

DOKUZ EYLUL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE
AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE PROGRAM
MASTER'S THESIS

**ISLAMOPHOBIA AS A RESULT OF THE U.S. POLICY IN THE
MIDDLE EAST AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN AMY
WALDMAN'S POST-9/11 NOVEL *THE SUBMISSION***

Arzu PINAR

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail Yavuz Bülent UĞRASIZ

İZMİR – 2019

APPROVAL PAGE



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this master's thesis titled as "Islamophobia as a Result of the U.S. Policy in the Middle East and Its Representation in Amy Waldman's Post-9/11 Novel *The Submission*" has been written by myself in accordance with the academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that all materials benefited in this thesis consist of the mentioned resources in the reference list. I verify all these with my honor.

26/06/2019

Arzu PINAR



ABSTRACT

**Master's Thesis
Master of Arts (MA)**

**Islamophobia as a Result of the U.S. Policy in the Middle East and Its
Representation in Amy Waldman's Post-9/11 Novel *The Submission***

Arzu PINAR

**Dokuz Eylul University
Graduate Institute of Social Sciences
Department of American Culture and Literature
American Culture and Literature Program**

The Middle East is one of the oldest settlements in the history of humanity. It has been the focal point of history for centuries due to its location, history, resources, rich culture, and status of being the land where religions were born. With the formation of a bipolar world order after the Second World War, the Middle East has been the scene of power struggles and the fact that it has rich energy resources has increased interest in the Middle East. The United States of America, which emerged as the hegemon power after the end of the Cold War, developed its Middle East policy in this direction. Apart from aiming to protect its interests, it has chosen Israel as its permanent ally and prioritized its security in the region with its establishment in 1948. Israel's establishment and the conflicts that had started even before it was founded are the sources of the problems that still exist in the Middle East. America's pro-Israel attitude not only hinders the solution of the problems, but also increases anti-Americanism. As a result of the policy that the US pursued, the terrorists who were created with their own resources attacked the USA on September 11, 2001 and paved the way for developments that would strike the whole world. Following the policy with the perception of the evil 'other' during the Cold War, the US filled this 'other' gap

created by the disintegration of the Soviet Union with the fight against terrorism and Islam after the September 11 attacks. Another problem that arose was Islamophobia, which increased considerably. In addition to the historical background of the US Middle East policy, its results, 9/11 attacks, the origins of Islamophobia and its current status, Amy Waldman's novel *The Submission*, which is one of the striking post-9/11 novels that depict Islamophobia, was also examined in this study.

Keywords: Islamophobia, Middle East, Arab-Israel, Zionism, 9/11, Amy Waldman, *The Submission*, US Foreign Policy.



ÖZET

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

A.B.D.’nin Ortadoğu Politikasının Sonucu Olarak İslamofobi ve Bunun Amy Waldman’ın 11 Eylül Sonrası Romanı *The Submission*’daki Temsili

Arzu PINAR

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Programı

İnsanlık tarihinin en eski yerleşim yerlerinden olan Ortadoğu; konumu, tarihi, zengin kültürü, semavi dinlerin doğduğu topraklar olması ve ekonomik zenginlikleri gibi pek çok özelliği nedeniyle yüzyıllardan beri tarihin odak noktası olmuştur. İkinci Dünya Savaşı’nın ardından iki kutuplu dünya düzeninin oluşması ile Ortadoğu güç mücadelelerine sahne olmuş ve özellikle zengin enerji kaynaklarına sahip olduğunun anlaşılması, Ortadoğu’ya olan ilgiyi artırmıştır. Soğuk Savaş’ın bitimi ile egemen güç olarak ortaya çıkan Amerika Birleşik Devletleri de Ortadoğu politikasını bu yönde geliştirmiştir. Her zaman çıkarlarını korumayı hedeflemesinin yanı sıra, 1948’de İsrail devletinin kurulması ile kendine İsrail’i daimi müttefik olarak seçmiş ve İsrail’in bölgedeki güvenliğini öncelikleri arasına almıştır. İsrail’in kuruluşu ve kuruluşundan bile önce başlayan çatışmalar bugün hala devam etmekte olan Ortadoğu’daki sorunların kaynağını oluşturmaktadır. ABD’nin İsrail yanlısı tutumu da sorunların çözümüne engel olmakla birlikte Amerikan karşıtlığını da artırmaktadır. ABD’nin izlediği politikanın sonucu olarak kendi kaynakları ile yarattığı teröristlerin, 11 Eylül 2001 tarihinde ABD’ye saldırması ile tüm dünyayı sarsacak gelişmelerin önü açılmıştır. Soğuk Savaş döneminde ‘öteki’ algısı ile politika izleyen ABD, Sovyetler Birliği’nin dağılması ile oluşan bu ‘öteki’ boşluğunu, 11 Eylül saldırılarının ardından terörizm ile mücadele ve İslam ile doldurmuştur. Ortaya çıkan bir diğer sorun ise ciddi boyutta artan İslamofobi olmuştur.

Amerika'nın Ortadoęu politikasının tarihsel gelişimi, sonuçları, 11 Eylül saldırıları, İslamofobi'nin kökenleri ve günümüzdeki halinin yanı sıra, günlük hayatta olduğu gibi edebiyatta da yerini bulan bu olgunun örneklerinden biri olan Amy Waldman'ın *The Submission* adlı romanı da bu çalışmada incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İslamofobi, Ortadoęu, Arap-İsrail, Siyonizm, 11 Eylül, Amy Waldman, *The Submission*, Amerikan dış politikası.



**ISLAMOPHOBIA AS A RESULT OF THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE
EAST AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN AMY WALDMAN’S POST-9/11
NOVEL *THE SUBMISSION***

CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| APPROVAL PAGE | ii |
| DECLARATION | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| ÖZET | vi |
| CONTENTS | viii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |

CHAPTER ONE

THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND 9/11 ATTACKS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1.1. | AN OUTLOOK ON THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE U.S. BEFORE WWII. | 3 |
| 1.2. | THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST DURING THE COLD WAR..... | 4 |
| | 1.2.1. Zionism and the Birth of Israel | 6 |
| | 1.2.2. The Arab-Israeli Conflict and the Other Events..... | 11 |
| | 1.2.3. The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan and Iran-Iraq War..... | 22 |
| 1.3 | THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AFTER THE COLD WAR..... | 28 |
| 1.4 | SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 ATTACKS AND THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST..... | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.4.1. September 11 Attacks | 34 |
| 1.4.1.1. The Background and Al-Qaeda | 37 |
| 1.4.2. The War On Terrorism and the Invasion of Afghanistan | 41 |
| 1.4.3. Neo-conservatism in the U.S. Foreign Policy | 45 |
| 1.4.4. The War in Iraq | 51 |
| 1.5. THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO THE PRESENT | 54 |

CHAPTER TWO

ISLAMOPHOBIA AS A POST 9/11 CHALLENGE

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.1. WHAT IS ISLAMOPHOBIA? | 64 |
| 2.1.1. Islamophobia in the U.S. Before and After 9/11 | 73 |
| 2.2. THE REPRESENTATION OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN AMY WALDMAN'S <i>THE SUBMISSION</i> | 76 |
| CONCLUSION | 85 |
| REFERENCES | 87 |

INTRODUCTION

Although US relations with the Middle East historically dates back to the 19th century, the main interest of the US in the region developed during the time it began to appear as the leader of the Western world after the Second World War. Soon, the world witnessed a bipolar political system, which was the Cold War. During this 45-year period between 1945 and 1990, the US pursued a foreign policy placing the Soviet Union to its center. There are analogies between the foreign policy applied in this period and the foreign policy of the US in the Middle East today. The United States aimed to stabilize the regions of strategic importance to its interests, and the oil-rich Middle East was the leading region. In this sense, the historical background of the US policy in the Middle East will be examined in the first chapter of the thesis.

The US and the Soviet Union also supported opposing parties in this region as they did across the globe. However, the most strategic and important pro-American country in the region was the state of Israel, which was established in 1948 (Ahmedov, 2005, p. 139). The security of Israel has been one of the priorities of the United States in the region since the day Israel was founded. Therefore, the US supported Israel both militarily and politically during all its wars with the Arabs in the Cold War and prepared 'peace' plans in order to keep the Arabs close while considering its interests. Nevertheless, the United States' special relationship with Israel, has led to problems with Arab countries (Ataman, 2006, p. 403).

While the Cold War was still going on, the 'orientalist' point of view, which was first introduced by Edward Said and has been discussed, has been particularly effective in the politics and foreign policy of the US (Little, 2008, p. 10). According to Western and American rulers and elites, while the West constantly represents perfection, the good, the right, and the superior, the East always represents evil, backwardness, wrongs and the imperfections. Being an anti-Arab and anti-Muslim, accordingly Islamophobia, are the products of this perspective. For this reason, even though the United States and the West form temporary alliances in the Middle East, they only see Israel as the absolute ally (Ataman, 2006, p. 425-427).

With the end of the Cold War, a new 'other' had to be found. New concepts and theories have been developed for the new situation and the one that has created the largest influence and that has been emphasized the most is Samuel Huntington's "The

Clash of Civilizations” thesis. According to this, the war period of the ideologies and the nationalisms is over and it is the turn of the war between the civilizations. He declared that the most serious alternative of the Western civilization is the Islamic civilization, and therefore, the most serious ‘other’ and the enemy is the Islamic World (Huntington, 1993, p. 22-49). Instead of the danger of communism, where the ideologies prevailed, the Islamic danger of the era of the clash of civilizations is defined as the determining factor in international politics. The Middle East, which is a region dominated by Islamic civilizations and Muslim countries, is seen as the Islamic world and because of this, it has been the most affected region by this new understanding.

The United States, which had never been attacked in its history, was attacked for the first time on September 11, 2001 in New York and Washington. These terrorist attacks revealed that the US and its people are vulnerable to attacks and struck a huge blow to its myth of invincibility and being untouchable. When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the US consciously armed and trained guerilla forces to fight against the Soviets in the last period of the Cold War. The fact that the people who carried out the attacks are the terrorists that came into the picture with the organization of the guerilla forces in the aftermath of the invasion of Afghanistan and them being Muslims, has sharpened the West's view of the new 'evil' and formed the basis of today's Islamophobia. Therefore, we see that the US is in fact one of the main reasons in the emergence of Islamophobia. Islamophobia took an epidemic form soon after September 11, it developed as an obsession with Muslim terrorists and escalated as a groundless and irrational phobia of the Muslims in the world.

We see Islamophobia especially in politics, law, cinema, public institutions, etc. in addition to literature. Especially after the September 11 attacks, an increasing number of works have been produced about the attacks and anti-Islam approaches. In the second chapter of the thesis, both the origins of the concept of Islamophobia, and the reflections of it in Amy Waldman’s *The Submission*, which is one of the novels of post-9/11 period, with the author's fictional story inspired by what happened in real life will be examined.

CHAPTER ONE

THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND 9/11 ATTACKS

1.1. AN OUTLOOK ON THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE U.S. BEFORE WII

The Middle East has an area of 15 million km² and a population of 450 million, and today the world's largest oil reserves are located in this region with more than a 45% ratio (Harunoğulları, 2017, p. 154). It is a region that has always attracted the interest of other countries because of these oil reserves. In addition to the raw material sources discovered in this region by the West in the 1910s, the existence of the origins and the important centers of the three major religions, the region's historical and cultural background, and the fact that it is a transition point in the middle of the three continents played a decisive role in world politics especially after World War II. Any superiority to be achieved in this region enables the possibility of gaining political power, as well as economic power. Following World War I, the Ottoman Empire lost its influence and Arab nationalism was presented to the people in the region by the powers of the time such as Britain. This was the leading step for the sharing of the land between those powers and, for a long time, Britain maintained its existence in the region with colonialism.

The beginnings of the US-Middle East relations dates back to the missionary activities that had started before World War I. In parallel with the missionaries, educational institutions such as Robert College (1863) in Istanbul, the Syrian Protestant College (later called the American University of Beirut, 1866) and the American University of Cairo (1919) were opened (Hahn, 2005, p. 2). These activities continued in cultural and predominantly in commercial areas until the Cold War. With the end of World War I, the major US oil companies were significantly involved in the Middle East oil market. The decrease in America's own oil reserves and the desire to keep these reserves for worse case scenarios, the increasing need for more oil as a developing country and the existence of no alternative resource to oil while being this dependent on it have made the Middle East a priority for the US. Since any turmoil or instabilities in the region will affect the oil flow, this priority still remains in position

in today's US foreign policy. As the Second World War was approaching, the US was meeting its major amount of oil need from the Middle East, thus increasing its activities in the region.

1.2. THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST DURING THE COLD WAR

Adopting 'isolation' as the foundation foreign policy, the U.S. declared neutrality at the beginning of both the First and the Second World War, and then involved depending on the course of the wars. In its neutral periods, the US continued to provide military and financial aid to the European states, especially to the UK, and at the same time expanded its commercial activities in many regions of the world.

The United States, emerging victorious from World War II, also emerged as the world's largest economic, military and political power, and began to establish an order based on liberal values. Signals of the Cold War, which would leave its mark for a long period after the Second World War, were given in the Potsdam conference held in July in 1945 by the differences of opinion between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The U.S. president at the time Franklin D. Roosevelt died in April in the same year, before the end of the war and the Vice President Harry Truman took his place. After the end of the WWII, Truman caused changes in American foreign policy with his doctrine. The world took a bipolar structure as pro-Soviet and pro-US/Western Blocks, the Cold War years began in 1947 and the world entered a new era.

America's security policy of post-WWII was basically to 'contain' the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's policy of gaining access to warm waters and the U.S. policy of containment created conflicts mostly in the Middle East. The U.S. policy in the Middle East was shaped within the framework of the containment policy and tried to create a balance protecting the interests of the U.S. among the countries of the region. The United States, which was one of the poles in the bipolar world system, aimed to be superior, and controlling the energy resources in the Middle East, which has economic and strategic importance, or at least preventing the other pole from accessing these resources and achieving their strategic goals, were the two options. Between 1948 and 1960, the United States sought to accomplish this through military alliances.

In this, potential allies were Muslim and Arab countries. By the mid-1960s, the U.S. also tried to get close to radical Arab nationalism. Although a high importance was given to being in close contact with the Arab and Muslim countries and the conservative forces, Israel was regarded as the most reliable ally in any circumstances after it was founded in 1948.

The containment policy was first practiced in the cases of Greece, who had been threatened by the USSR with a civil war, and Turkey, from whom the USSR had demanded the right to possess a naval base in the straits. As the economic pillar of this policy, which was also the basis of the Truman Doctrine, the then U.S. foreign minister George Marshall formed and implemented an economic aid plan to help European countries recover from the war debts and to prevent the economically distressed states from falling under the influence of communism. On the other hand, America led to the creation of an alliance with the aim of integrating the economic efforts related to the containment policy with military efforts. In 1949, the US, Britain, France, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Iceland, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Canada established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), an alliance based on the principle of common defense. The key provision of the organization was Article 5, which stated that:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security (NATO, 1949).

The Middle East hosted one of the first Cold War conflicts. The American-Soviet tension in 1945-46 took place in Iran. According to the agreement between Iran, the US, Britain and the Soviet Union at the time of war, the occupation forces of these countries had to withdraw from Iran within six months of the end of the war. After the war, Britain and the US withdrew their troops from Iran, but the Soviets did not in a search for oil. After the United States and Britain took a firm stance within the United

Nations, the Soviet Union withdrew completely from Iran in May in 1946 (Hahn, 2005, p. 5).

The establishment of the State of Israel, which influenced the course of US foreign policy in the region and which can be considered as the starting point of the Middle East conflicts, occurred in May 1948. Approximately eleven minutes after the announcement of the establishment of Israel, President Truman officially declared U.S. recognition of Israel. This decision confronted the Arab countries, who were against the U.S.-supported Israel from the very beginning, with the United States, who was trying to maintain friendly relations with them (Hahn, 2005, p. 24).

1.2.1. Zionism and the Birth of Israel

The word 'Zion', which is the origin of the word Zionism, is the name of the mountain on which Prophet Solomon built the holy temple (Burhan, 2008, p. 20). Since the earliest times in Jewish history, it has been used synonymously with Jerusalem. This word has been given meaning after the destruction of the first Jewish temple in Palestine by the Babylonians, and it became a feeling that indicated the desire and longing of the Jewish people expelled from lands of Zion to return to Palestine. (Boyer 1995, p. 7; Öke, 2013, p. 28) The ideology of Zionism involves the establishment of a Jewish State at the center of the Middle East, which includes the vast territories extending from the Nile to the Euphrates (Abufayyad, 2015, p. 23). The basis of this ideology is in the first book of the Old Testament, Genesis: 15:18-21,

“On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram and said, 'To your descendants I give this land from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates—the land of the Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Hittites, Perizzites, Rephaites, Amorites, Canaanites, Girgashites and Jebusites' ”(Holy Bible, 1994: 16).

This land is called the Land of Israel (Hebrew: Eretz Yisrael) by the Jews. The two blue lines at the top and bottom of the present Israeli flag are attributed to this interpretation.

The transition of Zionism from religious to a political dimension actualized with the nationalism movement which characterized the 19th century and spread by the French Revolution in 1789. Especially the movements of nationalism in Europe, put the European Jews in a very difficult situation. As a result of a series of attacks,

massacres and unrests, the idea of permanent emigration and organization was brought forward by the Jews in Europe for the first time in history. In this sense, the idea of the establishment of a Jewish state and the immigration of European Jews to this country emerged as tangible in the book *Der Judenstaat* (Jewish State), which was written by an Austrian-Hungarian Jew, Theodor Herzl, in 1896 (Ulutaş et al., 2012, p. 16). The source of the idea that Herzl strongly advocated was due to severe anti-Semitic events. But in defending the idea of a Jewish state, his goal was not primarily the Palestinian territory. On the other hand, Jewish immigration to Palestine, named by the word 'Aliyah', has been one of the top priorities of the Zionist movement. This wave of immigration began 14 years before Herzl put forward the idea of a Jewish state and still continues today.

