, it is unthinkable to reconcile them with the reason and mindset of the West and Westerners. Backward mentality informs and guides their thinking and actions, which has made them obstinately stranded in past medieval barbaric savage values and lifestyle, having become increasingly resistant to change and progress. From this perspective, Lewis alludes to an idea of the violent and turbulent dawn of Islam as a worldwide and monotheistic faith and that Mohammad was not only a prophet but also a ruler of a political entity and a warrior who fought for God against the enemies of God. Lewis indicates the violent and savage character and dimensions of Islam. He contends that those who follow this religion would subscribe to the violent and barbaric scripts, norms and practices dictated by Islam [10].

Lewis highlights that according to Islam, the world is split into two parts. On the one hand, there is the House of Islam (Dar Al-Islam) and on the other, there is the House of Unbelief or House of War (Dar Al-Harb). Muslims consider bringing the latter to Islam as their ultimate duty and thereby violence and warfare are inherent to Islam and Muslim lifestyle and mindset. So, the assumption is that Islam and its followers are inherently violent and such mindset and behavior are incurable and unredeemable. Guided and inspired by their faith, Muslims are deeply committed to jihad or to waging a permanent holy war within the House of Islam and abroad in the House of Unbelief against infidels [10].

As a monotheistic faith Islam is portrayed by Lewis as an advanced and sophisticated civilization, having claims to world domination and enlightening and civilizing infidels. In this trajectory, though Islam did succeed in taking over the barbarians to the east and the south (a reference to cultures adhering to polytheistic faiths), when Islam encountered a similar powerful faith and distinct civilization in the west and the north known as Christendom, it had to acknowledge this formidable foe as a competing universal religion. The contact and communication between Islam and Christendom was conceptualized as the struggle and contest for world domination, which lasted for over fourteen centuries. For a long time, Islam had been advancing and penetrating deep into Europe, conquering the Christian realms of the Levant and North Africa. Yet for the last three hundred years, since

the failure of the Ottomans to capture Vienna in 1683 and the rise of European colonial empires, Islam has been on the defensive, being increasingly assaulted by European Christian powers [10].

From this standpoint, Lewis describes Islam as a rebellious force against Western Christian preeminence and prevalence with the aim at restoring its heyday greatness. Islam's loss to ever advancing the West and Russia, a growing influence of foreign alien laws, norms and ways of life within Muslim lands, and the emancipation of women and children in Muslim countries are considered by Lewis as the root causes of 'Muslim rage'. He alludes to Islam's aspiration and desire to keep its primordial, pristine and medieval identity within religious patriarchal norms. As the order and system based on Islam were subverted, undermined and disrupted by Christians, the outbreak of its rage against Christendom was inevitable [9, p. 49]. Unlike Christian nations in old Europe, the United States had long been ignored or even later admired in Muslim lands. Yet with a growing American footprint in the Middle East, a profound change and transformation occurred in Muslim perceptions of America. With the US imperialism and its unequivocal support for the Zionist state of Israel in the heart of the Islamic world, Muslims' perceptions of America dramatically changed and shifted from admiration to hostility.

Unlike Christianity and its denominations, Islam has never experienced profound changes and seems not to be prone to any change. In this regard, the abomination and rejection of any idea about progress, modernity, secularism and freedom by Islam has rendered this faith and its followers in a state of backwardness, savagery, and darkness. Lewis argues that Islam was never willing to grant full equality and freedom to those who held other faiths and beliefs [9, p. 56]. The West went ahead of Islam in two matters: first, in economic development, and second, in political development. Although initially the West had been admired and imitated by Muslims, later this positive attitude developed into hostility and rejection [9, p. 57].

Lewis indicates that Muslim hostility and rejection of the West lies in their deep sense of humiliation of having been overtaken and overwhelmed by those whom Muslims considered to be inferior. Those Muslim reformers and modernizers who sought to modernize their respective countries were seen by fundamentalists as agents of the West and collaborators. Lewis points to the fact that Muslims could not cope with the rapid transformation and development of their societies, increasingly seeing the Western style of development model as alien and detrimental to their way of life. Such Muslims therefore cultivated the belief that the old Islamic ways were best, and they were thereby obliged to return to the true path prescribed by their God [9, p. 59].

The fundamentalists in the House of Islam consider secularism and modernism to be their enemies. Secularism is attributed to the Jews and the West who are striving to impose this neo-pagan evil on Muslims. The war against modernity is focused on resisting the process of change that has occurred in Muslim countries. Lewis sees so-called Islamic fundamentalism as the manifestation of aimless and formless anger, indignation and hostility of Muslims to those who have undermined, eroded and disrupted their traditional values, norms and ways of life.

