THE PROJECT OF ISLAMOPHOBIA

Mualimul Huda
STAIN Kudus, Central Java, Indonesia
mualimulhuda@stainkudus.ac.id

Abstract

Most of academicians argue that islamophobia is more enlarge after 9/11—troppled the twin towers of the World Trade Center by attacking three commercial jetliners. It is no doubt that 9/11 has hold the comeback of religion into world agenda which situated in political, ideological, religious, economic, sociological, cultural and other questions. Under such conditions, the authority announced the dangerous climate, constitutes the military to begin "war on terror" intent to safety; in other way, it makes way to invoke a battle ethic between "good and evil" such as the meaning of dangerous and safety.

In the present article argues that such global war on terror and its prevention policies can lead to the institutionalization of Islamophobia, circulate for extremism to flourish of public imagination. It is a project of terror and also counterterror as discourse of islamophobia. Base on Runnymede Trust, Islamophobia coined to describe racism of Muslims and intolerance of their religious and cultural beliefs. This discourse turn up after Cold War as Huntington clash of civilizations' thesis and Fukuyama's declaration of capitalism and liberal

democracy along with Gulf War and Islam revolution. Afterward, this paper will not fully demonstrate all discussions, but instead will look briefly at make sense of islamophobia with some discriminations, intimidations and exclusions on the muslim and its impact on the cultural measures.

Keywords: islamophobia, discrimination, terrorism, 9/11 affair, war on terror.

A. Introduction

"Conflict will increasingly involve multiple diverse actors, all competing for the   allegiances and behaviours of targeted populations. As a consequence the outcome of future conflict will increasingly be decided in the minds of these populations rather than on the battlefield" (The Australian Army:2006)

After "the catastrophic events" of 9/11, Islam is often viewed as the cause rather than the context for radicalism, extremism and terrorism (John L. Esposito:2016). The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) presented the report on potential anti-Islamic reactions in the 15 EU States. The report showed that Muslims and also Islamic communities and other vulnerable groups have become targets of increased hostility, discrimination, prejudice, violence and aggression. The issues of the EUMC's report are "Acts of violence, aggression and/or changes of attitude in the EU population; towards ethnic, cultural and religious minorities, especially Muslims and other vulnerable groups and victims; Measures of anti-Islamic actions and reactions (See Christopher Allen & Jorgen S. Nielsen,2002: 6).

In 2006 USA Today-Gallup Poll reports that about Americans prejudice against Muslim or Islam Faith and its implication for using measure security to help preventing terrorism. As a result 22% American respondents said that would not like to have a Muslim as a neighbor, and about 4 in 10 Americans favored more rigorous security measure for Muslims than for other U.S. citizens

(John L. Esposito & Ibrahim Kalin, 2011:xxv). Four years later, in January 2010 American respondents 43% admit that has a prejudice toward Muslims. It is along with increasing anti-Muslims sentiment in the last few years ((John L. Esposito & Ibrahim Kalin, 2011:xxv). On June 22, 2010, a *New York Post* editorial attacked the plans to build new mosques in the state of New York, "...because where there are mosques, there are Muslims, and where there are Muslims, it can be problems." This statement provoke tha feeling of anti-Muslim, islamophobia. "Before New York becomes 'New Yorkistan', it is worth noting that the capital of Great Britain was London until it became popular as 'Londonstan', degenerated by a Muslim community predominantly from South Asia and Africa, whose first generation of 'British Asians' has made the United Kingdom into a launching pad for terrorist (John L. Esposito,2011: 237).

In 2014, (counter)terrorism become a major focus of national attention in Britain. Government ministers announced the policy, while journalists and commentators fabricated the issues of radicalization and extremism on the media agenda. In 2015, the UK Government announced a new *Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015* to save the threat of violent extremism. In the 2011 revised Preventing Violent Extremism policy, extremism is explicitly defined in the terms of the absence of British values:

> Extremism is vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs. We also include in our definition of extremism calls for the death of members of our armed forces, whether in this country or overseas (HM Government, 2016: 3).