The first World Zionist congress was held on August 29, 1897 in Basel, as Herzl's book produced a very wide response in the world. The decisions taken at this congress are briefly: the common origin and history of the Jews all around the world are connected with the past, they have a national identity, the final solution is the establishment of a Jewish state, the colonization must be continued in Palestine, the organization of the Jews and the communication with the governments to reach the goal. (Abufayyad, 2015, p. 27).

After the secret Sykes-Picot agreement, which was signed between the United Kingdom and France in 1916, later ratified by Russia, and which set the borders of the partition of Middle Eastern lands of the Ottoman Empire in case it was defeated in the World War I, it was decided that there would be a British mandate administration in Palestine. The revolt of the Arabs in the region, with the provocation of Britain promising independence to the Arabs, affected the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. The collapse of the Ottoman Empire was an opportunity for the Zionists, who had previously received a negative response from Abdulhamid—the Ottoman sultan, and in 1917, when Lord Rothschild, a rich Zionist leader, wrote a letter to Britain, they reaffirmed their demands for immigration to Palestine and the recognition of a state for the Jewish nation (Smith, 2013, p. 245-250). Foreign Minister Arthur Balfour responded with a letter called the Balfour Declaration, which would affect the course of the region. In his letter, British support is clearly stated as:

“His Majesty's government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to

facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.” (Balfour, 1917)

However; “it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine...” part has been ignored throughout history and the way for the establishment of the state of Israel, which is considered to be the basis of the ongoing problems in the Middle East, was paved. One country that supported the declaration was the United States. Although president Wilson stated that “endorsement of Britain’s 1917 Balfour Declaration was a gesture made without a great deal of thought”, it has been an action that has completely influenced America's Middle East policy for the upcoming periods. (Azar, 2011, p. 12).

Throughout the British mandate administration that was officially launched in 1923, immigration waves and land purchases continued increasingly. One of the biggest waves of immigration to Palestine, the 5th Aliyah, took place between 1929 and 1939. Around 160,000 Jews arrived in Palestine between 1933-1936 because of Hitler and his anti-Semitic policies. Others, who faced the quota implemented by the British administration, reached the Palestinian territories illegally (Ulutaş et al., 2012, p. 20). With increasing populations, the Palestinian people began to lose their effectiveness against the Jews who began to dominate Palestine's commercial and cultural life. The change in the balance against the Palestinian Arabs increased the unrest and fueled the conflicts. After the first uprising in 1921, the first of the white papers prepared by the secretary of state for the colonies of Britain, Winston Churchill, was published in 1922, and implemented a limitation on the Jewish immigration in order "the economic capacity of the country to absorb new arrivals" (Churchill, 1922). The British mandate's biased attitude and the continued immigration of Jews, led to the Great Arab Revolt between 1936 and 1939, in which neighboring Arab nationalists joined. The committees that were established in order to manage this uprising in each city gathered in April 1936, and formed the Arab Higher Committee. The committee decided to continue the uprising until their demands of a selected national government, the cessation of both Jewish immigration and the sale of lands had been fulfilled. Britain, then, sent a research commission and the commission submitted a report to the

government. The report stated that it was not possible for Arabs and Jews to take part in the same state and suggested a partition of the lands. The Arabs opposed this and also the fact that the Jews did not lean towards this idea made the report ineffective (Ercan, n.d., p. 239).

As the Second World War approached, Britain wanted to preserve the balance in the Middle East because they needed Arabs for reasons such as the strategic location of the Middle East and oil deposits in a possible war. Another White Paper was published in 1939 to stop the ongoing uprisings. In this paper, it was stated that the number of immigrants would be restricted to 75.000 for the next 5 years and the acceptance of immigrants above this number would be presented to the Arabs for approval, the establishment of a bi-communal independent Palestinian State in the next 10 years with an Arab-Jewish collaboration was proposed and the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine was not a part of British foreign policy (Gökçınar, 2009, p. 5). This document led to differences of opinion among the Palestinian Arabs and the riots were weakened. On the other hand, the Jews opposed the British mandate and called the document 'Black Paper'. For the Zionists, who began to think that Britain had given up on supporting the establishment of a Jewish state and that it would be an obstacle to their goals, a process of change began. Since it is always in the Zionist agenda to take the support of a powerful state, the United States, who was taking the World stage in the strongest manner instead of Britain, was integrated into Zionist politics (Taylor, 2017, p. 57). In this sense, The Biltmore Conference was held in New York City in May 1942 and it was addressed by three outstanding leaders of the Zionist movement: Weizmann, David Ben-Gurion, and Nahum Goldmann. They reiterated their demands regarding Jewish immigration, the Jewish army, and the Jewish state and were supported. After the 1939 White Paper, there was a remarkable increase in the activities of the American Zionist movement, along with the membership number. Due to the rise of the conflicts arising from Jewish immigration, the pressure from the Arabs for the implementation of the White Paper of 1939, the increasing anti-British attitude of the Jews, Zionist pressures and the economic burden of the Second World War, Britain could not find a way out and brought the issue to the General Assembly of United Nations in April 1947. With the UK's application, the Arab-Jewish issue became an international problem.

On the other side, the Jews continued to influence the United Nations for the establishment of a Jewish independent state, while the Arab unity under the leadership of Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia continued to support the end of the Mandate regime and the establishment of an independent state by the Palestinian Arabs. The United Nations also sent an 11-member special commission to Palestine for an investigation. One of the two proposals drafted by the commission was the division of the land into an independent Jewish state, an independent Arab state and an international zone in Jerusalem under the governance of United Nations, while the other proposed the establishment of a federal Palestinian state, composed of Jewish and Arab communities, its capital being Jerusalem. The Arabs opposed both of the proposals and insisted on a democratic state system that respects the rights of all communities in Palestine. On November 29, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the resolution regarding the partition of Palestinian lands and the entitlement of Jerusalem as a place designated with special status under international observance, despite the Arab states' and Turkey's dissentive votes and with the affirmative votes of Haiti, Liberia, the Philippines and Ethiopia under the US pressure (Sander, 2013, p. 216). The main articles were:

1. The Mandate for Palestine shall terminate as soon as possible but in any case not later than 1 August 1948.

2. The armed forces of the mandatory Power shall be progressively withdrawn from Palestine, the withdrawal to be completed as soon as possible but in any case not later than 1 August 1948.

The mandatory Power shall advise the Commission, as far in advance as possible, of its intention to terminate the Mandate and to evacuate each area.

The mandatory Power shall use its best endeavors to ensure that an area situated in the territory of the Jewish State, including a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for a substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than 1 February 1948.

3. Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in part III of this plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the armed forces of the mandatory Power has been completed but in any case not later than 1 October 1948. The boundaries of the Arab State, the Jewish State, and the City of Jerusalem shall be as described in parts II and III below.

4. The period between the adoption by the General Assembly of its recommendation on the question of Palestine and the establishment of the independence of the Arab and Jewish States shall be a transitional period. (A/RES/181(II) of 29 November 1947, United Nations, 1947)

Immediately after the end of Britain's mandate administration, the Palestinian Jewish Community leaders gathered in Tel Aviv on May 14, 1948, declaring the establishment

of the state of Israel. About eleven minutes later, the US declared that it recognized the state of Israel. This was followed by the Soviet Union's recognition next day and Britain's 10 months later.

The United States' general attitude towards Zionism was not very intrusive because of the policy of isolationism until the presidency of Harry S. Truman. In the 1930s, the U.S. supported the immigration of Jews to Palestine in order to avoid the problems of Europe, which was in turmoil with the policies of the Hitler administration in Germany. Following the death of Roosevelt, the president of the time, the vice president Truman became president and it was a harbinger of a change in the U.S. attitude towards Zionist politics. Truman's close Jewish friends made him feel deep sympathy for Zionism. In his *Immigration into Palestine Statement* in 1946, he reported that he supported 100,000 Jewish immigrants to Palestine and favored the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine (Truman, 1946). Despite the opposition of Foreign Ministry officials, he supported the United Nations' Partition Plan in 1947. With his decision of prompt recognition of the state of Israel, Truman, "having once again disregarded the advice of his advisors, most of whom had urged him to wait" (Tessler, 2009, p. 263). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Security Officials believed that the local nationalism in the Middle East would work against the Soviet Union within the framework of containment policy. Therefore, they predicted that the support to Zionism would lead to confusion in the region as well as making an enemy of the Arab states. Indirectly, this would have undermined the US interests, in which the priority is always oil, and the Cold War policy. Another reason underlying Truman's Zionism sympathy was the influence of the Jewish lobby, whose influence on American decision-making bodies was increasing, on the presidential elections in 1948.

1.2.2. The Arab-Israeli Conflict and the Other Events

A few hours after the state of Israel declared its independence, the Arab League members, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, launched a war against Israel and the first Arab-Israeli War began. This war, which the Palestinian Arabs referred to as the Nakba (Great Disaster), expanded Israel's territory considerably. Although the

Arab League was able to make progress at the forefront, the war turned against the Arabs due to the lack of coordination between them and the support of the Western powers to Israel. During some cease-fires thanks to the United Nations, Israel also received weapons from the Soviet Union and attacked Jordan and Syria with Soviet aircrafts. The last ceasefire to end the war was signed separately between Israel and each of the Arab states in different periods in 1949 (Hahn, 2005, p. 26). The War of 1948 is an important milestone in terms of the sharing of Palestinian lands and the problem of Palestinian refugees, which is one of the outcomes. The US put in special effort to solve the refugee crisis as it posed a threat to the stability in the region and had the chance to trigger the spread of communism (Hahn, 2004, p. 110). Jerusalem was divided between Jordan and Israel, and Gaza, on the other hand, was divided between Israel and Egypt. The lands abandoned by the Palestinians began to be rapidly transformed into Israel territories by the Jews. In addition to being recognized by many states on the international stage, Israel was also admitted to the UN in May 1949. With the favoring developments, it focused on its goals, and the "Return Act" issued in 1950 allowed Jews from all over the world to return to Israel. In parallel with the law issued in 1952, the Jews were also granted citizenship.

In the post-war Arab countries, political and military turmoil and other developments took place. A series of military strikes in Syria started in March 1949 and continued until 1970, when Hafez Assad came to power. There was a failed coup in July 1949 in Lebanon. King Abdullah of Jordan was killed by a Palestinian in 1951. King Farouk was deposed by a military coup led by Gamal Abdel Nasser and Muhammad Naguib in 1952 in Egypt. During the coup, they received support from the Muslim Brotherhood and communist communities. In 1953, Muhammad Naguib became the first president of Egypt with the transition from constitutional monarchy to republic regime. Again in 1953, the coup in order to overthrow the elected prime minister, Mohammad Mosaddegh, who wanted to nationalize the oil resources in Iran, was ruled by the US and Britain, whose oil interests were always in the forefront and which were beware of the communist spread. Pehlevi, who was supported by the US and was the last Shah of Iran, came to power instead of Mosaddegh. In 1954, Nasser became the president of Egypt instead of Naguib and remained in power for a long time. As the UK, which had long been a leader in the region, started to withdraw from

the region, the US gradually adopted the role of the guardian of the region. For this reason, the United States decided to bring the countries of the region together in a Western-supported defense organization to prevent the spread of the Soviet Union into the Middle East (Ramazani, 2010, p. 3). The USA saw Turkey, which was secular and democratic, as the country to move together in agreement for this purpose. Under the leadership of US, the first agreement was signed between Pakistan and Turkey in 1954. That, after a long and troubled diplomatic process, was followed by Baghdad Pact signed in 1955, between Iraq and Turkey. Many Arab countries, particularly Egypt, reacted to this pact. Even though Pakistan and Iran joined this pact later, the US did not join the pact, keeping it out of a gathering force and could not prevent it from collapsing. In 1959, Iraq left the Baghdad Pact with a coup in Iraq along with the increasing influence of USSR. Upon this, other countries gathered and changed the name of the pact to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), but this organization also officially ended 20 years later.

After the first Arab-Israeli war, Egypt wanted to buy weapons from the UK and the US but was rejected. Then, it made an arms purchase agreement with the Soviet Union, through Czechoslovakia. After that, it took another step that led to the Suez Crisis, which is also called the second Arab-Israeli war in history. Egypt, which was looking for financial support for the Aswan High Dam to be built on the Nile, following the rejection from the US, declared that it nationalized the Suez Canal in July, 1956. The Suez Canal is a canal completed in 1869 by a French company and was highly important in the oil flow to Europe and the US at that time. Since the sale of Egypt's shares to England in 1875 due to financial need, it had been operated by the British-French partnership, open to international traffic. The nationalization decision posed a threat to the interests of most countries, particularly Britain, regarding the oil flow, and of Britain and France, which profoundly benefited from the canal. Then, Britain and France, which wanted to overthrow Nasser, prepared an attack plan as a result of their negotiations with Israel. According to the plan, Israel would attack Egypt with the opportunity it had been expecting since the first Arab-Israeli War, and the British-French troops would also occupy the region under the pretext of intervening and stopping the attacks. The plan came to life in October, 1956 with the Israeli occupation of the Sinai Peninsula and Britain and France sent a note to Egypt asking for the battle

to be stopped. After Egypt rejected the note, the British and French forces intervened. Consequently, with the defeat of Egypt, Britain and France maintained the control of the canal. The United Nations deployed peacekeeping forces at the canal region. For the first time contrary to the nature of the Cold War, the US and the USSR opposed the war by taking the same action. As a result of their pressure on the United Nations and the threats of the USSR, UK, France and Israel have withdrawn from Egyptian territory and the United Nations peacekeeping forces took their places until 1967.

The main reasons for the US opposition to the war were the negative impact of a disorder in the Middle East on the oil flow and other interests, and the possibility of Arab countries to fall under the influence of the Soviet Union with increasing anti-Westernism. On the other hand, although Nasser-led Egypt was defeated in the war, it became a hero of Arab nationalism with the end of the British presence in the region. Egypt's prestige among Arab countries increased and so did the Soviet influence in the Middle East. This war was particularly indicative of Britain's weakening power, and after this, in the United States and the USSR axis, which emerged as two superpowers, the events between pro-Western conservative regimes and pro-Soviet radical regimes were influential in the region. In 1958, the monarchy was overthrown with a coup in Iraq and a republic regime was adopted; crises and internal conflicts occurred in Lebanon and Jordan. Another important development that emerged as a result of the war was the Eisenhower Doctrine. In 1957, the US president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, clearly stated that any Middle Eastern country could seek economic or military assistance from the United States, especially if it were threatened by a country governed with communism. In this way, it would be “a new mechanism for U.S. intervention to stabilize the region against Soviet threats or internal turmoil or revolution” and to protect its oil interests in the Middle East (Hahn, 2004, p. 224).

Another development took place in the Palestinian territories caused by the Suez Crisis. The Fatah organization was founded in 1959 by Yasser Arafat and his colleagues, a Palestinian who fought against Israel with the Muslim Brotherhood in the first Arab-Israeli war and fought against Britain and France at the Suez Canal. The organization's fundamental principles were that the liberation of Palestine would be with the efforts of the Palestinian people. In contrast, the Arab countries opposed it feeling excluded, held the first major Palestinian congress in 1964, and founded the

Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Though there was a conflict between them for a while, Fatah joined PLO in 1967 and transformed into a political party.

The outbreak of the third Arab-Israeli war, also known as the 6-Day War, was in June 1967. The reason of the war, which is important in many respects, was Egypt's a series of actions prior to war triggered by the misinformation from the Soviet intelligence that Israel would attack Syria. Then, Nasser removed the United Nations peacekeeping forces from the Sinai Peninsula and closed the Tirana Strait to Israel (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016, p. 338). Israel, which strongly opposed this and argued that the transition from the straits should be free, started the war with a sudden attack. In the face of these unexpected attacks, first on its air force and then on Gaza, Egypt abandoned Gaza, and then Israel, occupied the Gaza Strip. After its power weakened, Egypt persuaded Syria and Jordan to attack alongside, but these Arab countries could not escape defeat. Israel captured the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan and the Golan Heights from Syria. With a very serious loss of land and soldiers on Egypt, Syria and Jordan's side, the ceasefire was declared six days later. The weak strategies and the lack of coordination of the Arab countries was a major cause of their defeat.

What made this war important was that Israel greatly expanded its territory as a result. Its self-confidence increased and it refused to give back the territories, not recognizing the United Nations' decision of not to gain any territories through war. Another significant point of the war was the emergence of a serious refugee problem. Many Palestinians fled the West Bank to become refugees or were exiled. Both the situation of the refugees and the situation of the occupied territories made the Arab-Israeli problem even more complex, and with this war the problem became the focus of the whole world. Nevertheless, with changing population and territorial balances, a stronger Israel emerged in all circumstances, and the Arab countries, with the hope of taking back their lost territory, tended to follow a more peaceful path, not an aggressive one. The sustained defeat of Arab nationalism in previous battles and smaller conflicts, as well as the minor successes of Palestinian resistance groups, highlighted Palestinian nationalism, and Fatah and PLO united as mentioned above.

In the upcoming events of the Six-Day War, the US had refused the request for military aid to Israel and opposed an Israeli attack on Egypt. The United States, which had been involved in Vietnam and facing opposition to this war at home, tried to avoid

a second front. Instead of a military intervention, the US pursued diplomatic solutions to affect the Egyptian blockade on the Israeli ships in the Straits of Tiran, which was a failed campaign. After Eisenhower, the Kennedy administration had close relations with Israel. From this period on, the American presidents would consider Israel as a state with a special relationship between the United States. Johnson, who became the president after Kennedy, showed that he was one of Israel's best friends. When Israel requested tanks from the US, the foreign ministry and the CIA objected, but the White House did not take the objection seriously. Johnson, who could not afford to lose his Jewish support in the presidential elections, approved the transfer of war planes to Israel, even if he hesitated. This turned the United States into Israel's main weapon supplier. Israel adopted the perspective of maintaining the status quo in the region in favor of the United States. He was also ready to help the US with the pressure on conservative Arab regimes and the threat of radical nationalists. The most important result of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war for the US was the loss of diplomatic relations with almost all Arab states because of its support for Israel, and thus the great loss of prestige it suffered in the Middle East (Sander, 2013, p. 390).