Such mood and attitude resulted in an explosive mixture of rage and hatred among the Muslim masses who espouse abductions and assassinations while trying to find approval and precedent for such actions in their scriptures and in the deeds of their prophet [9, p. 59]. Consequently, the Muslim masses overwhelmingly see the West as the ultimate source of these dramatic changes in their societies. Here the US as the legitimate heir of Western civilization and the leader of the Western world has become the focus for Muslim anger and hate [9, p. 60]. Lewis views Islam and Muslims as irrational, their hate and anger as a historic reaction of an ancient foe against the so-called Judeo-Christian heritage and as a manifestation of 'a clash of civilization' [9, p. 60]. He therefore pushed hard for externally imposed violent change and transformation Muslim nations in the Mideast through American military intervention under the George W. Bush administration. At the same time, he rekindled old anti-Islam and anti-Muslim bigotry, hatred and hostility in the United States and other Western.

Samuel P. Huntington's Contribution to Neo-Orientalist Islamophobia

Building on Bernard Lewis, Samuel P. Huntington further articulated and elaborated on the concept of 'a clash of civilization'. He constructed 'a clash of civilization' as a conflict between civilization and barbarism. This thesis fatefully ingrained into the consciousness of Americans and other Westerners [19]. Echoing Lewis, Huntington likewise underlines the violent character of Islam and Muslims' propensity to violence, which is purportedly dictated by their religion [11]. The logic is that since Islam is violent, its adherents are likewise violent. Throughout his book "*The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*" published in 1996 and other studies Huntington used the categories of 'culture' and 'civilization' as a unit of analysis. Applying the paradigm of 'a clash of civilization' in examining dramatic events after the end of the Cold War, Huntington considered culture as the main cause and source of future regional and global conflicts. He alluded to the idea that the era of nation states had been over and thus the age of 'a clash of civilization' came into being. Like Lewis, Huntington was the prominent figure who contributed to the rise of the 'Islamophobia Industry' in the US and the West. His main target was Islam and Muslims. In his book "*The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*" he draws attention to how at the end of the 20th century Muslims were engaged in far more intergroup violence than members of other civilizations [12, p. 262]. Yet this claim was not backed up by evidence and even he admitted that to assess the violence propensities of civilizations, extensive research is needed.

So, Huntington's arguments and opinions are not backed up by empirical valid evidence and data. That is why his arguments are premised upon his personal views and including prejudices emanating from his cultural and ethnic background. Like Lewis, he came from a cultural environment where racial ethnic prejudices are deeply pervasive and entrenched in people's mindset and ingrained in American Christian culture. Deliberately overlooking the violent and genocidal nature and

character of his society, Huntington shows his concern about violence in other cultural environments, especially in Muslim societies. He was therefore wondering about the root causes of collective violence in Muslim countries. In this regard, he asserts that since throughout their history Muslims have been known for their propensity for violence, which explains the proclivities of Muslims for group violence today [11]. His hypothesis was that since the history of Islam has been violent and thereby current Muslim societies are likewise violent. So, according to Huntington, there is a direct correlation between the past and present of Muslim societies, that is the violent past still reverberates across time, making contemporary Muslims similarly violent.

To substantiate his claims about purported violent history of Islam, Huntington refers to the birth of Islam in the 7th century. Today Islam has remained a violent faith, he asserts, from its inception Islam was a religion of the sword, which glorified military virtues [12, p. 263]. Referring to the birth of Islam among belligerent and warlike Bedouin nomadic tribes, Huntington argues that violence lies at the very origin and foundation of Islam. Parroting Lewis, Huntington points out that Islam's founder the prophet Muhammad was purported to be a warrior and a skillful military commander. Here he refers to Jesus and Buddha who unlike Muhammad were peaceful. The doctrines of Islam, he asserts, advocate constant war against infidels, yet he draws attention to how Muslims throughout their history mostly have fought with one another. Pretending to be a great scholar of Islamic studies, he claims that Islam is devoid of nonviolent concepts and practices [12, p. 263].