As the writer said earlier for the same argument by ministers of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown governments (Tony Blair, 2006). In his autobiography, *A Journey* (2010), Blair extent

the anti-Muslim sentiment in thelanguange of "the war of terror" (Tony Blair, 2010:348). The report of the 2013 *Task Force on Tackling Radicalisation and Extremism* also includes a definition of "Islamist extremism" as the following data:

> ...an ideology which is based on a distorted interpretation of Islam, which betrays Islam's peaceful principles, and draws on the teachings of the likes of Sayyid Qutb. Islamist extremists deem Western intervention in Muslim-majority countries as a "war on Islam", creating a narrative of "them" and "us." They seek to impose a global Islamic state governed by their interpretation of Sharia'ah as state law, rejecting liberal values such as democracy, the rule of law and equality. Their ideology also includes the uncompromising belief that people cannot be Muslim and British, and insists that those who do not agree with them are not true Muslims (HM Government,2016:1-2).

Derian assumes that 9/11 is not wholly new. He argues that 9/11 is a combination of new and old forms of conflict, including "the rhetoric of holy war", "a virtual network war in the media and on the internet", a high-tech surveillance war overseas suc as in airports, cities, and even our homes, and "a dirty war of counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency". He states, "It would appear that 9/11 christened a new network: the Military-Industrial-Media-Entertainment Network (MIME-NET). If Vietnam was a war waged in the living-rooms of US, the first and most likely the last battles of the counter/terror war are going to be waged on global networks that reach much more widely and deeply into our everyday lives." The complicity commercial media to circulate the affair was disseminates the terror. In that context Derian named by "a mimetic war of images" (James Der Derian, 2011) .

> A mimetic war is a battle of imitation and representation, in which the relationship of who we are and who they are

is played out along a wide spectrum of familiarity and friendliness, indifference and tolerance, estrangement and hostility. It can result in appreciation or denigration, accommodation or separation, assimilation or extermination. It draws physical boundaries between peoples, as well as metaphysical boundaries between life and the most radical other of life, death. It separates human from god. It builds the fence that makes good neighbors; it builds the wall that confines a whole people. And it sanctions just about every kind of violence.

Derian trace the war and power of media in West as historical theory and resistence-hegemonic framework to respond it. He thinks it will be to distinguish new from old dangers, real from virtual effects, and terror from counterterror in the network wars'. He also argues,

"...that social scientific theories are unsuited for the kind of political investigation demanded by the emergence of a military-industrial-media-entertainment network. President Eisenhower in his 1961 farewell address famously warned the US of the emergence of a 'military-industrial complex', and of what might happen should 'public policy be captured by a scientific and technological elite'. Now that Silicon Valley and Hollywood have been added to the mix, the dangers have morphed and multiplied...Think of C.Wright Mill's power elite with much better gear to reproduce reality."

According to his view, 9/11 affair here caution by attacking that differ in the scale of the devastation as well as the nature of the attack. The attack along with damage condition, the mechanism of shock and surprise. Base this argument he state,

"9/11 or WTC defied the public imagination of the real not

to mention, as just about every public official and media authority is loathe to admit, the official imagination and pre-emptive capacity of the intelligence community, federal law enforcement, airport security, military, and other governmental agencies. Shock and surprise produced an immediate and nearly uniform reading of the event that was limited to discourses of condemnation, retribution, and counterterror... Otherwise 9-11 will be remembered not for the attack itself but for the increasing cycles of violence that follow (James Der Derian, 2011).

Derian names this new conflict as *virtuous war* (See James Der Derian,2001). It has evolved from the battlefield technologies of the Gulf War (also remember the Vietnam War) and the aerial campaigns of Bosnia and Kosovo. it appears on "war doctrine (when possible) and holy war (when necessary)". He argues that it broaden the infowar of global surveillance and the networked war of multiple media. "In the name of the holy trinity of international order global free markets, democratic sovereign states, and limited humanitarian interventions," Derian said, and afterward US "has led the way in a revolution in military affairs which underlies virtuous war."

B. Islamophobia: Counterterror and Counterinsurgency

Islamophobia refers to prejudice, unfounded dread, hatred and hostility towards Islam and Muslims, and the practical consequences of such discrimination against Muslim individuals and communities. This includes the exclusion of Muslims from mainstream political and social affairs(Lorraine P. Sheridan, 2006: 317-336.) This dread, hatred and hostility can be expressed towards Muslims in many ways, such as:

1. Negative or patronising images and references in the media, and in everyday conversations;
2. Attacks, abuse and violence on the streets;
3. Attacks on mosques and cemeteries;
4. Discrimination in employment;
5. Lack of provision, recognition, and respect for Muslims in

most public institutions (ATCSA 2001).