In the meanwhile, power changes took place. In February and March 1963, in Iraq and Syria, the Socialist Ba'ath parties showed themselves with coups one after another. In 1968, the Ba'ath Party, led by Al-Bakr, came to power again in Iraq. Saddam Hussein was appointed as his deputy, who was to hold power for almost a quarter of a century. In the US, President Nixon's doctrine was declared. Under this doctrine, "the US would equip and rely on various client states to resist revolution and otherwise stabilize each region of the world" and Soviet containment policy continued (Hahn, 2005, p. 70). The tension before the next major Arab-Israeli War took place between March 1969 and August 1970 in the 'War of Attrition' between Israel and Egypt. Egypt was equipped with powerful weapons by the Soviets and Israel by the United States (Hahn, 2005, p. 55). Nasser's aim was to force Israel to withdraw from Sinai. He wanted to wear out Israel, believing that the only way to do this was by attacking Israel. Israel and Egypt had organized both air operations and ground operations in each other's security zones. But Nasser was unsuccessful in this policy, and the War of Attrition came to an end on August 7, with a ceasefire with US mediation. In the same year, Nasser passed away from a heart attack and was replaced

by Enwar Sadat and Hafiz al-Assad, who was known as a moderate, came to power in Syria. One year later, the Aswan Dam, which was one of the reasons of the 6-Day war, was completed with the support of the Soviet Union. In 1972; a 15-year Friendship and Cooperation Agreement was signed between Iraq and the Soviet Union, and the Iraqi government nationalized the Iraqi Oil Company.

In 1973, the fourth Arab-Israeli war took place. The most important features that make this war different from the other Arab-Israeli wars are that it aimed not to remove Israel from the map, but to take the lands lost in the War of 1967 back from Israel and although Israel attacked first in the 1956 and 1967 wars, this time Egypt and Syria attacked.

Since the autumn of 1973, Egypt and Syria had accelerated their military preparations with the help of the USSR. It was surprising for Israel that the war started on 'Yom Kippur', a sacred day for Jews, and in the holy month of Ramadan for Muslims. On October 6, 1973, the Egyptian and Syrian forces organized a sudden attack on Israel and made progress in the Sinai and Golan Heights. At first, Israel focused on the Syrian front. Although other Arab countries sent reinforcements, Syria did not succeed against Israel. On the Egyptian front, Israel managed to repulse in a short period of time, even though it was not initially successful. The UN Security Council, with the intense diplomatic efforts of the US and the Soviet Union, adopted the Resolution No. 338 on 22 October 1973, calling for the implementation of Resolution 242 (Azar, 2011, p. 29). Israel and Egypt immediately approved the decision, but Syria refused. Israel accepted this as an excuse for further progress in the Syrian territory, and the conflict continued, albeit with a diminishing intensity. The war ended on October 25, 1973 with No. 340 resolution of the UN, which was adopted in line with the diplomatic initiatives of the US, USSR and the UN.

The Yom Kippur War had consequences that not only affected the region but the whole world. Despite the military victory, Israel did not achieve the desired success. For the first time in this war, 'the myth of Israel's invincibility' disappeared and the Arabs began to feel confident. On the other hand, while Israel was diplomatically excluded in international society, it became more dependent on the US both in military and economic aspects. After the war, in 1973, the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) laid an oil embargo on the countries

supporting Israel. Although this embargo, which continued until March 1974, was highly effective, the most important reason for its failure to achieve full success was; instead of terminating the oil export, Arab countries exported oil with a raise in the prices. Even though the oil crisis was a short-term event, some of the results showed themselves in the long-term, for example, Arab states were able to use oil as a political power and a weapon, and after that, industrialized countries quickly headed for alternative energy sources.

The US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, made attempts, which were called 'shuttle diplomacy', by going between the capitals of Israel and Arab countries from October 1973 to summer 1974, to ensure lasting peace in the region after the ceasefire and hosted the Geneva Conference of 1973. As a result of Kissinger's efforts, an agreement was signed between Egypt and Israel on January 18, 1974, making Israel withdraw largely from the west of the Suez Canal and establish safe zones. Conducting the same shuttle diplomacy with Syria, Kissinger also ensured that a peace agreement had been signed between Israel and Syria on May 31, 1974, (Hahn, 2005, p. 60).

On the other hand, in the Arab Summit in Rabat in 1974, the PLO was accepted as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians. In the UN General Assembly, the decision to establish an independent, sovereign state in Palestine was revised, the PLO was given observer status in the UN and the PLO leader Yasser Arafat delivered a speech at the UN General Assembly. In 1975, the most important development was the civil war in Lebanon. During this civil war that lasted about 15 years, other countries also intervened. During the Arab-Israeli conflicts, thousands of Palestinian refugees had sought refuge in Lebanon. The PLO was also expelled from the Jordanian territory and chose Lebanon as its base. Clashes had begun between the Lebanese Front, a group of political forces led by the leader of the Phalangist Party, Pierre Gemayel, who advocated good relations with Israel and was disturbed with the existence of the Palestinians, and the Lebanese National Movement, which supported the Palestinians. The war took an international dimension with the invasion of Lebanon by Syria and Israel (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016, p. 428). Although the war was ended with the Taif Treaty signed in 1989; the invasion by Syria lasted until 2005. The consequences of the civil war include the PLO leaving Lebanon and the emergence of Hezbollah.

Furthermore, the Egyptian administration signed two agreements in September 1978, which were mediated by the US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and by President Carter, setting the framework for a possible peace with Israel. These agreements, called Camp David Accords, are composed of two frameworks: Framework for Peace in the Middle East and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel. According to the second framework, relations between the two countries would be normalized, and Sinai would be given over to Egypt's sovereignty. These treaties were followed by the Egypt-Israel Peace Agreement on March 26, 1979, and thus Israel-Egypt relations began to normalize. The Framework for Peace in the Middle East on the Palestinian issue was much more complicated and uncertain. For this reason, this contract was not successful (Mansfield, 2013, p. 423). For the first time, Israel was recognized by an Arab country by sitting at the table with Egypt. The Arab and Eastern Bloc countries did not accept Egypt's agreements with Israel and accused Anwar Sadat of betrayal. Egyptian President Sadat paid the price of these signatures with his assassination in 1981, and his country was excluded from the Arab world during the 1980s and Egypt became an ineffective actor in the Middle East. In spite of this exclusion, Egypt had become the second country which the United States aided the most after Israel and secured its economy. Israel completed its withdrawal from Sinai in September 1979, which was occupied 15 years ago, thus the Cairo administration regained its revenues from the Sinai oil and the Suez Canal. With this agreement, Israel escaped from fighting on a number of fronts with regular Arab armies; after that, the resistance organizations in Palestine and in Lebanon rose with the guerrilla movement. With this treaty, the United States once again proved being a constant ally by fully protecting Israel by both means of weapons and aircraft aid and military and political issues. The energy risk of withdrawing from the Sinai Peninsula, where Israel met its oil need during the occupation, was soon overcome by Kissinger's interruption; Sadat agreed to sell Egyptian oil to Israel, which other Arab countries refused to sell.

There were events that would change the fate of the two Middle East countries in the same year, besides the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty signed in 1979 as a result of the Camp David Accords. In Iraq, Saddam Hussein became president and a revolution occurred in Iran under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini to overthrow the

monarchy regime of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi to establish an Islamic Republic based on Islamic law and Shiite sect views. After the end of the Mosaddegh government, with the support of the United States, the Shah carried out social and economic modernization reforms. Women's freedom was increased, the literacy rate increased, and land regulation was applied which got the most reaction. However, these changes were too disturbing for the extreme religious segment. Ayatollah Khomeini accused the Shah of corruption in 1963, of ignoring the rights of the people under oppression and of endangering the sovereignty of Iran. In addition, he claimed that the regime had ignored the Islamic beliefs of the country because of the sale of oil to Israel and the granting of economic privileges to the United States. Khomeini after his opposition, was arrested and then was sent to exile first in Turkey, then in Iraq, and then in France (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016, p. 327-330). He protected his sphere of influence by sending recordings to Iran during his exile calling for the establishment of an Islamic Republic of Iran and the overthrow of the Shah. The opposition to the Shah grew. The public outcry against the Shah had a terrible impact on the economy; increasing the objections. This also made the Shah increasingly aggressive. In 1957, the Shah's secret security organization named SAVAK began to kidnap, torture and kill the protesters. Feeling that control was out of hand, the Shah declared strict governance in 1978 and America also discredited the Shah. The Shah, unable to get the support of America and fearing that the streets would be in chaos, appointed the opposition leader the minister of internal affairs, and escaped from Iran on January 16, 1979. Upon this, Khomeini, who had been calling for the overthrow of the Shah, returned to Iran and was greeted with excitement by Iranians. (Sander, 2013, p. 404). As a result of the referendum that was held on March 30-31, 1979, Iran officially became an Islamic Republic, in December 1979 the country approved the theocratic constitution and the religious leadership of Khomeini, and Banisadr was elected president.

The first tension between the post-revolutionary Iran and the United States began with a hostage crisis. On 4 November 1979, a group of students protesting that the Shah went to the United States for medical treatment, with a no-knock raid to the US embassy, took 52 embassy staff hostages for 444 days. Security forces did not take much action against the incidents because Khomeini was already calling the United

States the "Great Satan" and the situation was considered normal. Iran demanded the return of the Shah to Iran and said that they would not release the hostages until their condition was met. America's first reaction was to freeze Iranian assets in US banks and this was followed by the expulsion of Iranian diplomats and students from the US, and finally breaking off diplomatic relations (Hahn, 2005, p. 74). In April 1980, the US decided to carry out an operation to rescue the hostages. However, despite all preparations, the rescue operations of the hostages of the US resulted in a complete failure and this failure tarnished its prestige. President Carter continued back-channel negotiations and in exchange for unfreezing Iranian assets, the Iranian Hostage Crisis finally ended 444 days later. The Iran-Iraq war that broke out in the same year also played a huge role in Iran's decision. Since Carter failed in the events, he was defeated by Ronald Reagan in the presidential elections, and Reagan became the 40th president of the United States on the same day of the release of the hostages (Hahn, 2005, p. 76). After the release of the hostages, Iran expected the United States to take steps to not interfere in its internal affairs and to give up the sanctions it imposed but this attitude has remained the same in the periods of the following presidents after Reagan.

The Iranian revolution showed significant results for both the Middle East and the United States. In a country that was a close ally of the United States during the Cold War period, power changed hands, and instead of a secular administration, an Islamic administration one of whose the main discourses was opposition to the US came to power. The Islamic regime in question, was not an Islamic regime similar to Saudi Arabia which was compatible with the US or the West, but a powerful regime in which the Shiite sect was idealized and had the potential to affect surrounding Muslim countries. This revolution in Iran significantly affected the US foreign policy on a macro scale and the Middle East policy on a micro scale. The US struggling with the USSR in the international arena lost Iran as an ally, which was a major oil exporter, and its impact on the Middle East was threatened (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016, p. 468). One of the reasons why the revolution was a risk for the US is that the geography of the Middle East, which failed to be recognized with Arab nationalism against the West, could adopt this new revolutionary ideology and this new Islamism could become a source of hope for the masses. As a matter of fact, although this effect was felt in almost all Islamic countries, it was felt the most in Lebanon. The Hezbollah

organization emerged in 1982 and it became a significant actor in the Middle East and became one of the most effective forces in Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon. On the Palestinian issue, Iran and Hezbollah became two of the most important actors and played an important role in Israel's peace settlement with the Palestinians. At this point, it can be said that one of the most important dynamics of political Islam's strengthening and becoming a threat against the US and the West was the Iranian Revolution. Considering that the Islamic Revolution of Iran is an important touchstone in the context of the reinforcement of political Islam, it can be said that the September 11 attacks, which is one of the most painful consequences of this process, is the result of a process that started with this revolution. As a matter of fact, the US, which supported the Islamic movements against the socialist ideology of the USSR, withdrew its support after political Islam became a threat to it and took a position against terrorism and extremism triggered by Islamic ideology.

1.2.3. The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan and Iran-Iraq War

The invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union was an event that affected many parts of the world, particularly Afghanistan and the Middle East, but this was also the last 'hot' days of the Cold War. We need to go back in history for the events in the background of this invasion, which lasted about nine years. In Afghanistan, where 80% of the population is Muslim, the kingdom was established in 1919 after the struggle against Britain. Then in 1973, the proclamation of the republic was made under the leadership of Mohammad Daud Khan. In the period after the proclamation of the republic, Khan made important attempts to improve relations with the Soviet Union. But in 1978, a pro-Soviet coup overthrew Mohammad Daud Khan and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was established (Sander, 2013, p. 409). This new administration's reform program included equal rights for women, land reform and administrative measures in the classical Marxist-Leninist direction.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union made a serious mistake, believing that the revolutionary administration of Afghanistan could make communist ideals real, and provided comprehensive assistance to radical Afghan leaders trying to achieve this in a traditional society in which people were living completely with Islamic values.

Slowly riots against the central government started to appear. In particular, Muslim insurgents, called 'Mujahedeen' (the ones engaged in jihad), began grouping. The first revolts erupted in the summer of 1978 and spread all over the country. After this, the developments that led to the intervention of the Soviet Union to Afghanistan accelerated. The president of the period, Noor Mohammad Taraki, declared that he would pursue a neutral foreign policy, but on December 5, 1978, 'the treaty of friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation' was signed with the USSR. Shortly after this treaty, the national resistance movements against pro-Soviet power began (Klose, 1978).

The clashes between the government and the opposing Muslims began to intensify. In parallel with all these developments, the government could not handle these resistance movements and asked for help from the Soviets. Upon this, on 25 December 1979, the Soviet Union de facto invaded Afghanistan. Two days later, Babrak Karmal, who was in exile in Eastern Europe, was appointed as the president with the Soviet support. There were now three elements in Afghanistan: the government of Afghanistan, the opposing Muslims-the Mujahedeen, and the Soviet troops.

After the invasion, Pakistan, Iran, China, Arab and Western countries reacted and the UN decided to address the issue. However, due to the veto power of the Soviet Union, no effective decision came from the UN Security Council. The Islamic world took action and the Islamic Conference was held in Islamabad in January, 1980, under the leadership of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. The invasion was strongly condemned, Afghanistan's membership in the Islamic Conference was suspended, and a boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980 was requested. On the other side, Pakistan was blamed for its support to Mujahedeen.

In the US, President Carter called the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as an act contrary to international law and in a message he sent to the Senate on January 3, 1980, he wanted to postpone the ratification of Strategic Arms the Limitation Talks (SALT)* treaties. The Senate immediately complied with this proposal and has not ratified these

* *SALT-I & SALT-II are the Negotiations and Agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union that were aimed at curtailing the manufacture of strategic missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons (The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2016).*

treaties to this day. The United States attempted to take international measures, including an embargo on agricultural products, against the Soviet Union, and attempted to cancel, to take it to another country or to boycott the Olympic Games in June 1980 in Moscow. At the same time, it was announced on January 4, 1980 that the US decided to have a permanent naval force in the Indian Ocean and it would support this force by obtaining base facilities from Oman, Kenya and Somalia (Hilali, 2005, p. 155).

On April 14, 1988, a bilateral agreement was signed between Afghanistan and Pakistan, under the guidance of the UN, with the US and the Soviets being guarantors. With the agreement, relations between the two countries were settled and the process of the Soviet military units' withdrawal from Afghanistan began. In 1988, with the thought that Afghanistan had become a serious burden for the Soviets, Gorbachev made a statement that the Soviets would leave the Afghan territory in about ten months and he hoped that the relations with Afghanistan would improve and that they would support the Najibullah government. The withdrawal process was completed in February 1989 (Sander, 2013, p. 412).

The US lost an important ally in the Middle East in 1979 with the overthrow of the Shah in Iran. Subsequently, the USSR invaded Afghanistan, so Middle East oil was under threat. For this reason, the US made significant changes in its strategy regarding the Middle East. The 'détente' policies were again replaced by the Cold War policies. The United States was the country that supported the Mujahedeen along with Pakistan. Pakistan transferred money and arms aid from Saudi Arabia and the United States to the Mujahedeen, on the other hand, it was dealing with the immigration problem caused by millions of Afghan refugees who fled the invasion. Asylum seekers usually fled to Pakistan, Iran, and China and they also caused Afghanistan to have problems with neighboring countries. Currently, hundreds of thousands of Afghans are still refugees in Pakistan, Iran and other countries of the world.

At the end of this long and thorny war, apart from many military and civilian casualties, internal conflicts began. Clashes began between the government of Muhammad Najibullah, who was appointed in 1987, and opposition groups, and more than 400,000 people were killed in the conflicts. Najibullah resigned in 1992 as a result of the increasing conflicts in the capital, Kabul. Then, the opposition groups chose

Burhanuddin Rabbani as the new president. After Rabbani came to power, conflicts started between groups that could not agree on power sharing. An unstable Afghanistan became a suitable ground for radical movements. The remaining Mujahedeen who came to fight with the Soviets, or the ones returned to their homeland became armed threats by creating radical movements in places where they are located. One of these organizations that emerged in Afghanistan was the Taliban because of the increasing administrative gap and instability caused by internal conflicts, and it was followed by al-Qaeda, which was based in Afghanistan. The organization, which emerged in Kandahar province in 1994 in the south of Afghanistan, declared the establishment of the "Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan" in 1996, it executed the former president Najibullah. After the Taliban seized power, internal conflicts in the country turned into an ethnic and civil war from the struggle for power. With the support of al-Qaeda, the organization has taken control of almost 90% of the country. Thousands of civilians lost their lives in the conflicts between other groups and the Taliban that remained in power until the occupation of Afghanistan by the United States on 7 October 2001 (Bag, 2019).