According to Huntington, the first source of current propensities to violence in Muslims societies lies in the bellicose origin of Islam. As to other sources of the purported bellicosity of Islam, Huntington indicates the proximity of Muslims to non-Muslim groups, Muslims' inability to coexist with non-Muslims, inassimilability and indigestibility of Muslims, a lack of a dominant center in Islam, and an exponential demographic growth in Muslim societies. As to the proximity of Muslims to non-Muslims, territorial expansion of both Muslims and non-Muslims by land brought them into direct contact with each other. Moreover, the Western sponsorship resulted in the establishment of the Zionist ethnocratic and ethnoreligious entity in the heart of the Muslim world. Here Huntington admits that the overseas colonial expansion of European powers did not lead white Europeans to living in territorial proximity to non-Europeans as the latter were decimated by the former [12, p. 263]. Even though throughout their history various Muslim political entities have managed to create multicultural societies where the representatives of multiple cultures, ethnicities and faiths have lived side by side, Huntington questions and even rejects any idea of Muslims' ability to coexist with non-Muslims.

Huntington calls attention to inassimilability and indigestibility of Muslims. In this sense, Muslim minorities pose a threat to culturally homogenous Western nations by diluting their culture and increasing a quest for multiculturalism. According to Huntington, in their countries even if they constitute an absolute majority, Muslims are purported to have problems with non-Muslim minorities. And by the same token, Muslim minorities in non-Muslim countries tend to have

problems with non-Muslim populations. Since Islam merges religious faith and politics, drawing a sharp line between Muslims and non-Muslims, which makes coexistence between them out of question. For this reason, unlike Muslims, Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Confucians and the representatives of other faiths tend to have less problems in adapting to and coexisting with one another than with Muslims [12, p. 264]. As an example, he refers to Southeast Asia where Chinese communities are purported to have virtually no difficulty living in Thailand and the Philippines with local populations unlike in Muslim-dominated Indonesia and Malaysia where Chinese diaspora are faced Muslim violence [12, p. 264].

Muslim propensities to violence throughout history are linked by Huntington to militarism, indigestibility and their proximity to non-Muslims. Like Lewis, Huntington admits that Western imperialism is the culprit behind the mess and violence in the Muslim world, which led to the mass victimization of the Muslim masses. Yet he explicitly trivializes the West's destabilizing and destructive role in the Mideast and beyond, increasingly questioning the validity of the Muslims' sense of victimhood. Furthermore, Huntington attributes the purported violence, instability and chaos in Muslims societies to the absence of a dominant center or a hegemonic Muslim power who would be responsible for the order and mediation of conflicts within the Islamic world [12, pp. 264-265]. Moreover, one of the sources of Muslim propensities to violence is ascribed to the demographic explosion in Muslim countries and the presence of large numbers of males. The Muslim youth is considered by Huntington as a natural source of violence and turmoil both in Muslim nations and beyond. Huntington claims that violence in Muslim societies at the end of the 20th century was caused by a dramatic growth and rejuvenation of Muslim populations. In his view, the aging of this generation and economic development in Muslim nations may result in a significant reduction in Muslim propensities to violence and thereby in "a general decline in the frequency and intensity of fault lines wars [12, p. 265]. Thus, Huntington like Lewis contributed to normalizing and rationalizing racist neo-Orientalist narratives about Islam and Muslims in the US and beyond. Furthermore, he became an ardent supporter of neocon foreign policy in the US aimed at the wholesale destruction and decimation of Muslim nations in the Middle East and beyond.

Implications of Lewis's and Huntington's Islamophobic and Neo-Orientalist Worldviews

In this section, we discuss the implications and consequences of the Islamophobic narratives of Lewis and Huntington for foreign policy of the US and for American society at large. Although both Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington significantly contributed to the knowledge production about Islam and Muslims, their hypotheses and assumptions reflect preexisting Islamophobic knowledge and prejudices inherent in Western societies. Despite the generation of violence and terrorism by the United States and European powers to a greater extent, Lewis, Huntington and many other so-called Western pundits increasingly single out Is-

lam and Muslims as violent and belligerent. Both Lewis and Huntington immensely contributed to the 'Islamophobia Industry' in the United States and in the West in general. Not only did they contribute to the 'Islamophobia Industry', but also, they became the architects of the American war on global terrorism, the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, the invasion of Iraq in 2003, and other numerous catastrophic criminal wars across the Muslim world waged by the US and its allies [13].

It was 1990 when Bernard Lewis penned his "*The Roots of Muslim Rage*" and 1993 when Samuel P. Huntington penned his essay "*A Clash of Civilizations?*". From this perspective, both laid the foundation of the conceptual and ideological underpinnings of a new world order and a blueprint for a new international system where the US would dominate. In the post-Cold War era, as the only global superpower, the US was in search of an enemy. In this regard, Lewis and Huntington helped find an imaginary enemy. The whole religion and its adherents were declared an existential threat and foe of the US and the so-called Western civilization. As a result, the US and its allies started a global crusade against Islam and Muslims in 2001 under the guise of the global war on terror. In fact, the intention was to extend the US empire and to forge a new world order [13]. Lewis provided the rationale for the unending American war since 2001 and offered a blueprint for sowing an American-style democracy in the Middle East, especially in Iraq and other Muslim nations [14]. In fact, Lewis and Huntington replaced the Soviet Union with Islam as the global foe of the United States [14].