David Kilcullen, the Australian counterinsurgency writer who has served as an official adviser to the US State Department, wrote that war is "a form of armed politics, and politics is about influencing and controlling people and perceptions"(David Kilcullen, 2004: 1). In this context Kilcullen views that it is a global war which United States and its allies are involved in demands and using an updated model of counter-insurgency theory rather than the conventional counter-terrorism method (George Packer ,accessed on January 15, 2016).

In an other article in 2004, Kilcullen wrotes " the present conflict is actually a campaign to counter a globalised Islamist insurgency. Therefore, counter-insurgency theory is more relevant to this war than is traditional counter-terrorism." He defines the form of terror is "a tactic of insurgency", afterward he argues that the war on terror is not a conflict against terrorism but a defensive war against a globalized Islamist insurgency and should be approached as such, and 'counterinsurgency doctrine is more relevant to this conflict than counterterrorism doctrine (David Kilcullen, 2010: 165). The question now is insurgency of/for whom?

About the undetanding of terror and counterterror, after 9/11 we need the ability to distinguish between Islam itself and Muslim extremism will be critical. Runnymade Trust asumes the eight distinction views of Islam.

1. Whether Islam is seen as monolithic and static, or as diverse and dynamic.
2. Whether Islam is seen as other and separate, or as similar and interdependent.
3. Whether Islam is seen as inferior, or as different but equal.
4. Whether Islam is seen as an aggressive enemy or as a cooperative partner.
5. Whether Muslims are seen as manipulative or as sincere.
6. Whether Muslims criticisms of 'the West' are rejected or debated.

7. Whether discriminatory behaviour against Muslims is defended of opposed.
8. Whether anti-Muslims discourse is seen as natural or as problematic.

For the critical view, Jocelyne Cesari argues, "Islamophobia overlaps with other forms of discrimination like xenophobia, anti-immigration sentiments, and the rejection of the validity of cultural differences (Jocelyn Cesari in John L. Esposito & Ibrahim Kalin,1997: 5). The name of anti-Muslim has been motivated by "a new reality" of dangerous situation as well as anti-semitism which boosted anti-Jewish (Runnymede Trust's Report;. 4). The assumption of racism and its implication on socio-cultural reaction as Samuel Huntington views in *Clash of Civilization* that "The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic Fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power." In the other words, Islam becomes "the other" opposition of West civilization. The same view given by Charles Moore, editor of *The Spectator.* He wrote, "You can be British without speaking English or being Christian or being white, but nevertheless Britain is basically English-speaking, Christian and white, and if one start to think that it might become basically Urdu-speaking and Muslim and brown, one gets frightened and angry." More argued, because of "our obstinate refusal to have enough babies, Western European civilization will start to die at the point when it could have been revived with new blood. Then the hooded hordes will win, and the Koran will be taught, as Gibbon famously imagined, in the schools of Oxford (Charles Moore:19 October 1991)

These views above seem in the negative feeling, that Islam is a threat to human kind and Muslims imagined by devil, so the clash of civilization means as ethical conflict as good and evil. The issue is not only about how to define war and civilization, but to examine our deeply rooted political unconsciousness. Not only politicians, but also journalists, academics, and ordinary citizens have some

very biased notions of "the Other." Based on the neoconservative paradigm, terrorism was tend to the assumption of extremism of the radical religious ideology. The role of extremist religious ideology mechanically pushes an individual into terrorism. The implies that someone is more defends and also more celebrates of his value by the doctrine of multiculturalism. This assumption defines the identity, as Prime Minister David Cameron stated that behind the muslim terrorism lay "a question of identity" that "the passive tolerance of recent years" had to be abandoned in favour of a much more assertive defence of British values against "Islamist extremism"; that British Muslims had to privilege their Britishness over their global allegiance to other Muslims (David Cameron, 2016).

Now the question is, "are we in the historical moment to celebrate the 'End of History,' or at the crucial crossroads to get out of the trap of the political and/or ideological stereotypes of the 'Clash of Civilizations'?" *Huang Ping* said (Huang Ping, accessed on January 17, 2016.) He argues that after the 9/11 attack "there was mobilization and condemnation from all parts of the world. It was mostly because of the tragic loss of civilians and the total destruction of world's most well-known trade center. It was also partly because of global media and that a superpower was involved." The attack becomes other kind of violence measure included war on terror. He states that violence has been industrialized and institutionalized within the modern system—the one key to understand of the dilemma of modernity. The modernity on the one hand, he assumes, "promotes and legitimizes democracy, liberty, freedom, the rule of law for domestic politics and to ensure and secure civil rights, and, on the other, mobilizes, institutionalizes, and industrializes violence as the basis for protecting territory, sovereignty, and national interests." In his analysis, Ping was base to the *Dushu* (*The Monthly Reader*) in November and December 2001 that it presents some interpretations to understand the contradictory and problematic modernity and the nation-state, "terrorism in today's world is an internal and institutionalized