With the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989, travel and immigration between East and West Germany became free. On September 12, 1990, an agreement was signed in Moscow, between the US, the USSR, the UK, France, East and West Germany and this agreement came into force on 3 October 1990 and, as a result, a united Germany was born (Armaoğlu, 2012, p. 1096-1098). On the other hand, partly due to the effect of the political, military and economic deterioration caused by the invasion of Afghanistan, Gorbachev resigned on 25 December 1991 and one day later, the Soviet Union was officially dissolved, the independence of the states forming the Union were granted and the Cold War ended. The US became the only superpower after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

During the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, another war broke out in the Middle East. The Iran-Iraq War was an armed war that took place between 1980 and 1988 and drew the attention of the world. The religious sects fight between Iran and Iraq, being the hegemonic power in the Middle East, Iran's occupation of several Gulf islands and the problem of waterways were the causes of the war. The Iran-Iraq

War changed the balances in the Middle East and later became one of the causes of the Gulf War.

In 1969, Iran declared its withdrawal from the agreement signed in 1937, with the aim of solving the border problems regarding Shatt-al-Arab, which is an important waterway for both countries, and to indirectly put pressure on Iraq, it started to give support to the Kurds, who wanted autonomy in northern Iraq. Diplomatic ties that had been cut in 1970, were restored in 1973 and a treaty was signed in Algiers in 1975. Accordingly, the border between the two countries would go through at the deepest part of the waterway. In addition, Iran assured that it would not support the Kurds in Iraq against the government. But, Iran's refusal to withdraw from the Gulf islands that were invaded during the armed conflicts in 1971 hindered the development of the relations. Iran was excluded in the international arena due to the Islamic revolution in 1979, had problems with several countries, notably the US, and it was also weakened with the hostage crisis that lasted 444 days. Saddam Hussein, who saw this as an opportunity, started a war in 1980 that would last eight years (Yurdakurban, 2007, p. 23).

Saddam was anxious that the revolution in Iran would provoke the Shiites in Iraq against the government and because of this, he wanted to bring the revolution to a halt. Iraq annulled the Algiers Agreement of 1975 on 17 September 1980. Iran refused to withdraw its troops from the region that was the focus of the dispute and, as a result, Saddam Hussein passed the border with his army on September 22, 1980. Iraq maintained its dominance in the first days of the war. But, as Iran's resistance increased, the war went into a mutual attrition process. Iran pulled itself together quickly and repelled most of the attacks in many locations in less than two years. In the same days, Tehran and Baghdad were bombed. Iran felt more comfortable in this long war compared to Iraq, which founded its strategy on a quick victory. Iraq, who was aware of this fact, wanted to weaken Iran's economic power and started to attack Iranian ships carrying oil. Similarly, Iran also attacked Iraq's oil facilities (Hahn, 2005, p. 82). The damage to the Gulf oil trade led to the US participation in the war. USA and its allies were highly dependent on Gulf oil and that oil trade route's being in danger was too risky for the West. In order to clear the oil trade route, the US sent a fleet to the region and started to protect Kuwait's petroleum ships by letting them hoist

the US flag. Iran and Iraq, as both were worn out in this long battle, eventually accepted to start peace negotiations led by the UN. But, they disagreed in the following talks. While Iran requested all Iraqi troops to withdraw as a prerequisite for the peace talks, Iraq insisted on a joint surveillance on Shatt-al-Arab waterway. Despite all the disputes, they finally reached an agreement and the UN Resolution 598 became effective on 20 August 1988, ending all combat operations between the two countries. 350 peacekeepers belonging to the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) mission took the control of the peace, remaining on the Iran-Iraq border until 1991 (Kennington, Battle & Byrne, 2004, p. 44).

Throughout the war, Iraq had the support of the Western countries and Iran could never capture the critical oil wells in Iraq. Other Arab countries, which were uncomfortable with Iran's decisive role and dominancy in the oil market, followed a policy siding Iraq and gave a great amount of economic and military support. However, Iraq owed a serious amount to those countries when the ceasefire agreement to end Iran-Iraq war was signed in August 1988. The debt of Iraq was mostly to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Iraq requested a debt restructuring from both countries, but they refused (USA, Central Intelligence Agency, 2007).

The general policy of the US, which declared neutrality at the beginning, towards the war was to ensure the flow of oil to the West, to protect the region against Soviet influence, to prevent Iran's revolution to spread to the region and the possible chaos that may occur as a result, and to end the war. In fact, the US was never fond of the Islamic regime that came to power by ousting the Shah, who was an ally of the US. For this reason, it tried to restore the diplomatic ties that were cut in 1967 with Iraq. The US crossed Iraq off the list of the countries supporting terrorism in 1982 and diplomatic relations were completely restored in 1984. On the other side, apart from the CIA's secretly providing Iraq and Iran with intelligence, America secretly sold arms to Iran via different countries and the money generated from these trades was transferred to the guerrillas in Nicaragua. These events known as Iran-contra affair, later came to light, created a big public reaction and President Reagan's prestige was tarnished. By supporting Iraq in the war against Iran, the US turned a blind eye to Iraq's production of chemical and biological weapons and their use in the war several times (Kennington, Battle & Byrne, 2004, p. 21-43). The US, which followed this

double sided policy, would occupy Iraq in 2003 with the reason that Iraq possessed chemical weapons. Arabs, however, except Syria and Libya, despite the support from Khomeini on the Palestine issue since the beginning, supported Iraq. Turkey stayed unbiased and continued its relations with both parties.

The Iran- Iraq War cost about one million people's lives. Fighting sides consumed their economic resources. The Iran-Iraq border did not change in the end of the war and the effects of the war were widely felt. As a result of the attacks on oil facilities in both countries, oil production decreased but the prices increased. Iraq's debts to the supporting countries partly led Saddam to attack Kuwait in 1990, in order to capture oil wells there. This attitude of Iraq left it alone in international relations (Hardy, 2005). Hence, it is possible to state that the events in the aftermath of Iran-Iraq war set the base for the Gulf War.

Apart from these two wars, other developments that affected the balances in the region also occurred. The president of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, who sat to the table with Israel in Camp David negotiations and made Egypt to be the first Arab country to recognize Israel, was assassinated at a ceremony in 1981. Israel, on the other hand, occupied Lebanon for two weeks in 1982 in order to disarm and banish PLO that was under the leadership of Yasser Arafat. In Palestine, as a result of the chain events that were triggered by the death of four Palestinians caused by an Israeli military car in Gaza, a resistance movement called the first 'Intifada' began on 9 December 1987 against Israeli occupation. This movement ended with the start of the peace negotiations between the Palestinian government and Israel and consequently, the Oslo Accords that were signed in 1993.

1.3. THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AFTER THE COLD WAR

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was a turning point. This collapse ended the long period of intense ideological competition. It also brought about the reorganization of inter-state relations. The collapse of old inter-state structures has solved similar geopolitical structures (Marples, 2016, p. 75; Rubin, 2005, p. 128; Schreuer, 1993, p. 447). The West, where the United States was the leading force, was the winner of this struggle.

Many liberal-democrats welcomed the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War with great joy. Western analysts, following international developments in 1990, declared the victory of the liberal-democratic West, claiming that weapons would be significantly reduced, the path of peace and prosperity was opened and brought up utopian theories (Fukuyama, 2006b, p. 23). In this context, the United States has started to play a more selfish role in the developments in the world. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the violent dissolution of Yugoslavia, the eruption of chaos and wars in the Caucasus and Rwanda, led to the frustration and uncertainty in the post-Cold War optimism (Fawcett, 2018, p. 122).

These developments were painful surprises, and shook the post-Cold War politics of utopian ideas. These developments have proven that the United States still plays a leading role in world developments, and has shown the need for American leadership in the post-Cold War world. This confession ignored the views that America was losing its former influence, which was expressed by many international relations experts since the mid-1970s. This has created a new political awareness., arguing that there is a new political environment in favor of international co-operation in the name of peace, democracy and human rights, and in favor of the United Nations interventions (Cambodia, Somalia and Bosnia) (Eveland, 2018, p. 349-352).

After the Cold War, during the Bush era, the Middle East policy focused on two main axes: Israel and Iraq. The basis of this is that after the Cold War the threat of the expansion of the USSR has been eliminated and the United States' interests, which is the only superpower, have become important in the world and the region. In order to achieve this goal, the Bush administration, which saw that the Palestinian-Israeli problem must be solved first, began to put pressure on the Likud administration in Israel, which was seen as a major obstacle to the solution (Simon & Stevenson, 2015, p. 74).

As mentioned before, during the Cold War, the US foreign policy was to fight against Communism. Following the removal of the danger of communism, it can be clearly seen that the US has made it a top priority in its foreign policy to protect itself and fight against countries from the threats of the Middle East countries. Consequently, Iraq, Iran and similar states are defined as threatening factors for the stability in the Middle East. The US defines them as the states that produce weapons of mass

destruction, trigger violence and support terrorism, and they are also known as rogue states (Kaussler & Hastedt, 2017, p. 122).

On the other hand, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 has emerged as a threat to the peace and security of the region and the interests of the United States (US). If the United States were silent to this invasion, Iraq would have 20% of the world's oil reserves. Such a situation would clash with the national interests of the United States in terms of risking the uninterrupted flow of oil into the world markets as well as the emergence of a hegemonic enemy in the region (Neumann, 2017, p. 160-166).

The primary aim of the American administration is to become a benevolent hegemonic state and to meet the financial, political, military and geographic needs necessary to maintain this position. Undoubtedly, the most important event of the new world order, which began with the end of the Cold War, was the invasion of Iraq by Kuwait. Two years after the end of the Iran-Iraq War, on August 1, 1990, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, with the claim that Kuwait was historically a province of Iraq and unlawfully removed Iraqi oil. The main factor driving Saddam Hussein was to dominate Gulf oil, and in 1990, the Gulf region was more open to attack than ever before (Simpson, 2018, p. 65).

Moreover, Saddam had been encouraged by success against Iran and could not imagine that the main reason behind his success was the support of foreign countries. The invasion of Kuwait by Iraq triggered US President Bush and his allies in the region, especially in Saudi Arabia. Unlike Bosnia and Herzegovina, the occupation of Kuwait was threatening not only the region but also the entire international system for the control of oil resources. The US, without losing any time, established a multinational alliance with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and various Arab states and began to build a military unit in the region. The United Nations Security Council (UN) said it would launch an armed operation against Iraq if it did not withdraw from Kuwait by January 15, 1991. When Saddam refused to obey the ultimatum and withdrew his troops from Kuwait, the war began on January 17th. On 23 February, a ground operation to rescue Kuwait was launched and Iraq, which did not exhibit significant resistance, was defeated in 4 days and a cease-fire agreement was reached on 27 February (Crystal, 2017, p. 65).

One of the important results of the Gulf War is to intimidate other states who want to rebel against American policies by defeating Iraq heavily. Thus, America would establish a complete and unequivocal control in the Middle East and especially in the Persian Gulf. At the end of the Gulf War, America wanted to bring a new order to the Middle East. In his speech at a joint session of the American Congress on 6 March 1991, President Bush presented the following four principles for the peace and stability of the Middle East (Krieg, 2016, p. 97-113).

Firstly, since the vital interests of America are connected to a safe Gulf, a security system must be established in the Middle East. This security system should be done by the countries of the region, but America should help. Also Bush said:

This does not mean stationing U.S. ground forces in the Arabian Peninsula, but it does mean American participation in joint exercises involving both air and ground forces. It means maintaining a capable U.S. naval presence in the region, just as we have for over 40 years. And let it be clear: Our vital national interests depend on a stable and secure Gulf (Bush, 1993, p. 15).

Secondly, it is necessary to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the region and should be initiated from Iraq first. Bush expressed this argument as follows:

We must act to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles used to deliver them. It would be tragic if the nations of the Middle East and Persian Gulf were now, in the wake of war, to embark on a new arms race. Iraq requires special vigilance. Until Iraq convinces the world of its peaceful intentions - that its leaders will not use new revenues to rearm and rebuild its menacing war machine - Iraq must not have access to the instruments of war (Bush, 1993, p. 15).

Thirdly, it is essential to ensure a comprehensive peace between Israel and its neighbors based on the decisions 242 and 338 for the stability of the Middle East. In his speech, Bush explained the third principle as follows:

All of us know the depth of bitterness that has made the dispute between Israel and its neighbors so painful and intractable. Yet, in the conflict just concluded, Israel and many of the Arab states have for the first time found themselves confronting the same aggressor. By now, it should be plain to all parties that peacemaking in the Middle East requires compromise. At the same time, peace brings real benefits to everyone. We must do all that we can to close the gap between Israel and the Arab states and between Israelis and Palestinians. The tactics of terror lead absolutely nowhere; there can be no substitute for diplomacy. A comprehensive peace must be grounded in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of territory for peace. This principle must be elaborated to provide for Israel's security and recognition, and at the same time for legitimate Palestinian political rights. Anything else would

fail the twin tests of fairness and security. The time has come to put an end to Arab-Israeli conflict (Bush, 1993, p. 17).

Lastly, the Middle East is rich in natural resources. This wealth (i.e. oil and water) should be used for the welfare of all countries in the region. He detailed the fourth principle in his speech as follows:

We must foster economic development for the sake of peace and progress. The Persian Gulf and Middle East -and Middle East - form a region rich in natural resources with a wealth of untapped human potential. Resources once squandered on military might - military might must be redirected to more peaceful ends. We are already addressing the immediate economic consequences of Iraq's aggression. Now, the challenge is to reach higher to foster economic freedom and prosperity for all the people of the region (Bush, 1993, p. 15).

He sent Secretary of State Baker to the Middle East to implement these four principles and begin the process. Thus, after the Gulf War, the United States focused on the Middle East, it began to restructure the Middle East with its principles.

The Gulf War is also a proof of US hegemon power in the post-Cold War era. America is the only country in the world with the ability to reach all parts of the earth with its navy, air bases and ground forces, which are strategically important, and also have the ability to reinforce these positions against an emergency. In 1990, Iraq's response to the invasion of Kuwait revealed the flexibility and scope of these capabilities. The United States has shown an unprecedented military force by sending 1,500 aircraft and 500,000 soldiers (including heavy armored units) to Saudi Arabia and filled the Mediterranean Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean with aircraft carriers in a few months (Kennedy, 2000, p. 377). One of the most important and long-term consequences of the Gulf War is the strengthening of fundamentalist currents in the entire Middle East and North Africa.

The Arab League, which has been the most talked about in the region since 1945 and which is the subject of all the political parties' programs, took a big blow. In the Gulf War, the Arabs also eliminated the Arab League notion of their clusters and their national states as well as their struggle to protect the interests of the West. The Gulf War also increased the likelihood that the region would lead to clashes between tribes, sects and local rebels and to new divisions and chaos. A complete commitment to the nation-state in the region seems to be almost absent. Moreover, the borders of most of the regional states were drawn by the imperialist states and their temporary interests, regardless of the local dynamics, ethnic and religious structure.

Consequently, Iraq's occupation of Kuwait and its vast scale defeat by out-of-region forces had an accelerating effect on the chaos process. Another important result of the war was Iran's new weight in the region (Schmierer, 2016, p. 165-168).

The heavy defeat of one of the two most powerful states in the Gulf in 1991 brought the other, Iran, to a relatively superior position. The US intervention in the region because of the Gulf War and especially the fundamentalism of the region, supported anti-Americanism, as well as the September 11 events. The peace atmosphere that began with Clinton started to vanish with George W. Bush. While the Irish Republican Army (IRA) attempted to lay down arms, the Nobel Peace Prize was expected to be on the verge of a Barak-Arafat meeting and both Ariel Sharon's victory in the Israeli elections and the September 11 attacks changed the defense perception of the United States (Pipes, 2017, p. 24).

However, the US has faced significant problems in the other two pillars of the new Middle East order. The most important achievement of the Arab-Israeli Peace Process was the peace agreement signed between Israel and Jordan in 1994. Jordan became the second Arab country to make peace with Israel after Egypt. However, this was an expected development. The other step in the Peace Process was facing increasing problems. Yasser Arafat returned to Palestine with the agreements signed within the framework of the Oslo Peace Process, and was elected the President of the Palestinian Authority. Although the administration in the West Bank and Gaza was transferred to the Palestinian Authority, Palestinian-Israeli relations faced major crises in the second half of the 1990s. As a result, the peace process ended in 2000 and the Israeli-Palestinian relations evolved into a more problematic one. Similarly, Israel-Syria talks ended in 2000 as well (Altunışık, 2009, p. 69-81).

On the other side, the US policy on Iraq has been increasingly criticized by its allies. In the mid-1990s, three of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, France, Russia and China, began to say that the sanctions and inspections on Iraq that started with Kuwait's invasion should end. These countries signed oil exploration agreements with the Iraqi administration. Some states in the Middle East also started to openly criticize the US policy. Various UN agencies also started to reveal how sanctions imposed on Iraq harmed the Iraqi people. In short, there was no longer an international and regional consensus on Iraq.

1.4. SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 ATTACKS AND THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

1.4.1. September 11 Attacks

The use of violence in the name of Islam goes back to old times. The spread of the opposition accompanied with violence among Muslims has been widespread shortly after the death of their prophets. In this process, assassination was used as a tool and an assassination cult was created (Esposito, 1999, p. 60). However, terrorism in the name of Islam, started with Hashhashis, or commonly known as Assassins, of the Ismailia sect (Rapoport, 1990, p. 149; Roy, 1994, p. 98). Most of the time, known as the world's first professional terrorists, Assassins were effective in Iran and Syria in the 11-13th centuries and used the assassination system in a systematic way. This movement, which lasted nearly two centuries, was not against the Crusaders, but against the top level Muslims, who were politically, militarily or religiously qualified and were seen as sources of evil, and was also aimed at undermining or destroying Sunni authorities. In today's Islamist terrorist acts, the killing of innocent civilians as much as possible is the primary goal and the main aim is to create a psychological impact with fear. Lately, such acts often take place in the form of suicidal acts.

The 9/11 attacks are known as the deadliest terrorist attacks on the United States by 19 militants associated with the overtly Islamist al-Qaeda group. The attacks on New York City and Washington DC have led to extensive death and destruction and have triggered US counter-terrorism efforts (Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. 2003, p. 67).