Lewis and Huntington became intellectual and ideological mentors of the group of hawkish politicians and high-ranking officials in the United States known as neoconservatives who took prominent positions in the George W. Bush administration between 2001-2008. These extremely belligerent and warlike neoconservatives in the George W. Bush administration ardently advocated an aggressive foreign policy course, steering the US into a perpetual war [15]. The Islamophobic narratives and perspectives promoted by Lewis and Huntington fed into the aggressive American foreign policy and actions of neoconservatives. After September 11, 2001, both Bernard Lewis and Samuel P. Huntington became media stars in the US, fervently lending their support for the US war efforts. Lewis was repeatedly drawing attention to the incompatibility between Islam and democracy, the rejection of modernity by Muslims, and their fascination with terrorism [16]. Lewis called for ceasing to ask questions like "Why do they hate us?" because Muslims had purportedly been despising and hating the West for a millennium [16]. Emphasizing the irreconcilability between Islam and democracy and Muslim propensities to violence, Lewis passionately advocated war against Muslims and the US invasion of Iraq, alleging that the US would be welcome by Muslims as 'liberators' [16, p. 541].

Huntington was likewise pushed for war against Muslims. He was among prominent American intellectuals who wrote the letter "What We're Fighting For: A Letter from America" in February 2002, addressed the US public, government and the international community [17]. In the letter, Huntington and other American intellectuals highlighted the justness and necessity of the war on terrorism, which

allegedly caused and promoted by adherents of the radical, violent and intolerant religion of Islam [17]. Moreover, they contended that American war on terror was permissible, necessary and just [17]. Huntington and Lewis systematically reinforced one another's cultural and civilizational paradigms on Islam and Muslims, again and again highlighting the incongruence of Islam with democracy, modernity and progress. They convinced both the political establishment of the US and American public of Muslim hatred of America and the West that was allegedly motivated by Islamic fundamentalism [18]. Besides, they claimed that Muslims' self-sacrifice and killing themselves lacked any political goal other than achieving religious martyrdom. In this regard, Robert A. Pape and James K. Feldman argue that such presumptions fueled the belief that future 9/11s could be prevented only by the US military intervention and subsequent wholesale violent transformation of Muslim societies [18, p. 2]. Premised upon such presumptions promoted by Lewis and Huntington, the US invaded and decimated Afghanistan, Iraq and other Muslim nations in the Middle East, generating more violence and destruction.

Besides their decisive and far-reaching impacts on the US foreign policy after September 11, 2001, Lewis's and Huntington's anti-Islam and anti-Muslim paradigms fueled public hatred, bigotry, racism and hostility towards Islam and Muslims in the US and other Western societies. Although Islamophobia had been inherent and deep-rooted in Western societies [2], Lewis and Huntington revived and reignited old anti-Islam and anti-Muslim sentiments and hatred in the US. Framing Islam and its adherents as innately violent and bellicose reflected colonial neo-Orientalist racist narratives in the US and beyond. As a result, all segments of Western societies were heavily involved in anti-Islam and anti-Muslim hysteria and crusade. Echoing Lewis and Huntington, one of the chief proponents of neo-Orientalist trend in the US, Daniel Pipes highlighted the lack of democracy and abundance of terrorists in Muslim countries [19]. The binary Manichean worldview 'us versus them' took deep root in the US society and people's consciousness. Moreover, racist neo-Orientalist paradigms resonated with Islamophobic narratives and discourses promoted by Lewis and Huntington. Intellectuals, media, think tanks, experts, politicians, government agencies, and ordinary people were engaged in collective hate, vilification and demonization of Islam and Muslims within the US and other Western societies. Islamophobic racist slurs, rants, tropes and narratives were normalized and rationalized in society, becoming a powerful national discourse.

Caroline Mala Corbin observes how Muslims were increasingly dehumanized after 9/11 in the US, facing racialization and 'othering' [20]. Corbin also identifies two pervasive, prevalent and all-embraced narratives in the United States such as "Terrorists are Muslims" and "white innocence and white supremacy" [20]. Deliberate targeting and victimization of Muslims were so pervasive and ubiquitous, the label of 'terrorism' or 'terrorist' was exclusively reserved for Muslims even if horrendous terrorist attacks were committed by whites not by Muslims. The label 'terrorist' was intentionally applied to Muslims but not to whites, which was defined by Dustin Craun as 'white benevolent innocence' [21] and by Caroline

Mala Corbin as ‘white privilege’ [20]. On the one hand, Islam was portrayed as an inherently violent and alien faith, and on the other, Muslims were stereotyped, racialized and persecuted [22].