part of modernity. Only when we bind ourselves to the stereotype of modern vs. traditional, civilized vs. barbarian, the West vs. the Rest, can we view the September 11th attacks as plotted by some premodern barbarians." Thereby, is terrorism not a real and serious threat to us all? Is the terrorist threat exaggerated by the government? (Caroline Cox and John Marks, 2003:9)

Chomsky argues that the attack motivated by four political root causes. These are the presence of US troops in the Saudi region, the strong slant in American policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the ongoing devastating sanctions on Iraq, and the wide US support for repressive dictatorial regimes in the Muslim and non-Muslim world (Ismail Ozsoy, 2007:6)

C. Poetics of Terror: How Safety and Dangerous are Govern and Understood?

"Terrorism is usually defined as violence against civilians for the purposes of publicising a political cause. However, it should be noted that, in UK policy discourse, the term "terrorism" tends to be used inconsistently and selectively: violence against civilians carried out by the US government, for example its "shock and awe" bombing of Iraq, is not described as terrorism. Equally, the term is not used to describe violence by non-state actors engaged in systematic harassment and intimidation, such as the English Defence League (Arun Kundnani, 2015:40).

In "Who are the Global Terrorists?", Chomsky refers to the US Army Operational Concept for Terrorism Counteraction definition (in 1984, when Reagan administration intensify the war on terrorism) that "terrorism" as "the calculated use of violence or threat of of violence to attain goals that are political, religious, or ideological in nature...through intimidation, coercion, or instilling fear." He asserts that terrorism echoing the Reagan in 1980s where Honduras was the major base for US operations as well as when US

labelled the "terrorist organization" on African National Congress (ANC) against the Apartheid regime of South Africa (appartently because of US opposition, the UN resolution against terrorism was ignored), or an embargo in response the situation in Central US, Reagan declared a national emergency because "the policies and actions of the Government of Nicaragua constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States." Furthermore when Reagan cooperates with Shimon Peres, Israel Prime Minister, to attack Tunis that killed 75 peoples and in Beirut Lebanon that killed 80 people and wounded 256. Chomsky states that the bomb also "burned babies in their beds," killed children "as they walked home from the mosque," and "devastated the main street of the densely populated" West Beirut suburb... The crime was organized by the CIA and its Saudi clients with the assistance of British intelligence (Chomsky, accessed on January 15, 2016)

This affair well remembered to the hijacking of the Achille Lauro affair. In his ambitious novel, *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters,* Julian Barnes notes, "We have to understand it, of course, this catastrophe; to understand it, we have to imagine it..." (Julian Barnes, 1989:125) The affairs that Chomsky was called by the law day as Reagan's proclaimed to punish the terrorist that without law there can be only chaos and disorder. Chomsky asserts, "Washington waged its "war on terrorism" by creating an international terror network of unprecedented scale, and employing it worldwide, with lethal and long-lasting effects." The last word as Mary Kaldor's view on *"Beyond Militarism, Arms Races and Arms Control".* He states, "In the new wars, mobilising people is the aim of the war effort; the point of the violence is not so much directed against the enemy; rather the aim is to expand the networks of extremism." How does we understand of the reality in our own imagination?

About 20 years later, in October 2007 Denis MacEoin, an author of crime thrillers and ghost stories, wrote *The Hijacking of British Islam.* He claimed to "demonstrate unequivocally that separatist and hate literature, written and disseminated in the

name of Islam, is widely available in the UK (Michael Gove,2006:7). Afterwards, it was removed from Policy Exchange's website after the BBC publishes that its had been fabricated (Peter Barron, 13 December 2007).