On September 11th, 2001, four planes operating passenger flights were hijacked and intended to be crashed against American buildings. Three of them hit their target, killing all people onboard and also a number on the ground, the last plane crashed in an empty area killing all people onboard. Two of the planes crashed into the World Trade Center towers in New York, the third on the Pentagon just outside Washington DC, and the fourth plane fell in an area in Pennsylvania (Drakos, 2004, p. 435-446).

The first of the four planes to depart was American Airlines Flight 11, a Boeing 767-200ER. It was 159 feet and two inches long, with a sixteen-foot-six-inch-wide body that allowed for two aisles. The plane made daily flights between Boston and Los Angeles, and when it took off at 7:59 a.m. in the morning of the doomsday, it carried only 81 passengers in its 158 seats. Forty-seven minutes later, it crashed into the North Tower. United Flight 175, also a Boeing 767-200ER, was the second. Like American Airlines 11, it was scheduled to fly between Logan and LAX. When United 175 took off at 8:14 a.m., it was even lighter than the American flight: Only 56 out of 168 seats were occupied (Eisinger, 2004, p. 115-130).

When it crashed into the South Tower at 9:03 a.m., traveling 540 mph. American Airlines Flight 77 was the third plane to take off that day, a Boeing 757-200. AA77 left Washington, D.C., at 8:20 a.m. bound for Los Angeles. It was two-thirds empty, with 58 passengers in its 176 seats. It crashed into the Pentagon at 9:37 a.m., -flying 530 mph. The fourth plane, United Airlines Flight 93, was also a 757-200. It was delayed for 42 minutes past its scheduled 8 a.m. departure from Newark to San Francisco. When it finally took off, it carried only 37 passengers—its capacity was 182—and it was loaded with a little over 7,000 gallons of fuel. It crashed at 560 mph into an empty field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, at 10:03 a.m.

The terrorist attacks against the United States pulled attention towards a thesis called “The Clash of Civilizations” created by famous political scientist Samuel Huntington. It was first published in *Foreign Affairs* magazine in the summer of 1993 as an article and emerged as a response to “The End of History” thesis of Francis Fukuyama which argued that Western liberalism had won a final victory against socialism and this would determine the structure of global relations. Samuel Huntington's “The Clash of Civilizations” thesis includes analysis of civilizations and cultures, the effects of culture on power relations and the change of power balances, Western universalism, Islamic radicalism, China's powerful emergence, and international conflicts sparked by the struggles. The main idea of the Clash of Civilizations can be summarized as; the culture and cultural identities in relation to the identities of civilization, shaping the patterns of reconciliation, segregation and conflict in the world after the Cold War, and that the relations between civilizations are more confrontational rather than compromising. Later, the article became a book

and general topics mentioned in the book can be listed as follows: Modernization is different from westernization and modernization does not automatically lead to westernization; Western civilization began to decline and on the other hand, Asian (Far East) and Islamic Civilizations are on the rise; Within the framework of civilizations, similar states began to participate in a collaboration and a new world order emerges leading to the polarization of different states; The West's universality claim leads to conflicts with other civilizations - especially Islamic and Chinese civilizations; The survival of the West depends on the United States as its central state, and its identity is more idiosyncratic than universal.

The developments after September 11 and the Bush Doctrine have interesting implications of the Clash of Civilizations. To be explained in detail later, it can be said that the Bush Administration, which was dominated by neo-conservatives, acted on the axis of US civilization in its struggle against radical Islam, which is associated with the name of Osama Bin Laden. Moreover, the preemptive war and unilateral policy, which is the essence of the Bush doctrine, is something proposed by Huntington and they are implemented by the US administration in the Iraq War. On the other hand, the Clash of Civilizations thesis is inadequate in explaining the many developments which have been going on since September 11 (Kongar, 2016, p. 56-60). The Thought of the Clash of Civilizations is more than academic, according to many people, and it is a thesis close to the Democrats who have been put forward to legitimize political goals (Welch, 2006, p. 21).

The Americans have always built their national identity on the grounds of the undesirable other. The September 11 attacks have created an opportunity for the United States to identify 'the other' that had been needed since the Cold War. The new threat has been state-sponsored international terrorism. However, the threat needed to be embodied because the state could not make the necessary interventions against an intangible threat and the state would be perceived as weak. For this reason, the threat was first associated with the personality of Bin Laden (Chomsky, 2010, p. 31). It was then embodied as Islamic fundamentalism or Islamic terrorism. The reason for the creation of this new 'other' perception is to provide legitimacy to the new operations with the pretext of terrorism just like the operations carried out during the Cold War under the pretext of communism (Chomsky, 2010, p. 181-182). In this preparation

period, America (and the Western world) entered the process of creating a new other, with Huntington's Conflict of Civilizations thesis. These include Western, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American, and African civilizations. The most important conflicts of the future will emerge along the cultural fault lines that distinguish these civilizations from one another. Huntington explained the reasons for the clash of civilizations that will be at the core of world politics in the future: The first reason is the thought system of the Cold War. In the Cold War, western capitalism was the symbol of the market economy. There was a clash of political and economic systems in this period. With the end of the Cold War, the form of conflict at that time was finished and a gap was created (Kellner, 2004, p. 41-64). Now, this gap must be filled with a new conflict. The former form of conflict was on economic and political grounds. The current form of conflict must be the clash of civilizations and masses. Therefore, religion should be at the heart of the conflict. Because religion, civilization and culture are an integral part of the concept. The second reason is history. Since the beginning of the Crusades (1096) there has always been a conflict between the east and west. The future form of this conflict that has endured for centuries will be the conflict of Islam and Christianity (Rapoport, 2001, p. 419).

1.4.1.1. The Background and Al-Qaeda

During the Afghanistan-Soviet war, a large number of volunteers from Muslim countries such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Iraq, Pakistan and Turkey had gone to Afghanistan to help. In mid-1980, Osama bin Laden and the leader of the Muslim Brotherhood in Palestine, Abdullah Azzam, established an organization called the Maktab al-Khadamat (MAK), also known as Maktab Khadamāt al-Mujāhidīn al-'Arab in Peshawar, Pakistan, with the aim of finding volunteers to fight in the Afghan war and to provide them with logistical and financial support (Zelin, 2014, p. 21).

MAK opened branches in 50 countries including the USA, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Bin Laden followed his teacher, Azzam to Peshawar, Pakistan and met with some other jihadists in 1988, including Ayman al-Zawahiri, who was the head of the Egyptian Al-Jihad organization. They decided to form a new organization for the

future of jihad. According to Major Sean Wilson (2007), who has presented an in depth research on al-Qaeda in his thesis, “Azzam brought to al-Qaeda another interpretation of jihad. Azzam believed that it was every Muslim’s duty to fight against infidel expansion into Muslim lands. He viewed jihad in purely defensive terms. He believed that al-Qaeda could serve as a Muslim reaction force to liberate old Muslim lands, starting with Palestine” (p. 13). The USSR also began to withdraw from Afghanistan in 1988 and volunteers fighting in the Afghan jihad started to return to their homes. Meanwhile, Laden, who came to Saudi Arabia, started to argue the view that Muslims were always victims and could not protect their rights. Also, according to Laden, it was a loss that the Mujahedeen had returned home after gaining so much experience in the war. As a result, al-Qaeda was established for the purposes of eliminating the fragmentation among Islamic groups and creating an international army to defend Muslims against oppression and is still active today (Roy, 2008, p. 45). Therefore, it is clear that the US actually armed and trained the future terrorists that would attack it.

On the other hand, the path of Zawahiri, whom Osama bin Laden was supposed to meet for the first time in Jeddah around 1985, would cross with Bin Laden again. “Zawahiri and his organization, al-Jihad, was still separate from al-Qaeda but closely allied in 1993” (p. 61), Lawrence Wright (2006) mentions in his book about al-Qaeda. He also describes the process of unification and how Zawahiri, who was to become the leader of al-Qaeda after Bin Laden’s death, became the ideological leader and the right-hand man of Bin Laden as follows:

In January 1998, Zawahiri began writing a draft of a formal declaration that would unite all of the different mujahedeen groups that had gathered in Afghanistan under a single banner. It would turn the movement away from regional conflicts and toward a global Islamic jihad against America. The language was measured and concise, in comparison with bin Laden's declaration of war two years before (p. 259)... The end came in June 2001, when al-Qaeda absorbed al-Jihad, creating an entity formally called Qaeda al-Jihad. The name reflected the fact that the Egyptians still made up the inner circle; the nine-member leadership council included only three non-Egyptians. But it was bin Laden's organization, not Zawahiri's (Wright, 2006, p. 336).

After Azzam was assassinated in 1989 by unknown assailants, all the members of the MAK joined al-Qaeda. Bin Laden protested to the government that allowed American forces to remain in Saudi territory after Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990. According to Osama bin Laden, the Saudi leaders were hypocrites who denied their own beliefs. The fact that the United States had been on the territory of Saudi Arabia

was disrespectful to Islam. After that, Osama bin Laden, driven from Saudi Arabia, passed to Sudan and then to Afghanistan. al-Qaeda was first heard of in 1993 as a result of the explosion of a bomb in the World Trade Center in New York City. Ahmed Ajaj, who carried out this attack, was arrested when he landed at JFK Airport, several guidebooks were found about the training of terrorists in his luggage (Atwan, 2008, p. 38).

The title of one of these books was al-Qaeda. al-Qaeda was first reported in the US in a 1997 report. In this report, al-Qaeda was described as an operational center with more Sunni extremists taking on similar views. As a terrorist organization for the first time, the name of al-Qaeda had been reported in an investigation conducted by the US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) following the terrorist attacks on US embassies in eastern Africa, in 1998. Distinctive features of al-Qaeda are as follows (Gunaratna, 2006, p. 39-52):

- Its origin is not a nation-state but supranational and invasive.
- Their goals are passionate, but in fact more glorious.
- It is a rich organization
- Leaders are highly trained and elite.

In fact, the US itself prepared the ground for the September 11 attacks. As a result of the USSR invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the United States brought together many people, like Bin Laden, to educate them for a 'war of religion', trained them and provided them with ammunition. Later, these people turned the direction of their weapons to the US (Cooley, 2000, p. 11). The reasons behind this were the women and children who were killed due to the US and the UN embargo on Iraq, the US founding a military base in Saudi Arabia, the massacre of the Palestinian people, support for Israel and support for oppressive regimes.

The Purposes of Al-Qaeda

The main purpose of al-Qaeda is to mobilize the Islamic resistance based on Sharia law and to remove the Western powers and their supporters from the entire geography where Muslims live. In cooperation with the extreme Islamist groups close to them, it also aims to remove the borders in the Islamic world and establish a central Islamic State in the direction of Pan-Islamism. Another purpose of the organization is

to destroy the regimes that they believe are pro-Western and non-Islamic. Laden first aimed to destroy the states and systems in the Arab world (Sedgwick, 2004, p. 795-814). As a result, the US would be withdrawn from the Arab world and an Islamic state would be established in the Middle East under the caliphate[†]. The second aim was to carry out sensational terrorist acts in Western countries by the groups affected by al-Qaeda and its ideology. Thus, the United States, Israel and its allies would collapse economically-psychologically. For this purpose, more than 30 actions were carried out by al-Qaeda and its extensions worldwide. The ideology of al-Qaeda can be based on the following principles according to Dr. Christina Hellmich (2005) from University of Reading (p. 39-54):

- This fight is a Clash of Civilizations. The militant jihad is a religious duty and is therefore necessary for the liberation of one's soul as well as for the defense of the Muslim nation.
- There are only two camps.
- There is no middle way between Islam and the West which represents the powers of the devil. This applies not only to the West but also to the Muslim States that do not share al-Qaeda's views.
- The violence that Muslims have to do is the only solution for the defense of Islam. Living in peace with the West is nothing but a dangerous dream.
- Many theological and legal restrictions on the use of violence by Muslims do not apply to this war. Considering that the resulting benefit will be high, anti-violence decisions only help unbelievers.
- The power of America is based on the economy. For this reason, large-scale, mass victim attacks focused primarily on the US and other Western economic targets are the priority. Apostate regimes should be liquidated.

[†] *Caliphate is the political-religious state comprising the Muslim community and the lands and peoples under its dominion in the centuries following the death (632 CE) of the Prophet Muhammad (Afsaruddin, 2019).*

- Muslim governments that cooperate with Western states and do not apply Sharia provisions should be religiously unacceptable and should be destroyed by violence.

Al-Qaeda and other radical Islamist organizations have no goal of occupying other territories. All they want is to ensure that Muslims are free from the Western oppression and establish a state that implements the laws of Islam.

Osama bin Laden, who kept the idea of the caliphate on the agenda, tried to destroy the pro-Western states with violence and always tried to keep the dream of establishing an Islamic state by removing all boundaries. In line with this objective, the strategy he chose to unite the radical religious group and the terrorist organization operating in different countries and for international terrorist acts is three stages:

- Communiqué
- Community
- Jihad

At the stage of the communiqué, the personnel is provided with information and organizational propaganda, and the militants are given religious and military training during the community phase. Especially at this stage, the idea of jihad is constantly emphasized and armed struggle is encouraged. The jihad stage consists the terrorist acts. Thus, it can easily be said that the aim of al-Qaeda is not only to establish a direct caliphate state but to take any steps to be taken in this way and to reposition people in a way (Moghadam, 2008, p. 87).

1.4.2. The War on Terrorism and the Invasion of Afghanistan

In the US Foreign Policy after September 11, the understanding of the fight against terrorism was revised. If we look at the anti-terrorism policies before the events in general, we can see how the attacks changed the place of terrorism in international politics. After the events, terrorism has become a determining factor and in general terms, it is possible to see the mistakes made by the US Government (Griffin, 2004, p. 381-402).

The Washington administration maximized security measures immediately after the attacks and the issue of terror became the country's main agenda. There were

also military interventions among the international measures taken after 9/11 in the fight against terrorism. On 7 October 2001 and 20 March 2003, the US carried out military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, respectively. The main reason for the launch of these operations was to correct the broken dignity of American society, regain the lost sense of trust, and to overthrow the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, where al-Qaeda is sheltered. But the United States went beyond this, with the military operations it carried out in Afghanistan and Iraq, transforming the problem from the global counter-terrorism dimension into a struggle to increase US imperialist interests. Thus, by seeking to combat the process of counter-terrorism, it sought to establish a world leadership (Hegghammer, 2006, p. 11-32).

US President George W. Bush, in his address to the nation on September 15, 2001, four days after the attacks, started to make a global propaganda against terrorism by saying:

This is a conflict without battlefields or beachheads, a conflict with opponents who believe they are invisible. Yet, they are mistaken. They will be exposed, and they will discover what others in the past have learned: Those who make war against the United States have chosen their own destruction. Victory against terrorism will not take place in a single battle, but in a series of decisive actions against terrorist organizations and those who harbor and support them.

Bush, in his address to a joint session of Congress and the nation, on September 20, 2001, revealed the al-Qaeda terror organization led by Osama bin Laden as the perpetrator of the attacks and reported that there was ample evidence for this accusation (Woodward, 2002, p. 220). Bush also pointed out the target by explaining that the Taliban regime in Afghanistan supported al-Qaeda. In his speech, Bush also announced the US National Security Strategy and in this context; the US aims were specified as achieving peace by fighting terrorism and dictatorship, establishing good relations between great powers and promoting liberate and open societies all over the world. Even though there had been no support, with the pre-emptive war, also known as the Bush doctrine, it was declared that unilateral interventions would be welcomed.

Bush called the United Nations Security Council on duty immediately after the 9/11 attacks. As a matter of fact, in the same day, UNSC adopted Resolution 1368. This resolution severely condemned the September 11 terrorist attacks and stated that these events threatened international peace and security. It also urged all states to work together urgently to call the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of the attacks to

account. The US acted in the framework of the right to self-defense as enshrined in Resolutions 1368 and 1373, rather than requiring the direct authorization of the United Nations Security Council.

President Bush also made some demands in his speech on September 20, 2001, which asked the Taliban administration to hand over all terrorists in Afghanistan, including the staff of al-Qaeda, to shut down terrorist camps in the country, and to release and protect American citizens and foreigners, that these demands were not a matter of negotiation and otherwise, Taliban would bear the consequences. But, these demands were rejected, suggesting that the organization had no potential to carry out such a large-scale attack.

The Taliban proposed a new agreement on 6 October 2001, as the United States could insist on military intervention against Afghanistan. According to this proposal, Bin Laden's extradition could be returned to a neutral country to be judged according to Islamic rules if it was formally requested and sufficient evidence was submitted. The US rejected this proposal by stating that it would not enter into any negotiations. Upon this, NATO invoked Article 5, which, for the first time in its history, allowed its members to respond collectively to self-defense, and on October 7, 2001, a US-led coalition began attacks on Taliban-controlled Afghanistan with an intense bombing campaign by American and British forces (Rashid, 2008, p. 46).

The operation began with aerial bombing of the Taliban and al-Qaeda facilities in Kabul, Kandahar, Jalalabad, Konduz and Caspian-e-Sharif. The Taliban described these acts as an attack on Islam. In a statement to the Al Jazeera television network, Osama bin Laden called for a war against the entire non-Muslim world. After the airstrike, the coalition, NATO and US-led ground operations began. One month after the start of the military movement, on November 12, the Taliban forces withdrew from Kabul. At the beginning of December, the last Taliban fortress Kandahar was captured and the Taliban leader, Mullah Mohammad Omar, left the administration and fled (Lansford, 2017, p. 48). al-Qaeda fighters continued to hide in the mountainous Tora Bora region of Afghanistan. Until mid-December, the shelter and cave complex used by al-Qaeda in Tora Bora was seized, but there was no sign of Bin Laden. The provisional government formed under the chairmanship of Hamid Karzai started on 22

December 2001. It was announced that the military loss of the Taliban forces was 10,000 and the loss of civilian was around 3,767.