Islamophobia has become the official ideology of the American empire and powerful all-embraced discourse in US society. Islamophobic views of Lewis and Huntington intended to foment anti-Muslim hatred, bigotry and racism in the West. Besides Lewis and Huntington, thousands of individuals and groups have increasingly focused on reigniting the deep-rooted Christian hostility and hatred against Islam and Muslims. A right-wing American conservative pundit Ann Hart Coulter said in the aftermath of 9/11 “We should invade their countries [Muslim], kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity. We weren’t punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officers. We carpet-bombed German cities; we killed civilians. That’s war. And this is war” [23, pp. 184-185]. In a similar vein, Fred Ikle, a strategist and former undersecretary of defense, placed all the blame on Muslims, threatening to drop nuclear bombs on Muslim countries, including on holy Islamic sites Mecca and Medina [23, p. 185].

Anti-Muslim hysteria is so pervasive and rooted in American and other Western societies, individuals and hate groups systematically promote conspiracy theories of Muslims being an existential threat to the US and Western civilization. Islamophobia has permeated the US and Western societies so profoundly; it has become institutionalized as Black racism. Bernard Lewis’s question “Why do they hate us?” resonates and reverberates so well across every spectrum of society, it has been embraced and internalized by Americans and Europeans. Spewing anti-Islam and anti-Muslim hate speech has been normalized and rationalized in the West. In other words, the US and West, like in the medieval times, have been engaged in Christian crusades and war against Islam and Muslims. For instance, in March 2016 in his interview with CNN, Donald J. Trump stated that “I think Islam hates us ... we have a major, major problem. This is, in a sense, this is a war” [24, 25, 26]. Moreover, echoing Lewis and Huntington, Donald Trump and other Western politicians have framed Muslims as ‘indigestible’ and ‘impossible to assimilate’, and thereby anti-American and anti-Western [26]. Finally, Trump has consistently put the blame on Muslim Americans for terrorist attacks committed by Muslims and even non-Muslims [26]. Yet Trump did not invent Islamophobia in the US, as his comments are part of the nationwide ‘Islamophobia Industry’ in America and reflection of anti-Muslim narratives of Lewis, Huntington and many other Islamophobes in the West [27]. Donald Trump’s anti-Muslim comments and rhetoric resonate well with many Americans, especially the Republican Party and its supporters. In this regard, Arsalan Iftikhar highlights how Islamophobia had long been entrenched within ideological political platforms of leading politicians of the Republican Party. Besides the Republican Party, likewise Islamophobia is deeply embedded within the Democratic Party in the US.

American mainstream media and intellectuals are at the forefront of the ‘Islamophobia Industry’, reinforcing and perpetuating anti-Islam narratives. In media and public Islam and Muslims are largely depicted as violent, savage and barbaric

[20]. “The next time you hear of a terror attack – no matter where it is, no matter what the circumstances – you will likely think to yourself, “It’s Muslims again.” And you will probably be right” reads Fareed Zakaria’s opinion piece on the website of CNN [28]. Americans and other Westerners were repeatedly asking “why do they hate us?” referring to the 2001 September 11 attacks in the United States by a group of Muslims [29]. One of the most prominent American critics of Islam and Muslims Sam Harris once said that “We are at war with Islam” [30]. Sam Harris’s view was shared and echoed by other pundits like Pamela Geller who in her 2011 book emphasized that the West was at war with Islamic imperialism and expansionism, calling for bringing the so-called ‘Islamization of America’ to an end [31]. Applying the term “Islamofascism”, David Horowitz called attention to how Islam and Muslims exhibit their hatred against Christians and Jews, harboring evil intentions to destroy the Western civilization [32]. Racist Islamophobic hate speeches uttered by Trump and other American high-ranking officials, leading intellectuals and groups, clearly demonstrate how neo-Orientalism and Islamophobia promoted by Lewis and Huntington successfully operate in Western societies.