The Hijacking of British Islam followed an report before entitled *Living Apart Together*, which argued that the Islamism "is not only a security problem, but also a cultural problem(Munira Mirza, Abi Senthilkumaran, and Zein Ja'far, 2007: 15). The authors condemned multiculturalism for a rise in "anti-Western ideas" among Muslims and non-Muslims. They sought to identify that experiences of Islamophobia and discrimination faced by Muslims in Britain, and then it described as myths and attributed to a victim mentality that given social trusty by institutions, politicians, and other social groups. The report is over foreign policy that followed a "cultural problem of self-loathing and confusion in the West" (Munira Mirza, Abi Senthilkumaran, and Zein Ja'far, 2007: 7). Into the bargain for "bringing to an end the institutional attacks on Britain and its culture," in particular, the report criticised the claimed on teaching of history which claimed "taught in a one-sided, moralised way, focusing attention on the racism and violence of the Empire, and the oppression of ethnic minority groups and women, but with little sense of the positive contributions of the industrial revolution and the Empire (Munira Mirza, Abi Senthilkumaran, and Zein Ja'far, 2007:7). The authors argues that focusing on security and counterterrorism government policy has failed to deal with a political or cultural threat.

Abdelaziz El Amrani argues that 9/11 has come to symbolize in American history, it means beyond locality or global, so he suggests that the war on terror (Bush's term axis of evil) called up the hostility of Cold War (Reagan's term evil Empire refers to USSR). He assumes that a bipolar world order that divided East from West during Cold War as statement "You're either with us or against us". He concludes "...what is certain which 9/11 has been and will continue to be a powerful... upon world affairs. In other words, he located the issue in international system and global

politics to increase the legitimacy of US power. "Crucially enough, 9/11 and its aftermath have pushed many people around the world and in US in particular to renegotiate and rethink their loyalities and affiliations (Abdelaziz El Amrani;5) Acoording to Huntington's thesis, he asserts that it is emerged the clash between Western and Islamic civilization. But in this sense Huntington looks exaggerated the factor of culture in understanding the new global order and views Islam is monolithic.

D. Islamophobia in Future: A New Norm of Preventive

In the interview with David Barsamian, Chomsky said that the US will rule the world by force, and then will have the right to destroy that challenge before becoming a threat. So, "to establish a new norm, you have to do something. Of course, not every state has the capacity to create what is called a new norm... That's what power means." And to establish a new norm, he argues that "such as the right of preventive war, is to select a completely defenseless target, which can be easily overwhelmed by most massive military ferce in human history. However, in order to do that credibly, at least in the eyes of your own population, you have to frighten people." Islamophobia is one kind propaganda to "completely defenseless target"(Noam Chomsky,2005: 2). In the case of 9/11 Chomsky underlined:

> In a really spectacular propaganda achievement, which will not doubt go down in history, Washington undertook a massive effort to convince Americans, alone in the world, that Saddam Hussein was not only a monster but also a threat to our existance. And it substantially succeeded. Half the U.S. population believes that Saddam Hussein was "personally involved" in the September 11, 2001, attacks (Noam Chomsky,2005:3).

E. Conclucion

Therefore, the Gallup Poll's report at the beginning of article as well as the US achievement, and so do islamophobia is part of

effort to convince not only Americans, but all humans around the world. In this phase, islamic question was required on cultures, socio-politics, history, and philosophy for considerable studies. For example, as Jewish Question in the enlightenment when it fades. The discrimination against Jews in the history as we seen required the emancipation to change and fill West civilization, and it became more enlightened, more liberal, and more democratic, as well as Islam Question could be preservation the world in peace and trained on critical and political consciousness.

REFERENCES

Allen, Christopher & S. Nielsen, Jorgen. 2002. *Summary Report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001*. Centre for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, Department of Theology, The University of Birmingham, on behalf of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). Available at *www.fra.europa.eu/sites/ default/files/ fra_uploads/199-Synthesis-report_ en.pdf.* accessed on January 18, 2016.

Barnes, Julian. 1989. *A History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters.* London: Jonathan Cape.

Barron, Peter. "Disastrous misjudgement?", *BBC Blogs,* 13 December 2007. Available at: *www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/ theeditors/2007/12/disastrous_ misjudgement.html,* accessed on January 16, 2016.

Blair, Tony speech to the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles, 1 August 2006. Available at *www.news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_ news/politics/5236896.stm*, accessed on January 16, 2016.

_____. 2010. *A Journey.* London: Random House.

Cameron, David. "Speech to Munich Security Conference" on 5 February 2011. Available at: *www.number10.gov.uk/news/ pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference,* accessed on January 17, 2016.