Apart from the UN, the United States has been given legitimacy and support by NATO for its post-9/11 attempts. NATO changed its perspective on international terrorism after 9/11; it stopped seeing the issue of terrorism as a matter of internal security and began to perceive this issue as a threat to international security and to take measures related to terrorism (Bennett, 2003). The operation was also supported by countries such as Russia, China and Turkey apart from the UK, and countries such as Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, New Zealand and Canada announced that they could provide military support. Thus, NATO began to play a new role in the fight against terrorism. The invasion of Afghanistan took place under the pretext of opening a war on terror in response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. After the intervention, as another example would be seen in Iraq, the US-led state-building phase with external intervention started in the Middle East.

The purpose of the invasion of Afghanistan was to find the terrorist leader Osama bin Laden, to wipe out al-Qaeda and to overthrow the extreme fundamentalist Taliban government, which also ruled the majority of governments in the Islamic Republic. The Taliban, who has ruled the country since 1996, was alleged to have committed countless human rights violations against his people, especially women and ethnic Hazaras (Currier, Smith & Kuhlman, 2017, p. 118).

The next president, Barack Obama, described the Afghanistan War as the longest war in US history in his statement in May 2014. Obama announced that the US military presence in the country would be reduced by the end of 2015 to end this war and approximately 9,800 service personnel would be deployed at various locations in Afghanistan. Besides, by the end of 2016, US military would be reduced down to a normal embassy presence in Kabul, with a security assistance component (The White House, 2014). As of December 2014, NATO also decided to withdraw 87,000 troops from Afghanistan. Despite of these announcements and plans, America still maintains its presence in Afghanistan today.

The issue of whether the US and its allies' intervention in Afghanistan is legitimate remains multidimensional. After the occupation of Afghanistan, which was

on the basis of the right of self-defense and within the framework of fighting terrorism, the Taliban administration was removed from power with the reconstruction process. However, the problem of terrorism, which was declared as the reason of the intervention, could not be terminated. There is more than one reason for this: the first is the lack of internal instability in the country and the lack of consensus among internal actors; the second is the withdrawal of international support without the solid establishment of security within the country, while another reason is the ongoing impact of the US on the country despite the partial withdrawal. Particularly in the later period, other initiatives of the United States make the discussions of legitimacy more controversial.

In the post-9/11 period, the United States was the most decisive actor in the intervention and reconstruction of Afghanistan. Being active in the shaping and development of the political structure of Afghanistan is far beyond the goal of gaining a democratic state for the United States to fight terrorism only. According to journalist Mackenzie (1998), the United States' aim is to ensure that regional powers such as Russia, China, India and Pakistan are kept under control, access to the Central Asian market and its resources, and to ensure regional stability as desired (p. 90-103).

1.4.3. Neo-conservatism in the U.S. Foreign Policy

Conservatism means protecting certain values, institutions, rules and structures, especially in the process of radical change, to prevent damage from the change process. It emerged in the West with the French Revolution of 1789 and undertook the defense of the old order (Özipek, 2005, p. 6).

However, the movement being discussed, which is called neo-conservatism, is different from European conservatism as it arose in the US and it aims to preserve American values. Neo-conservatism in the US first started to be heard after World War II. In the neo-conservatism context, the values to be conserved are individualism, human rights, liberal democracy and free market economy. Therefore, it is very different from the structure of European conservatism (Beneton, 1991, p. 76).

The idea and philosophy of the neo-con perspective was formed by the Jewish professor of sociology, Leo Strauss, and the military strategist and scholar Albert

Wohlstetter. Both names have argued that US democracy is the most viable option within political systems. As a matter of fact, the new conservatives attached great importance to the forms of the regime in which the states were governed (Dorrien, 2012, p. 51). It was the belief that political regimes always and everywhere shaped people. There were 'good and bad regimes' in the world, and according to Strauss, the role of good regimes was to defend themselves against evil. (Drury, 2007, p. 62-67). In later periods, neo-conservatives interpreted this as a need for intervention to protect the security of the regime, which represents the 'good', and consequently the world peace, against the regimes that they would define as 'the axis of evil' (Fukuyama, 2006a, p. 48-49).

For the neo-cons, who are strictly anti-communists, the biggest enemy was the USSR and the eastern bloc countries. Communism, the ideology of the USSR, is an enemy of American values and state. This enemy has supporters inside as well as outside. These are the malicious circles that do not want the US to be strengthened and are constantly in opposition. Neo-conservatives creating a sense of society surrounded by such internal and external enemies, 'marginalized' certain classes of society and formed a whole of 'us and our values' through this other identity. The 'other' created within this scope has been perceived on the basis of a communist identity and is raised to the enemy status to be destroyed by being fed with prejudices (Whitaker, 1987, p. 10). Instead of isolationism in foreign policy and a weak federal government in domestic policy that the traditional conservatives promoted in the US, neo-cons promoted exporting American democracy in the form of a missionary policy and a politically and militarily strong state policy accordingly.

The neo-conservatives have criticized American rulers for softening policy and disarming efforts towards the Soviet Union since the late 1960s. The neoconservatives believed that the Soviet Union was like expansionist Nazi Germany before World War II. They also advocated the strengthening of national security against the growing military force of the Soviet Union. In addition, in the 1970s, the anti-communism had lost its old significance in the intellectual circles, especially in the face of the Vietnam defeat. This became more evident during Jimmy Carter's presidency, and this view was accepted by American policymakers (Wolfson, 2004, p. 32-49).

The neo-conservative wave, which rose in the 1970s, found its place for the first time in the cabinet of Ronald Reagan in 1981. The soft attitude towards the USSR and what happened in Vietnam led to a demand for the neo-conservatives to follow a policy of domestic and foreign unification along with a tough policy that prioritizes national interests. Unlike traditional Republican Party policies, they advocated taking into account the characteristics of the regimes in the countries in which the United States cooperated and intervening if necessary. In their view, for the permanent settlement of peace in the world, the structure of political regimes was far more important than any international institutions and agreements. They believed that the greatest threat to the world came from states that did not share the values of American democracy (Insel, 2003, p. 10-16).

Although the neo-cons were not directly influential during the Bush and Clinton periods, they continued to produce ideas through various journals and institutions (Foreign Affairs, National Interest, Commentary, Standard Weekly, Heritage Foundation, National Institute of National Security Affairs, Project for the New American Century) and increased their effects. When they finally found themselves in the American politics with the G.W. Bush government, they started to determine the American foreign policy with some prominent actors such as, Richard Perle, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Dick Cheney, Douglas Feith and R. James Woolsey (Atikkan, 2006, p. 68-69).

According to the neo-conservatives, the United States has faced an undirected world after the cold war and possesses a large army. Unused power is meaningless and so the US must prove its power to the world and make its hegemony dominant everywhere. Neo-conservatives suggest that the United States should intervene in states and communities which are likely to oppose an advanced order to prevent it from being challenged again (Fukuyama, 2007b, p. 57).

In this context, the attacks on September 11, 2001 were a major turning point. Because, as an ideological threat, communism was replaced by radical Islamic terrorism. According to the neo-conservatives, the target of the attacks is not only the United States. Attacks were made against the US, the way of life it represents, American values, and the most important ones of these: democracy and freedom

(Mearsheimer, 2005, p. 3). In June 2002, George Bush spoke at West Point, highlighting;

This war will take many turns we cannot predict. Yet I am certain of this: Wherever we carry it, the American flag will stand not only for our power, but for freedom. Our nation's cause has always been larger than our nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace -- a peace that favors human liberty. We will defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent... America has a greater objective than controlling threats and containing resentment. We will work for a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.

At the same time, he was implying that the American nation had the mission of saving humanity. In this context, the idea of a new attack against Iraq came up.

The preservation and strengthening of American hegemony and the United States' use of force to spread democracy throughout the world are two important elements that underlie the foreign policy approach of neo-conservatives. In the period after September 11, the spread of democracy has emerged as the most distinctive feature of neo-conservatism. In fact, it is thought that the active foreign policy pursued by the US for the dissemination of democracy was the result of the efforts of the neo-conservatives (Boot, 2004, p. 20-28). The neo-conservatives suggest that many options, including military power, should be used to spread this understanding of democracy throughout the world. According to this, if the democratization of other states and the withdrawal into the peace area are of vital importance for the United States, this aim must be fulfilled with all difficulties. In this context, the neo-conservatives, unlike realists and traditional conservatives, associate force use with human development. They believe that using American power can make the world better. Therefore, the neo-cons have contributed to the theoretical debates in the literature of international relations by bringing together the emphasis of liberals on development with the emphasis placed on the power of the realists: two prominent but opposing groups. Besides, the driving force of neo-conservatism in domestic politics was a reaction to liberalism and the counterculture of the 1960s, while its driving force in foreign policy was anti-communism (Daalder & Lindsay, 2005, p. 49).

According to the neo-conservatives, the new enemy is no longer the communists, but global terrorism and terrorist countries that support this terror. The global anti-terrorism principles that the world knows as the 'Bush Doctrine' were

based on this understanding. Following the September 11 attacks, 'National Security Strategy' which was created by Paul Wolfowitz and Dick Cheney in 1992, but was criticized by the public, and was quickly put into effect under Bush Doctrine (Yanardağ, 2013, p. 129). Thus, the views of the neo-cons became state policy. Neo-cons argue that the source of the problem lies in the political culture of the Middle East, that oppressive governments in the region encourage people to act or support terrorist acts, and as a solution they advocate the spread of democracy as a form of government in the Middle East (Johnson, 2007, p. 270- 271).

The danger opposing them is global and is not subject to any political or geographical boundaries. Therefore, there is no counterpart to make a deal as in the cold war period. Moreover, these terrorists cannot be expected to respect a treaty and it is not possible to impose sanctions if an agreement is violated. Therefore, the only option left is military intervention. Besides, this intervention should be done without waiting for the enemy to take action. That is, when the risk increases, you should strike first before a counter strike. The concept of preemptive strike was based on this point (Atikkan, 2006, p. 112).

Although the results were not as desired from the point of neo-cons, the Taliban and al-Qaeda were allegedly controlled, the spread of radical Islam was prevented in certain countries in the surrounding geography and public support was gained with the intervention in regions accepted as an energy corridor where China, India and Russia were influential, as a result of the Afghanistan operation initiated by the US, with the aims of global leadership, the neutralization of the terrorist organizations, the reconstruction of the Islamic regions and energy control.

As it will be mentioned later, there was a second front in the war against terrorism in Iraq. By using their own initiative in the decision-making phase of the Iraqi operation, the neo-cons adopted a security-oriented policy depending on the military potential, minimizing the commitment to international law and organizations. The negative image created by the invasion of Iraq, especially in terms of the economic loss and the international relations environment, and the neglect of the neo-cons in the administration caused George W. Bush to hand over his seat to Democrat Barack Obama (Jacobson, 2010, p. 207).

Obama, on the other hand, was dealing with the effects of the US-based global economic crisis following his position as president, while in foreign policy he pursued a strategy based on a more idealistic and soft power. Obama's main agenda also consisted of the issues of terrorism, extremism and the fight against radicalism. Rather than fighting terrorism directly with military power, he favored supplying logistics and financial aid to those who fought against terrorism. Besides, leaving the unilateral, dominant and harsh policies of the Bush era in terms of preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and fighting against global terrorism, multilateral and soft power policies were implemented within the framework of the principles of cooperation, alliance and common struggle in the Obama period. Obama withdrew US troops from the region to avoid the costs of military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq conducted during the Bush period, and tried to reconcile nuclear power with Iran through diplomacy, which was seen as a potential threat in the Bush period (Hurmi, 2010, p. 66). It can be said that the policies implemented by Bush led to a financial crisis in the USA and the increasing danger of terror and ISIS in the Middle East and all over the world. After taking office, Obama had to deal with the problems of the Bush era, but he focused primarily on domestic politics and economy. Although Obama, who adopted the soft power strategy, prevented the financial losses by withdrawing US troops from Afghanistan and Iraq in line with his national interests, he could not resist the growing power of ISIS in Iraq and Syria and instead of a strategy to destroy ISIS by sending troops back to the region, he decided to support other forces in the region (Kaplan, 2016, p. 1). The neo-conservatives did not get the power they wanted during the Obama period, but they retained their positions.

When we come to today's management, Donald Trump's inclusion of the neo-con names in his cabinet is a sign of his similar attitudes which G. W. Bush's aggressive policies followed. He created an unstable international environment with his impulsive and insecure moves. The US hopes to receive support from regional powers against China and Russia, and seems to mention more armaments. The main priorities of Donald Trump in the Middle East politics are the fight against ISIS, the reduction of Iran's influence in the region, Assad's leaving power and the indispensable principal element of US foreign policy; the security of Israel. Donald Trump made his first overseas trip to Saudi Arabia, and with the \$ 120 billion weapons deal, he signed the

largest arms deal in the history of the United States, while on the other hand he sought to get the support of the countries in the region (Arı, 2017, p. 166-167). Donald Trump has also announced that the US has withdrawn from the nuclear agreement with Iran; unilaterally ignoring the warnings of the other five members, despite violating international law and despite the fact that there is no evidence of an illegal situation of the other party (Liptak & Gaouette, 2018). Due to Donald Trump's decisions similar to George W. Bush's Middle East policy after the September 11 attacks, which was being directed with the interventionist approaches of the neo-con names, the US adoption of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, an increase in the number of embargo decisions and targeting Iran today, it can be considered as possible to see developments that will create a crisis (Gürel, 2018, p. 160).

1.4.4. The War in Iraq

In 1990, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait continued until Iraq's defeat by a US-led coalition in the Gulf war (1990-1991). However, the Iraqi branch of the Ba'ath Party, headed by Saddam Hussein, succeeded in maintaining its power by oppressing the uprising by the minority Kurds in the country and the majority of the Shiite Arabs.

In order to prevent the dispersion of the Kurds in Iraq, the plan regarding the establishment of a UN protected area in northern Iraq was accepted in the European Union meeting and allied combat aircraft patrolled the areas in northern and southern Iraq. Later, US forces launched a missile strike on Iraq's intelligence headquarters in Baghdad, in retaliation for the assassination attempt on President George Bush in Kuwait in April. In 1994, Saddam Hussein became the Prime Minister and Iraq recognized the borders of Kuwait. After the Gulf War, the end of Iraq's cooperation with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM), which was established to watch over Iraq's compliance with the decisions regarding the production and use of weapons of mass destruction, is one of the important events. The UN investigations in the mid-1990s revealed various prohibited weapons. The fact that this country was hidden from the UN's arms inspections disappointed the international community. In 1998, the US and the United Kingdom organized an air bombing campaign with the

code name 'Operation Desert Fox' to destroy Iraq's nuclear chemical and biological weapons (Yoo, 2003, p. 563-576).

However, after the bombing, Iraq did not allow inspectors to re-enter the country, and the neighboring countries were gradually trying to re-initiate trade with Iraq, and economic sanctions began to erode gradually over the next few years. George W. Bush won the elections at the end of 2000 and the neo conservative staff, who managed to be effective in this management, not only steered the foreign policy, but also shaped the Middle East policy. This group, and partly the president, thought that there had been a draining stalemate with Iraq since the 1990s and a new war was inevitable for the sake of Middle East interests and to prove US power in the region. Even before 9/11, President Bush, at his first National Security Council on January 30, “revealed that he favored a goal of regime change in Baghdad in light of evidence that Hussein was building Weapons of Mass Destruction” (Hahn, 2005, p. 122). After and with September 11 attacks, the US molded public opinion in order to fuel public fears and feelings of nationalism. Media has a huge role in this and this can be a thesis topic itself. The President also announced that the war against international terrorism encompasses Iraq and other countries that support international terrorism. The physical and psychological infrastructure of such a war was prepared throughout 2002. Iran, Iraq and North Korea were referred as an ‘axis of evil’ by the president himself. The final arguments used by the Bush administration to justify these preparations were that Iraq threatened regional and world peace with weapons of mass destruction and did not allow arms inspectors to work in the country, and it was the responsibility of the US to bring justice to Iraq, which was governed by a dictator, and free its people.

Although there was not enough or even no evidence regarding the link between the attacks of 9/11 and Iraq, it became a starting point for the Bush administration. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz argued that "a link probably existed and that the American war in Afghanistan should be followed by an invasion of Iraq" (Hahn, 2005, p. 122). On March 20, 2003, the Iraq War, known as the Second Gulf War, began with the invasion of Iraq by the US and British forces. President George Bush officially announced the beginning of the war (Katovsky & Carlson, 2003, p. 52).

Almost two-thirds of the world's oil reserves (65.3%) and the operating cost of natural gas reserves of just over one-third (36.1%) are located in the Middle East. Moreover, Iraq's strategic settlement in the middle of Iran and Syria is of great importance for the United States. Likewise, the capture of Iraq would provide control in Syria and Iran. The US was trying to ensure the legitimacy of the operation in order not to lose its international support in Afghanistan. The US, which created a number of reasons to justify its operation in Iraq, announced that it would proceed in line with the concept of pre-emptive war highlighted in the New National Security Strategy announced by President Bush in September 2002 (Dalacoura, 2005, p. 963-979).

The main idea of this concept was to identify and prevent the danger before it reached the borders of the country. For the US, this threat was a threat to the disruption of the international order, particularly the United States and its allies, in the case of the use of these weapons in Iraq, where the weapons of mass destruction were produced and in the hands of the terrorists. Another threat is that keeping the Saddam regime in power could lead to further attacks against the United States. For this reason, the United States envisaged blocking these threats in the context of a preventive war. The international community did not support this intervention which would be carried out in violation of international law. However, the US made it clear that it would launch a war against Iraq even though it did not receive the international support it expected in the Iraqi operation.

Turkey, Germany, France, Russia, China and other states were opposed to the war. Unable to get the support of the UN Security Council at the beginning of the operation, the United States succeeded in adopting the 1441 issue on 8 November 2002, with the support of the UK, after intensive negotiations (Gershkoff & Kushner, 2005, p. 531).

The adoption of this decision supports an ongoing irony in diplomacy: the threat to act alone is sometimes the most appropriate tool. As a matter of fact, the fact that the US officially declared that it can use force against Iraq on 25 October 2002 means that if the Security Council does not take action, it will intervene on its own.