Conclusion

Through a critical analysis of Islamophobic and neo-Orientalist paradigms and concepts developed by Lewis and Huntington, our study contributes to understanding of the intellectual and ideological roots and underpinnings of these phenomena in the West and beyond. We have ascertained that as prominent intellectuals Lewis and Huntington, greatly contributed to the rise of neo-Orientalist Islamophobia in the West, making the US more hostile towards Islam and Muslims, and at the same time, promoting anti-Islamic hatred and bigotry in Western societies. We have also observed that virulent Islamophobia is not confined within Western societies, similar Islamophobic trends are observed in non-Western societies. Interrogating and deconstructing neo-Orientalist and colonial Islamophobic narratives put forth by Lewis and Huntington we contend that race and racial prejudices are at the core of the Western Christian world, being perhaps its most essential and enduring ideology. Christianity, race and nationalism have been the key organizing principles in the West for many centuries, which have been deployed to construct a Manichean binary worldview of ‘good versus evil’, ‘us vs them’, ‘civilized vs savage’, ‘superior vs inferior’ and so on [33]. Despite horrendous crimes against humanity throughout their history in terms of European colonialism, imperialism, destruction of Indigenous societies and genocide of Indigenous peoples, predatory capitalism, humanitarian imperialism and the so-called global war on terror, Western nations have constructed and skillfully leveraged the concept of ‘White benevolent innocence’ to assert their identity as Western Christian conquering forces whereas claiming ‘benevolent innocence’ and ‘inherent goodness’, which have been inculcated in the minds of white people across Western societies [33].

In this sense, we argue that neo-Orientalist Islamophobic discourses promoted by Lewis and Huntington are in fact the reflection and continuity of these an-

cient old Manichean anti-Islam and anti-Muslim discourses deeply ingrained in the Western Christian societies and in Westerners' mentality. 'White benevolent innocence' and 'white privilege and supremacy' have resulted in a superiority complex of the West in relation to Islam, Muslims and other people of color. In fact, the Islamophobic narratives and discourses developed and propagated by Lewis and Huntington is the manifestation of this superiority complex of the US and other Western nations. In this regard, Lewis and Huntington aptly manipulated the superiority complex and mindset as well as deeply embedded Islamophobia in the West. From this perspective, although the US and other Western nations position themselves as tolerant secular liberal democracies and open inclusive societies that cherish human rights, liberty and freedom, we observe the implicit and explicit manifestations of ethnocentric Christian nationalism, xenophobia and intolerance, racism and racial hatred towards certain ethno-religious and racial groups, especially towards Muslims in the West and beyond [19].

In the 1980s and 1990s, there was the resurrection of neocolonial neo-Orientalist discourses in the West with respect to Arabs, Muslims and any people of color promoted by Lewis, Huntington and many other Western pundits. Bigoted and vicious anti-Arab and Islamophobic discourses and narratives have been disseminated, normalized and rationalized by policy makers, media, intellectuals, academia, and think tanks in the West, which have been embraced by the wider public. Violent and racist language and rhetoric of Western policymakers, media and intellectuals have often been translated into savage terrorist acts of Westerners against Muslims and other non-whites across the globe. The Western politicians and intellectuals have explicitly stated numerous times that the West is at war with Islam. Right-wing ethno-religious nationalists in the West increasingly perceive Islam and Muslims as an existential threat to the Western civilization, being incompatible with Western democracy, liberal values and traditions. In turn, xenophobic, racist and neo-Orientalist anti-Islam and anti-Muslim sentiment, bigotry, hatred and hostility show that the so-called Western liberal democracies are in fact are not democracies at all. Quite the opposite, the US and other Western nations have been stranded in the colonial age, being stuck in crusaders' Manichean mentality, tribal ethno-nationalism, racial superiority, and remaining neocolonial racist political entities.

List of references

- 1 Lean N. *The Islamophobia Industry. How the Right Manufactures Hatred of Muslims*. Pluto Press, 2017.
- 2 Gada M.Y. *An Analysis of Islamophobia and the Anti-Islam Discourse: Common Themes, Parallel Narratives, and legitimate Apprehensions*. *American Journal of Islam and Society*, 34(4), 2017, 56–69. [Electronic resource] URL <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v34i4.799>
- 3 Kumar D. *Islamophobia and the Politics of Empire*. Haymarket Books, 2012.
- 4 Said E.W. *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Vintage Books, 1978.
- 5 Ali Y. *Shariah and Citizenship – How Islamophobia Is Creating a Second-Class Citizenry in America*. *California Law Review*, 2012, Vol. 100, 1027-1068.