Cesari, Jocelyn. "Islamophobia in the West: A Comparison between Europe and America", in John L. Esposito & Ibrahim Kalin (eds.). 2011. *The Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century: Islamophobia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. "Who are the Global Terrorists?" Available at *www.library.uniteddiversity.coop/More_Books_and_Reports/Noam_Chomsky-who_are_the_Global_Terrorists.pdf*, accessed on January 15, 2016.

_____. 2001. *9/11.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 2005. *Imperial Ambitions: Conversations with Noam Chomsky on the Post-9/11 World*, *interviews with David Barsamian.* London: Hamish Hamilton-Penguin Books.

Cox, Caroline & Marks, John. 2003. *The 'West', Islam and Islamism: Is Ideological Islam Compatible with Liberal Democracy?* London: Civitas. Available at: *www.civitas.org.uk/pdf/c s29.pdf*. accessed on January 17, 2016.

Derian, James Der. 2011. *Virtuous War: Mapping the Military-Industrial-Media-Entertainment Network.* Oxford: Westview.

_____. "9.11: Before, After, and In Between," *Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Essay Forum*. *www.essays.ssrc.org/10yearsafter911/9-11-before-after-and-in-between,* accessed on January 15, 2016.

Esposito, John L. & Kalin Ibrahim (eds.), 2011. *Islamophobia: The Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esposito, John L. 2011. *What Everyone Needs to Know about Islam,* 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. "Islamophobia," *Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding.* Available at *https://acmcu.georgetown.edu/islamophobia.* Accessed on January 16, 2016.

Forum Againts Islamophobia and Racism (FAIR). *"Counter-Terrorism Powers: Reconciling Security and Liberty in an Open Society: A Discussion Paper."* FAIR's Survey on July 2004, London.

Avalaible at *www.statewatch.org/news/2004/feb/uk-CT-discussion-paper.pdf* accessed on January 17, 2016.

Gove, Michael. 2006. *Celsius 7/7.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Harris, Paul."9/11 Anniversary: New York Muslims insist that they are American too", *Observer*, 12 September 2010. *www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/sep/ 12/911-anniversary-new-yor-muslims.* accessed on January 17, 2016.

HM Government. 2013. *Tackling Extremism in the UK: Report from the Prime Minister's Task Force on Tackling Radicalisation and Extremism*. Available at *www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_ data/file/263181/ETF_ FINAL.pdf,* accessed on January 17, 2016.

Kilcullen, David. "Countering Global Insurgency". *Small Wars Journal.* 30 November 2004.

_____. 2010. *Counterinsurgency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kundnani, Arun. 2015. *A Decade Lost: Rethinking Radicalisation and Extremism.* London: Claystone.

Mills, Tom; Griffin,Tom & Miller, David. 2011. *The Cold War on British Muslim.* London: Spinwatch.

Mirza, Munira; Senthilkumaran, Abi & Zein Ja'far. 2007. *Living apart Together: British Muslims and the Paradox of Multiculturalism.* London: Policy Exchange.

Moore, Charles. "Time for a More Liberal and 'Racist' Immigration Policy", *The Spectator,* 19 October 1991.

Ozsoy, Ismail. 2007 "Terrorism: A Socio-Economic Analysis," in O. Nikbay & S. Hancerli (eds.), *Understanding and Responding to the Terrorism Phenomenon: Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop on Terrorist Operation on Washington DC, 8-9 September 2006.* Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Packer, George. "Knowing the Enemy: Can Social Scientists Redefine

the 'War on Terror'?", *The New Yorker,* 18 December 2006, *www.newyorker.com/magazine/2006/12/18/knowing-the-enemy,* accessed on January 15, 2016.

Ping, Huang. "September 11th: A Challenge to Whom?" an article on A Social Science Research Council Essay Forum, available at: *www.essays. ssrc.org/10yearsafter911/september-11th-a-challenge-to-whom,* accessed on January 17, 2016.

Sheridan, Lorraine P. "Islamophobia Pre- and Post-September 11th, 2001", *Journal of Interpers Violence* (March 2006, Vol. 21, No. 3), p. 317-336.

The Australian Army. 2006. *Adaptive Campaigning: The Land Force Response to Complex Warfighting*. Avalaible draft at: *www. fundforfallenallies.org/sites/fundforfallenallies.org/files/ library/Adaptive%20Campaigning%20%207%20Nov%20 06.doc*. accessed on 18 January, 2016.

The Runnymede Trust Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia. 1997. *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All.* London: Runnymede Trust's Report.