The resolution of 1441, which was adopted at the meeting of the UN Security Council No. 4644 and referred to a number of previous decisions, gave Iraq a one-week period to fulfil its obligations. Moreover, Iraq was given a one-month period to

provide the UN with accurate and complete information on the weapons of mass destruction and nuclear weapons program. If Iraq agreed to fulfil the requirements set out in this decision, the UN arms inspectors would immediately commence work and submit the results obtained from the studies at the latest within 60 days (Chossudovsky, 2005, p. 54).

However, in accordance with the decision no. 1441, the UN arms inspectors did not find concrete evidence that Iraq was in possession of weapons of mass destruction as alleged by the US, as a result of their investigations in Iraq.

Bush, did not want to resort to any other solution and announced that he had ended diplomacy. He also issued an ultimatum for Saddam on March 17, 2003, allowing him and his family 48 hours to leave Iraq. When Saddam refused to leave Iraq, the US and its allies launched Operation Iraqi Freedom. On April 9, the resistance in Baghdad collapsed and US troops seized the city. US Special Forces seized northern Kirkuk cities on April 10th and Mosul on April 11th. Tikrit, the hometown of Saddam, was captured with very little resistance. On May 1, President Bush officially announced the end of the war, Saddam Hussein was arrested on 13 December 2003 and was transferred to the Iraqi authorities in June 2004 for trial for various crimes; then he was convicted of crimes against humanity and was hanged on 30 December 2006. The war caused more than two million Iraqis to emigrate from their country. The Organization of the National Priorities Project estimates that the cost of the war was over US \$ 800 billion (Gartner, 2008, p. 690-695).

One of the main factors that shaped the political structure of the country after the invasion of Iraq was sectarianism. The Sunni Arabs, the dominant power of the Baathist regime, were largely excluded from Iraqi politics in the US occupation and subsequent period. The Shiite Arabs, which had little influence during the Saddam period, became the dominant political force with the intense support of the US and Iran. The Sunnis and the Shiites could not eliminate the tension even if they tried to come together under secular and liberal political structures because of the lack of any power to stabilize the country. Besides all these sectarian conflicts, organizations operating in Iraq and the Middle East, like the radical terrorist organization ISIS, have been one of the factors affecting stability and political balances in the region.

1.5. THE U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO THE PRESENT

The Western world entered the end of the 20th century in an extreme optimism created by the disintegration of the Soviet bloc. The Western system would now dominate the world in an unrivaled manner and end the conflicts. However, immediately after that, in accordance with the rule that each system should be stopped by the other, the former 'other' in the form of communism has been replaced by a religious 'other'.

The struggle was now between Western (Christian) civilization and Islamic civilization. This thesis was specifically formalized by the attack on the Twin Towers on 11 September 2001. Indeed, some commentators argue that September 11 is the beginning of the period of unprecedented global turmoil and instability in which the true nature of the post-Cold War era has emerged. George W. Bush, who took office in January 2001, came to power with the allegation of changing the Middle East policy of the Clinton administration, which he saw as failing (Hoffman, 2004, p. 549-560).

Although the Middle East policy of the new administration also has characteristics related to the region, it has also been greatly influenced by the new administration's project of establishing global politics and the leadership of the United States. The ideology of the neo-conservatives, who came to active positions in the Bush administration, largely directed the Bush administration's policies in the first period. Believing that the American global leadership was good for both America and the world, the neo-conservatives were in favor of America's use of greater military power to build and strengthen the leadership. Criticizing the policies of the Clinton administration, the neo-conservatives argued that they should pursue a policy of military power and moral openness to support America's global leadership (Barnett, 2003, p. 45).

The advocates of this ideology increased their weight in the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks, and made it easier for them to provide public support for their policies. Thus, the new National Security Strategy, developed in 2002, laid out the principles of the Bush administration's policy. For the establishment of American hegemony, the US was developing the doctrine of preventive war rather than a siege policy.

The Middle East region was of particular importance for the Bush administration in terms of new foreign policy, security understanding and policies. The main reasons for this was that this region, with more than 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, was key to the global hegemony of the US, as before. Moreover, if the US activity there was necessary for the extreme dependence of Europe and Japan on the Middle East oil, it was now added that the United States would also be increasingly dependent on this region.

The Middle East has always faced problems. As described above, the Arab-Israeli Peace Process was over, and challenges to US policies on Iraq and Iran had increased. Finally, the security of Israel was of particular importance to neo-conservatives. For those who represent the Christian right and the pro-Likud, which is a center-right to right wing political party in Israel which was founded in 1973 by Begin and Sharon, Jews within the neo-conservatives, the elimination of threats to the security of Israel in the region and restructuring the region was essential in this respect. The new US policy of the Bush administration was, unlike the Clinton period, not considering the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict important in terms of regional security and stability (Smith, 2006, p. 47). In Israel, the Bush administration accepted Israel's approach to the Palestinian issue as a major problem of terror. In this context, Bush paid attention to the issues of reform in Palestine and Israel's security. As mentioned above, Bush had a policy of isolating Syria. He blamed the Syrian regime for supporting Hezbollah and Hamas, which he described as terrorist organizations, and for supporting resistance fighters in Iraq. While the US had previously turned over the custody of Syria to Lebanon, it pushed Syria to withdraw from Lebanon. To this end, Bush's paradigm came as a goal to treat the Arabian Peninsula, North Africa and Pakistan as a whole and to put it in the process of forced democratization (Ritchie & Rogers, 2006, p. 38).

Both Afghanistan and Iraq wars turned into a complex rebellion war against enemies using guerrilla warfare, terrorism and suicide bombing tactics and drew attention to the limits of superior American power. The foundations of the war against terrorism were carved with tactical failures and strategic challenges. In other words, these policies did not neutralize the US's dominant position in the region as the Bush administration intended, nor did it neutralize Iran (McCracken, 2011, p. 781-801).

In the Obama Period there was a consensus within the country to support democratization worldwide. The reason for this is that the idea of spreading democracy in the world has to be traced back to the stage of formation of American national identity and seen as a mission to be fulfilled in American foreign policy. Capitalism, individual freedom and human progress constitute the main features of this political culture.

Having inherited a rather negative legacy from his predecessor, Obama based his foreign policy on improving the international image of the United States and resolving the problems caused by the Bush administration's policies. In favor of an active foreign policy in order to revive the US's global leadership, Obama said, this was a global leadership display based on the understanding that the world shared common security. In order to renew the American leadership, Obama focused on ending the Iraqi war and focusing on other problems in the Middle East and the Islamic world, preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, developing a more effective global strategy against terrorism, combating common threats, and rebuilding alliances, partnerships and institutions to ensure common security. He also emphasized the need to promote fair, safe and democratic societies (Obama, 2008).

When the Obama Administration is compared to the Bush Administration, there are serious differences between the approaches towards the Middle East. Both before and during his presidency, Obama tried to construct his presidency as the opposite of Bush. Instead of aggressive policies based on pretentious and preventive intervention, Obama preferred a less ambitious, less costly, softer and multilateral foreign policy. Describing his view of foreign policy as a pragmatist, Obama stated that he did not want to pursue a foreign policy driven by ideology and a realist policy based on American national interests towards the Islamic world should be pursued. Thus, when Obama took over the presidency, instead of building democratic nations, the emphasis was placed on preventing al-Qaeda and other radical and terrorist organizations from regaining power in these countries and organizing new attacks against the United States (Ross, 2012, p. 91).

The American government, which is thought to support moderate democratic regimes in the Middle East, attempted to exhibit a passive attitude at first. Syria was the last country in the wave of democratization that began in Tunisia in 2010 and then

spread to the whole Middle East, which is also known as “the Arab Spring”. The Muslim Brotherhood leader Mursi, who came to power after a democratic election in Egypt, opened the humanitarian corridor of the Gaza Strip, supported the negotiations between Hamas and Fatah, and improved his relations with the West. In November 2012, as a result of Israel's attack on Palestine, he supported Palestine and was overthrown by Sisi with a military coup because of his Islamic identity (Gerges, 2013, p. 207). After the change of regimes in Tunisia and Libya and the military coup in Egypt, the events that started as a wave of the Arab Spring in Syria in March 2011 gradually turned into a civil war. As far as the Arab Spring is concerned, there was already a widespread opinion that the Middle East should be democratized in the Obama administration, as in all other American governments. In order to accomplish this, Obama gave passive support to the uprisings in Arab streets, instead of the interventionism that intended to be made by spending billions of dollars in Iraq during the Bush period but that resulted against America. As an example of this, when the Muslim Brotherhood came to power in Egypt, the US was silent at first, but later, it tended to provide support to the military coup because it was uncomfortable with the regime. However, this passive attitude in Libya did not last long and became part of the Libya operation with NATO. In this context, America did not produce an intrusive image and shared the costs of the intervention with its European partners (Daalder & Stavridis, 2012, p. 2-7).

In Syria, it is possible to claim that Obama acted much more inconsistently. The uprisings in Syria against the Baathist regime were seen as a rebellion against the authoritarian regimes, such as those in Tunisia and Egypt that spread with the Arab Spring. But these uprisings caused more segregation of religious groups in the Syrian society and the grouping of the increasingly militarized conflicts as pro-government or anti-government which drifted towards a civil war. Obama continued his attitude of non-intervention due to the loss caused by Afghanistan and Iraq wars and did so in Syria (Obama, 2011). In Syria, the actions against Assad, whom the US administration was not at all satisfied with and desired to be overthrown due to his close ties to Iran, stood as a preferable situation for the US, but from the moment the conflicts escalated, Obama did not offer support to the opposition groups although he spoke against Assad. In the same way, Obama did not react when the use of chemical weapons was observed,

although the use of weapons of destruction was announced as the red line for a military intervention. When the option of military intervention came to the table, he approached the Russians' suggestion of a diplomatic solution and followed a passive policy.

Although the rebellions were successful in other cases, the civil war in Syria became inextricable due to the fact that the US had not offered any open support to any parties, and Syria's - especially Iran and Russia supported - military operations. In the Tunisian and Egyptian regimes, the US had an influence on the military bureaucracy, but did not have a similar relationship with the Syrian army. On the contrary, because the Syrian army had a great deal of support from Russia and Iran, America did not have the chance to penetrate like in other countries (Jeffrey & Eisenstadt, 2016, p. 60-61). In fact, Syria turned into a battlefield where the groups that America disliked, various jihadist groups gathered from all over the world and fought against the Iranian-backed Assad regime. Although the humanitarian tragedy increased exponentially, the US government tried to justify its non-intervention by mentioning that groups like the Free Syrian Army (FSA) would not be supported, but this situation changed later. Within the scope of the Syrian Train and Equip Program, which was launched in 2014 by the USA, and in order to train the opposition forces to fight against ISIS, it was reported that FSA fighters were trained and received weapons assistance in the first place. But later in 2014, when the US regulated this program to give priority to the groups fighting ISIS, People's Protection Units (YPG), the armed wing of the Democratic Union Party (PYD), which was formed by Kurds in the north of Syria, also started to receive support and this caused the weakening of FSA. PYD and YPG together is the Syrian wing of PKK, which is recognized as a terrorist organization both by Turkey and the US. This situation has also caused the US to face the opposition of Turkey, which has long been an ally of the US.

It can be observed that the withdrawal strategy of the Obama administration from Iraq and Afghanistan led to unwanted results. In particular, there were no plans or measures for the future of Iraq and the emergence of organizations in regions where the central authority of Iraq was not provided is one of these results. Later, although the US had to send limited troops back to the region and Obama's withdrawal efforts were hampered; first, he increased his military presence in Iraq to a large extent and

then he withdrew one way or another. Then, America passed from a land military method to a method based on unmanned aerial vehicles (McCrisken, 2013, p. 97-122).

Although Obama softened previous aggressive rhetoric, he continued the 'war on terror' and, the killing of Osama bin Laden in Pakistan where he hid is described as his greatest success. But; he was always a few steps behind in the events such as the Arab Spring, the Ukrainian Crisis, Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and Libya and could not intervene in these crises with timely and similar attitudes. Instead, the Obama administration lost the initiative to the actors in the region and failed to produce successful results when it intervened later.

Iran, which is one of Bush's 'axis of evil' states, became the target once again in the fight against radical Islam and terrorism with the September 11 attacks. The US was very annoyed with Iran's support for terrorism, its work on nuclear energy, and its threat to Israel, which hindered the Arab-Israeli peace process. Unlike previous President Bush, the Obama administration maintained its constructive policy with Iran as it tended to find a solution with diplomacy. The agreement signed between five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany (P5 + 1) in Geneva on November 24, 2013, which was deemed as one of his most significant achievements, entered into force on 20 January 2014 and the initial duration to remain in force was 6 months. The purpose of the agreement was to reach a final agreement to prevent Iran from taking its nuclear program further. The agreement was expected to give time to the West and give some relief to Iran, which had a long lived economic crisis due to international sanctions. The bill coming out of the negotiations the following month decided to reduce the economic sanctions of the US and other countries in return for limiting Iran's nuclear program (Rennack, 2018, p. 1).

President Donald Trump, who took over the presidential chair of the White House on January 20, 2017 from Barrack Obama, has demonstrated a fluctuating performance in foreign policy for more than 2 years. Trump adopted a tense relationship style with the closest allies of the United States, and in 2018, he mobilized the global system with a series of radical decisions. The unsteadiness in the team he would work with also drew attention. During the first two years of office, the US President faced problems in the selection of national security advisers and the foreign minister.

The first international official visit was made to Saudi Arabia by Trump in May 2017 and was completed shortly after with a visit to Israel. Trump, who has close ties with the crown prince, Mohammed bin Salman, has signed a \$ 110 billion agreement, which is considered as the biggest weapon deal in American history, as well as serious investment projects and contracts. Trump stated that the Arab countries were determined to destroy radical terrorist groups, and with this visit, Trump tried to obtain financial benefits and an ally among the Arabs against terrorism (Ikenberry, 2017, p. 96). While the good relations between Bin Salman and Trump due to their attitude towards the increasing influence of Iran were developing, the Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi, who opposed the Saudi administration, was killed by Saudi Arabia in the Istanbul Consulate General in October 2018 and this led to a crisis in Trump's Middle East strategy. Trump, who alternated between protecting Prince Bin Salman and finding the responsible individuals in Khashoggi murder, passed a tough test.

Despite making his first visit abroad to a Muslim country, Trump redefined the ban of Muslims from entering the country, which was one of the promises during his election campaign, by softening it as 'strict controlling' after the election. Although the prohibition laws he made with this intention were stopped by the courts twice, they were put into effect on the third attempt. As a result, 6 Muslim populated countries (Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, Chad and Yemen) were banned. One of the other campaign promises of withdrawing the US troops from the Middle East back home is still a debated decision. Trump, who appears to be willing to establish a closer cooperation with Turkey regarding the withdrawal process and the situation in the eastern of Euphrates, made a decision on 19 December 2018 to fully withdraw and this sparked controversy in the cabinet. Defense Secretary James Mattis resigned on December 20 after the decision, while US Special Envoy for the fight against ISIS, Brett McGurk, announced his resign on December 22. With this withdrawal, the US will have left the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), which it has shaped by training, equipping and coordinating since 2014, and this is the basis of the reactions (Norberg, 2019). In September 2017, the Trump administration announced that it would deploy 3,000 more troops in Afghanistan, in addition to the existing ones. Trump said it was a step required by the conditions in the area. But then, the US media reported that the president would reduce the number of American soldiers in Afghanistan from 14,000

to 7,000. In Syria, there are about 2,000 troops alongside the SDF consisting of Syrian Kurds and Arabs against ISIS and the withdrawal process is still not on the way. On the other hand, unlike Obama, President Trump carried out a missile attack on Assad's air base in April 2017 and bombings continued after Assad conducted a chemical attack on Idlib. In the fight against ISIS, the US increased arms support to the FSA and YPG / PYD wings.

Disregarding the efforts of his predecessor governments, all negotiations on the Middle East peace and the Palestinian side, Trump moved the Jerusalem embassy in Tel Aviv to Jerusalem on December 6, 2017, recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. In fact, the bill which recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel was passed in Congress in 1995. However, the previous US presidents had signed a release to postpone it every six months to prevent the peace process from being interrupted. In the face of Trump's decision, almost the entire world opposed the US in the UN General Assembly, with the exception of Israel and a few other islands. Yet this decision is considered a great diplomatic success for the Israeli government, which wants Jerusalem to be recognized as the official capital of Israel.

Donald Trump, who adopted a tough attitude towards Iran since he took office, then began to put this into practice. In April 2018, he appointed the famous names known for their hawkish views to the National Security Advisory and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and declared that the United States withdrew in May from a nuclear deal signed with Iran and P5 + 1, which was previously extended three times for 6-months periods. Thus, new sanctions against Iran came to the agenda. The US, which could not find a strong supporter except Israel, faced strong opposition from the other parties of the agreement (Dehghan, 2018). The Trump administration, which particularly turned a deaf ear to the call of the European Union (EU) countries regarding "treaty renegotiation", implemented sanctions on Iran as two packages in August and November. In 2019, Donald Trump's decision on April 8 once again attracted attention to the Middle East. Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), which is a branch of Iran's Armed Forces, has been included in the list of terrorist organizations by Donald Trump. In his statement, Trump called IRGC as the Iranian government's main means of governing and implementing the international terrorist campaign. Following the announcement of his decision, the Iranian National

Security Council reacted promptly and described the US Central Command, called CENTCOM, as a terrorist army. Trump's policy, especially the one on Iran, has shown that he is striving to move away from the foreign policy pursued during Obama's term. While the Obama administration was trying to get closer to Iran, Trump, on the contrary, saw Iran as the source of the problems in the region and chose Saudi Arabia as its epicenter by focusing on the isolation of Iran. While the Democrats approached Qatar and wanted to shape the region with soft power elements, Trump chose to shape the region through Riyadh with hard power elements (Wolf, 2017, p. 99-116).