- 6 Altwaiji M. Neo-Orientalism and the Neo-Imperialism Thesis: Post-9/11 US and Arab World Relationship. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 2014, 36 (4): 313–323.
- 7 Altwaiji M. and Alwuraafi E. The Fallacy of Neo-orientalism and the Risk of Imperialism: How American Politics Mobilize Novelists, *International Critical Thought*, 2021, Vol. 11, No. 2, 190–209, [Electronic resource] URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/21598282.2021.1924069>
- 8 Alamdari K. Terrorism cuts across the East and the West: Deconstructing Lewis's Orientalism. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 24, No 1, 2003, 177-186, DOI:10.1080/0143659032000044423
- 9 Lewis B. *The Roots of Muslim Rage*. The Atlantic, 1990, September Issue.
- 10 Lewis B. *What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- 11 Huntington S.P. *A Clash of Civilizations?* 1993
- 12 Huntington S.P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- 13 Schwarz J. The Architects of the Iraq War: Where Are They Now? *The Intercept*, March 15, 2023, [Electronic resource] URL <https://theintercept.com/2023/03/15/iraq-war-where-are-they-now/>
- 14 Waldman P. A Historian's Take on Islam Steers U.S. in Terrorism Fight, *The Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 3, 2004, [Electronic resource] URL <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB107576070484918411>
- 15 Kagan R. Neocon Nation: Neoconservatism, c. 1776, *World Affairs Journal*, May 29, 2008, [Electronic resource] URL <https://carnegieendowment.org/posts/2008/05/neocon-nation-neoconservatism-c-1776?lang=en>
- 16 Abrahamian E. US media, Huntington and September 11. *Third World Quarterly*, 2003, Vol 24, No 3, pp 529–544, DOI: 10.1080/0143659032000084456
- 17 “What We're Fighting For: A Letter from America.” Sixty Prominent U.S. Academics Say War on Terrorism is Just, US Department of State, 15 February 2002, [Electronic resource] URL <http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile/display.pl?p=/products/washfile/latest&f=02021401.plt&t=/products/washfile/newsitem.shtml>
- 18 Pape, R.A. and Feldman J.K. *Cutting the Fuse. The Explosion of Global Suicide Terrorism and How to Stop It*. University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- 19 Tuastad D. Neo-Orientalism and the new barbarism thesis: aspects of symbolic violence in the Middle East conflict(s), *Third World Quarterly*, 2003, Vol 24, No 4, 591–599, DOI: 10.1080/0143659032000105768
- 20 Corbin C.M. Terrorists Are Always Muslim but Never White: At the Intersection of Critical Race Theory and Propaganda, *Fordham Law Review*, 2017, Vol. 86, Issue 2, 455-485.
- 21 Craun D. White Benevolent Innocence, Oct 13, 2014, [Electronic resource] URL <https://medium.com/ummah-wide/white-benevolent-innocence-white-denial-and-identity-development-from-columbus-to-the-war-on-terror-28ebae29ca3d>
- 22 Sufi M.K. and Yasmin M. Racialization of public discourse: portrayal of Islam and Muslims, *Heliyon*, 8, 2022, [Electronic resource] URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12211>
- 23 Alamdari K. Terrorism cuts across the East and the West: Deconstructing Lewis's Orientalism. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 24, No 1, 2003, 177-186, DOI:10.1080/0143659032000044423
- 24 Schleifer T. Donald Trump: 'I think Islam hates us', March 10, 2016, [Electronic resource] URL <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/03/09/politics/donald-trump-islam-hates-us/index.html>
- 25 Trump D. 'I Think Islam Hates Us', January 26, 2017, [Electronic resource] URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/26/opinion/i-think-islam-hates-us.html>

26 Johnson J. and Hauslohner A. 'I think Islam hates us': A timeline of Trump's comments about Islam and Muslims, May 20, 2017, [Electronic resource] URL <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/05/20/i-think-islam-hates-us-a-timeline-of-trumps-comments-about-islam-and-muslims/>

27 Lopez G. Donald Trump's Islamophobic rhetoric resonates with many Republicans, Dec 8, 2015, [Electronic resource] URL <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2015/12/7/9868702/donald-trump-islamophobia-republicans>

28 Zakaria F. Why they hate us, June 20, 2016 [Electronic resource] URL <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/04/08/opinions/why-they-hate-us-zakaria/index.html>

29 Zakaria. F The Politics of Rage: Why Do They Hate Us? Oct 14, 2001, [Electronic resource] URL <https://www.newsweek.com/politics-rage-why-do-they-hate-us-154345>

30 Hounshell B. Sam Harris: Yes, it is a war with Islam, April 26, 2007, [Electronic resource] URL <https://foreignpolicy.com/2007/04/26/sam-harris-yes-it-is-a-war-with-islam/>

31 Geller P. Stop the Islamization of America. A Practical Guide to the Resistance. WND Books, 2011.

32 Horowitz D. Islamo-Fascism and the War Against the Jews. Second Thoughts Books, 2015.

33 Craun D. White benevolent innocence: race, whiteness and the genocidal mentality of colonial modernity, 2011, San Francisco State University, [Electronic resource] URL <https://scholarworks.calstate.edu/concern/theses/h702q7922>

Жұматай Ғ.Б., Ысқақ А.С.

Дұшпан образын жасау: Льюис пен Хантингтонның исламофобиялық және нео-ориенталистік көзқарастарын талдау

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада АҚШ пен басқа батыс елдеріндегі исламофобияның идеологиялық және тұжырымдамалық негіздері мен қазіргі жағдайы сыни тұрғыдан қарастырылады. Тақырып бойынша зерттеулерге сүйене отырып, мақалада Бернард Льюис пен Самюэль Хантингтонның нео-ориенталистік исламофобиялық көзқарастары мен дискурстарын талдауға мән береміз. Осыған байланысты Льюис пен Хантингтонның дискурстарындағы неоориентализм мен исламофобияның интеллектуалдық және теориялық негіздерін анықтау мақсатында олардың негізгі еңбектерін сыни тұрғыдан талдаймыз. Сондай-ақ Льюис пен Хантингтон көтерген нео-ориенталистікисламофобиялық көзқарастар мен дискурстардың Джордж Буш әкімшілігі тұсындағы АҚШ-тың сыртқы саясатына және американдық қоғамдағы исламофобиялық тенденцияларға қалай ықпал еткенін қарастырамыз. Льюис пен Хантингтонға ерекше назар аударуымыздың себебі АҚШ пен басқа Батыс елдеріндегі қазіргі исламофобия белгілі деңгейде осы ғалымдардың көзқарастарының ықпалымен белең алуымен байланысты. Зерттеудің нәтижелері Льюис пен Хантингтонның Батыстағы нео-ориенталистікисламофобияның өршуіне, сондай-ақ АҚШ пен басқа да Батыс елдерін мұсылмандарға қарсы соғысқа итермелеуге үлкен үлес қосқанын көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар исламофобиялық тенденциялар Батыстан тыс басқа елдерде, соның ішінде Қазақстанда да кең етек алып бара жатқаны айқын байқалады. Осыған байланысты діни төзімсіздік, ксенофобия, нәсілшілдік пен исламофобияның шырмауынан шыға алмаған Батыстың либералды демократиялары өзге батыстық емес елдерге үлгі бола алмайды деген қорытындыға келдік.

Түйін сөздер: исламофобия, нео-ориентализм, ислам, мұсылмандар, Льюис, Хантингтон, АҚШ, Батыс

Жұматай Ғ.Б., Ысқақ А.С.

Изобретение врага: анализ исламофобских и нео-ориенталистских взглядов Льюиса и Хантингтона

Аннотация. В данной статье критически рассматриваются идеологические и концептуальные основы и современное состояние исламофобии в США и других западных странах. Опираясь на литературу в статье, исследуются и анализируются нео-ориенталистские исламофобские нарративы и дискурсы, разработанные и продвигаемые Бернардом Льюисом и Самюэлем Хантингтоном. В этом отношении использован критический подход к основным исследованиям, написанные Льюисом и Хантингтоном для выявления и раскрытия интеллектуальных и теоретических основ нео-ориентализма и исламофобии в их дискурсах. Также изучено влияние нео-ориенталистских исламофобских нарративов и воззрения, продвигаемые Льюисом и Хантингтоном на внешнюю политику Соединенных Штатов при администрации Джорджа Буша-младшего и на исламофобские тенденции в американском обществе. Придание особого внимания Льюису и Хантингтону вызвано с тем, что нынешняя исламофобия в США и других западных странах в основном опирается на их нарративы и взгляды. Результаты нашего исследования показывают, что Льюис и Хантингтон внесли большой вклад в нео-ориенталистскую исламофобию на Западе, вовлекая США и другие западные страны в бесконечную войну против мусульман. Мы также наблюдаем, что исламофобские тенденции выходят за пределы Запада, имея различные проявления и в других странах включая Казахстан тоже. В связи с этим мы приходим к выводу, что так называемые западные либеральные демократии не могут считаться образцом для подражания и примером для других незападных стран из-за их религиозной нетерпимости, ксенофобии, расизма, ненависти и враждебности по отношению к исламу, мусульманам и представителям других рас.

Ключевые слова: исламофобия, нео-ориентализм, ислам, мусульмане, Льюис, Хантингтон, США, Запад