CHAPTER TWO

ISLAMOPHOBIA AS A POST 9/11 CHALLENGE

2.1. WHAT IS ISLAMOPHOBIA?

Political Islam

Unlike Christianity and Judaism, Islam's approach to the phenomenon of religion and state led to its being dragged into a political dimension. According to some theologians, Christianity emphasized that religion and state functions were different, by referring to Matthew 22:21 in the Bible as, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's" (Holy Bible, 1994, p. 991). But according to others, Jesus composed this sentence without any meaning that could form the basis for secularism. The secular meaning of the sentence was subsequently attributed by Christian theologians, who advocated rationality against church dogmatism. Jesus only wanted to show that he did not value the state in the world and despise it (Öktem, 1995, p. 1-10). On the other side, Islam finds the distinction between religion and state meaningless and accepts both as a whole for a Muslim. Islam states that religion and state is intertwined with each other since the beginning of Islam, as the Prophet Mohammed established an Islamic state while spreading the religion.

In social sciences, and especially in the Middle East studies, political Islamism, which was dealt with differently after the Iranian Islamic Revolution, was handled side by side with terrorism since the 9/11 attacks, al-Qaeda, the Taliban presence in Afghanistan and the ISIS threat growing since the Syrian civil war. These discussions are based on three assumptions. These are the fact that Islam is monolithic, that Islam is intrinsically violent, and that religion and politics are intertwined with Islam (Ayoob, 2008, p. 48). Especially in Egypt and Tunisia, although the institutionalized political powers or regimes are fed from the same political Islamic idea, their development in different processes is important in terms of understanding of political Islamism. Historically, there are many similarities in the development of Islamic movements as well as opposition elements in both countries, as well as similarities in the organizational styles of political power.

The most important reasons for the change in the field of political Islam are the end of the Cold War and the emergence of complications of the new power system (Kepel, 2006, p. 256). According to the Islamist ideology, the reason for socio-economic and political problems and the backwardness are the results of the move away from Islamic roots. In this context, the Islamist ideology argues that the only solution to the correction of society and politics must be sought in the essence of Islam and that the state must be seized in the light of the Islamist ideology in order to be able to apply it. In Muslim societies, young intellectuals who were educated in Western schools and raised from newly urbanized families have been staffed on this axis of Islamist ideology (Marret, 2008, p. 541-552).

The fact that the foundation of the Islamist ideology is made up of intellectuals in this context suggests that Islamism is a product of modernization rather than rejecting modernity. However, the decline in the quality of educated people expressed by the intellectual mentality after the 1970s has slowed down in the 1980s, when the majority of the Islamist staff consisted of people with a middle education level, the modernization of the Islamist ideology (Wells, 1999, p. 31). Nevertheless, the Islamist ideology has evolved in search of embracing modernity with a re-gained identity rather than a historical basis, with the re-emergence of the concepts of origin and identity. The Islamic ideology imposed the idea of entering development and consumption world to every field, from the education of the masses to scientific production, to the supporters that they felt they were being excluded.

The relationship between Islam and democracy is among the most debated issues in the last century, but still has not reached a consensus. When we look at the discussions of Islamic democracy in general, it seems that the most important dimension of the debate is focused on the subject of domination (Abootalebi, 2000, p. 122). The doubts about whether these two could come together and whether they would be compatible with each other were among the reasons for the discussions. While some authors state that democracy is in complete contradiction with Islam, some try to explain the existence of a complete harmony between the two. Particularly, Western intellectuals and most of the policymakers along with secular intellectuals in the Islamic world state that due to the fact that Islam is not a religion only preaching the principles of faith, but also one that regulates many worldly matters, it is not

compatible with democracy, in which regulations of state and daily life matters are based on human will, that democracy can only survive in secular social orders, that decisions made with human willpower will clash with the divine will, and therefore, it is difficult or even impossible, for democracy and Islam to exist together. With a relatively few intellectual groups in the West (Esposito & Voll, 1996; Lewis, 1996), a growing number of influential intellectuals in the Islamic world (El-Efendi, 2009; Nebi, 1992) state that while Islam functions as a religion in its own place, democracy can also be found as a management practice with consensus and consultation in Islamic states and it can also be practiced in countries and societies where Islam is the religion of the majority, or even is the determinant in political or administrative mechanisms.

The image, which was created by the military interventions of the Western powers, especially of the United States, in the Middle East with the purpose of so-called 'bringing democracy', has caused the idea of democracy to be questioned whether it is an ideological device of new colonialism or not. The fact that America still maintains its presence in the regions it has 'brought democracy' supports the fact of new colonization. The fact that a significant portion of the countries targeted in the military operations carried out are the countries with a majority Muslim population, such as Iraq, Libya and Syria, also causes controversy.

Although the Islamists' discourse on the essence of Islam defines them as fundamentalists, in theory, their efforts to reinterpret Islam reveal their reformist identity. Islamism has continued to remain on the political scene, but, it has lost its ability to become an alternative to Western modernization. In other words, even if it continues to spread and increase its influence; it has lost its original impetus. Following this bankruptcy proclaimed in the 1990s, political Islamist movements have made a choice between two extremes, one radical and the other moderate. While extremist political Islamism is represented by terrorist organizations such as ISIS and al-Qaeda, the moderate examples are the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, the Islamic Brotherhood in Yemen, the Ennahda in Tunisia and the list can be extended (Burke, 2004, p. 18-26).

The main starting point of Islamic movements is to take political actions and seize power within the framework of 'there is no other party than Allah's Party within

the ummah[‡] mentality. It is seen that the Islamic movements have entered into forms appropriate to the type of political party and have especially included women's associations. In this context, when the political party models of Islamist movements are examined, it is determined that there are three different models: Leninist, Western and Religious-Militant. The Leninist-type party mentality is a form that presents itself as a vanguard party, targeting the government and not recognizing the legitimacy of other parties (i.e. the Afghan Hizb-i Islami Party) (Edwards, 1993, p. 609-628). The political parties formed in the western type are based on a form which is not adopted by the active Islamist movements but which tries to change society and understandings to uphold Islamic values that are trying to embrace the program in elections and a multi-party system. The political parties, which characterize religious militant organizations, characterize parties (Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, Pakistani Jamaat-i Islami) which create association-type movements and infiltrate elites to try to achieve their political aims (Roy, 2008, p. 72).

The political Islamic movements, which can be examined under a single heading as a third world ideological movement in terms of both the ideological sources they feed and their interactions with each other, have moved away from the outset due to economic and political reasons. As a result, there emerged groups of one extreme, rejecting the liberal world system altogether, while there were groups of violent ones, redefining their goals to seek power within the parliamentary system and accepting inclusion in the world system (Beinin & Stork, 1997, p. 45).

The Islamist ideology, which gained an organizational dimension based on the claim that it should penetrate into the political arena, could not constitute a holistic ideology in itself with religious divisions (such as Shiite-Sunni, Wahhabis) and organizational (such as Ikhwan-i Muslim, Hezbollah, Al-Fatah, Hamas) diversity, although it constitutes the philosophical foundations of the Islamist Movements (Gerges, 1999, p. 51).

The Islamic movements, framed in the frame of Islamist ideology, have tried to regulate the established practices of Islam as they want, ignoring the reality of the

[‡] *Muslim community. A fundamental concept in Islam, expressing the essential unity and theoretical equality of Muslims from diverse cultural and geographical settings. In the Quran, it designates people to whom God has sent a prophet or people who are objects of a divine plan of salvation (Esposito, 2003, p. 122).*

nation-state. However, the formation of borders, the changes in the needs and expectations of each country have prevented the Islamic movements from providing a holistic structure and have tried to oppose the oppressive regimes by determining the strategies and management techniques appropriate to the conditions of the countries. The main reasons for the failure of Islamist movements to direct politics are the lack of reconciliation between the more moderate approaches to reforming regimes within Islamic movements and the more radical understandings and behavioral approaches to overthrowing regimes (Burgat, 2005, p. 114).

When the birth of political Islam is examined, both in radical and moderate versions, we see that it is a reaction to Westernization, secularism and modernity. The conflict between Islam and Christianity continues on the basis of cultural, historical and economic components that constitute the diversity between the Western and Eastern civilizations.

The understanding of the Islam in political connotations became a wider phenomenon after the 1980s. French sociologists Oliver Roy and Gilles Kepel used the concepts of political Islam to address the Islamic movements. In some cases, instead of the concept political Islam some referred to 'Islamic Fundamentalism'. Fundamentalism could be tracked to Protestant fundamentalism that occurred in 1920s in the United States which has opposed to the distinction between religion and politics. The same ideas were used to determine the social and political roots of Islamic fundamentalism. (Roy, 1994, p. 32; Kepel, 2016, p. 9-12).

The historical roots of Islam clearly show that Islam is a different religion which comprehends religion and state together. Islam, unlike Christianity and Judaism, is a religion which covers a state approach and has caused it to drift into a political dimension. The concept of 'political Islam' is mostly used for the establishment of a government based on Islamic rules. According to this concept, political Islam can be described as a discourse formed and arranged in the circle of Islamic government (Knudsen, 2003, p. 3). The political Islamist thoughts based on the comparison of religion and politics and emphasizes the state governance by the Islamic rules. Due to this understanding and according to the revelation-based information, the Islamic state is superior to other political views arising from human thought (Hoseinizadeh, 2010,

p. 17). The political Islamists argues superiority over all other modern and traditional thoughts which are formed by humans which are against religion and political unity.

When political Islam positions itself as a thought which is based against Western economic and cultural hegemony, in the 21st century, the Western public opinion perceives Islam as a threat. This situation can be analyzed as a reversal of the dual oppositions which occurred in the middle ages. However, the world has still been acting with the enlightenment rationality (Roy, 2008, p. 15). Because of this reason, the Western societies study political Islamist thoughts, Islamic philosophy and Islam based movements. Islam's internationally growing domains and its changing structure has been effective on the increasing attention to the Islam as a religion.

When we analyze political Islam as an ideology, it is clear that political Islam is not a steady ideology. Islamism covers such a wide scope of different agendas and therefore, it is interpreted as more than a specific ideology. So, the concept has been evaluated as a more scattered and ambiguous phenomenon. We can talk about four approaches towards 'political Islam' (Delibaş, 2004, p. 9-17):

- The first approach evaluates political Islam and Islamist movements as a threat to the West which replaces communism. This approach is merely based on the Western perception which occurred after the 11 September attacks and related with Huntington's civilization conflict. Huntington claims that the West is falling back and this is the strengthening of cultures / civilizations in Asia "and Islam. So, with the population growth of Asian and Eastern countries, the conflict between Western and Eastern countries will be inevitable" (Öztürk, 2007, p. 84-95).
- The second approach or thought, comprehends Islam as an anti-modernist thought. In this thought, Islam is a political ideology which refuses modernism (Abrahamian, 1991, p. 102). In this approach, political Islam is based on theological reaction, the return of political meaning, the rejection of science, modernity, philosophy of enlightenment and industrial revolution (Delibaş, 2004, p. 13). This approach is based on the Islam's revelation based thought and its effects on the progress which is not related with Quran. However, Islam's closure of progress is a controversial

thought. Some thinkers relate this closure with the geographical, economic and cultural boundaries.

- The third approach analyzes political Islam as a post-modern phenomenon: Those who advocate this approach are those who come to work with the colonial end. So, modernist / materialist social and economic development of secular, modernist / nationalist staff's failure of their strategy has led to the emergence of Islamic movements (Delibaş, 2004, p. 14). This idea is related with the collapse of modernist ideas which are based on Western civilization and the alternative ideals such as religion, community and ethnicity has gained importance.
- The fourth and the final approach to political Islam is the one that defines it within the context of causality (cause-effect): Those who advocate this approach are more conscious of the Islamists who they are in a sense aware of a modernist movement. However, they claim that the Islamist movement is rising up due to social, political and demographic reasons. The rise of Islam as a political thought is related with the Muslim majority countries' bad economic and life conditions (Delibaş, 2004, p. 15).

Although the influence of religion in politics in the Middle East increases and decreases in different periods, it can be said that the effect of Islam on politics has started to increase again especially in the period from 2000s until today. In fact, after the attack on the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, it can be seen that the United States' efforts to democratize the regimes in the Middle Eastern countries were effective in this. In this process, Islam has become more intimate with politics, through political parties and formations that have Islamic agendas. Political Islam has begun to achieve significant successes in the Middle East, consciously or unconsciously with the interventions of the United States and mostly a reaction against it, and it has found the opportunity to be in power in the democratization process. In the first democratic elections in Iraq after the operation of the United States, the winner was pro-sharia Shiites. In the same period, the influence of the political Islamists in Egypt increased. The Muslim Brotherhood, which had the chance to enter the elections held in late 2005 in the country where the democratization steps accelerated with the pressure of the United States, won the right to be represented in parliament. The process in Lebanon

did not progress differently. Again, the pro-Syrian government was overthrown with the pressure of the United States, and in June 2005, Iran-backed Hezbollah came to power.

Islamophobia

Islamophobia, which is a troubled concept, consists of the words 'Islam' and 'Phobos' in Greek. This concept, created with the combination of the word Islam with the suffix -phobia, which is used to express mental disturbances regarding irrational fear, can be described as the irrational fear against Islam and Muslims. Islamophobia also refers to discourses and actions focused on the exclusion and restriction of freedoms in political, economic, social, cultural or other areas against Muslims and those perceived as Muslims (Elahi & Khan, 2017, p. 7).

Although the word Islamophobia has become more commonly heard and pronounced after the 9/11 attacks, it is possible to trace its recent past in the early 1990s and the distant past until the birth of the Orientalist approach. Edward Said, in his book *Orientalism*, examined the role of the non-Western 'other' in the formation of Western modern identity. According to Said, in the post-Enlightenment period, the European cult established its own power and identity by positioning them against the identity which it defined as the 'East'. In this context, Orientalism can be defined as the West's process of establishing its hegemony over the world by producing the East as a traditional identity against the West, and thus the othering of the different (Said, 1979, p. 12-13). On the other hand, when we look back in history, Islam did not become the 'other' after the Cold War or the attacks of 9/11, but in the 11th century with the Crusades. The first known printed use of the term Islamophobia is in the February 1991 issue of 'Runnymede Trust', which is a periodical in the US, and has been included in the Oxford English Dictionary since 1997 (Sheridan, 2006, p. 317).

After the September 11 attacks, Islam became a priority issue of media, conferences and publications around the world. In this context, conflicts between religions, cultures and civilizations have begun to be discussed and some works have been produced in these terms. In such a period, when the discourse of conflict and polarization gained importance, rather than dialogue between civilizations and intercultural interaction, one of the most commonly and widely used words was

Islamophobia. Islamophobia, especially seen in the Western world, seems to be a subjective phenomenon, but it is fed by a wide variety of social, political, cultural, historical and religious roots. In the last decade, behaviors and thoughts that equate Islam and Muslims with terror and violent incidents that have become common and global not only in European and North American countries but also in the whole world, have become a crisis wave.

With attacks on 11 September, the deep anxiety, doubt and insecurity which have developed for the Islamic movements and fundamentalism in a micro scale, and for Muslims in general since the 1980s, have been replaced by a clear 'Islamophobia' or anti-Islamism (Halliday, 1999, p. 894). One of the major reasons of this opposition is that the Western media presents Islam and Muslims side-by-side with terror, terrorism or fundamentalism very often and consciously.

Media or mass media tools play a very important role in this issue, as in every social issue. As known, one of the most important instruments of globalization is the mass media. Mass media tools such as newspapers, radio, cinema, theater are indispensable especially the internet and social media culture industry of today. From the second half of the century we have passed to the present, the media has had a strong influence on the structure of almost every society in the world and has even shaped them. Nevertheless, the media have played and will be playing an important role in the development and spread of cultures, as well as social and political developments. On the other hand, it is quite difficult to say that the media has a neutral attitude while playing this role. It is possible to observe that global media networks consciously serve to the construction of religious, political, social and cultural prejudices and the direction of perceptions. One of the most popular of these perceptions is the acceptance of Islamophobia.

Hollywood has also helped in this negative attitude of the media. Many Hollywood films depict Arabs and Muslims as violent and uncivilized strangers. Principally after 9/11 incidents, heroic war movies have increased dramatically with Hollywood's quick response to the attacks (Moten, 2012, p. 168). The West had lost its biggest enemy, the Soviet Union, with the end of the Cold War. At this point, Hollywood enacted quickly to announce the brand new enemy of the west: Islam. These derogative images produced by media and Hollywood have produced another

stereotype of evil after the Cold War and legalize racist attitudes against Muslims and Islam.

2.1.1. Islamophobia in the U.S. Before and After 9/11

Pre-September 11 Islamophobia in the United States dates back much earlier. One of the best proof of this is the media and Hollywood-made films. In some of these films, Muslims, especially Arabs, are depicted as bad, dangerous, male oriented violent, uncivilized, lethal and even terrorist (Shaheen, 2003, p. 11-12). In addition, the policies of American governments against Muslims have been a manifestation of anti-Islamism, along with Islamophobia.

The Nixon administration, following the Munich massacre[§] at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games, issued directives containing a number of surveillance measures under the name of Operation Boulder. It can be said that the Nixon administration used Boulder to investigate Arabs in the United States and to block their political activism in Middle Eastern affairs. It is also claimed that these directives, which bring a number of serious negativities, including visa restrictions for Muslims, were triggered by the Zionist forces and the pressure of Israel (Hagopian, 1975, p. 100-101). With the administration of Nixon, the official government in the US was suspicious of Arabic-speaking societies. The US tried to develop a negative relationship with Muslims, especially Arab-born citizens and residents in the Arab countries and America. A pro-Israeli policy was adopted and the attacks of Palestinian Muslims were defined as 'Islamic terrorism'.

In the 1970s, Carter took several steps against Iranians and Iran in response to the crisis in which American citizens were held hostage in Tehran for 444 days. This made the view of Islamic religion quite negative. In the 1980s, the foreign policy of the Reagan administration openly included 'war on terror'. Lebanon and Libya were alleged to be involved in terrorism and Libya was bombed. In this process, a kind of vandalism and violence against the Muslims living in America was clearly seen and various attacks have been carried out on their gathering centers, mosques, workplaces

[§] *It refers to the death of 11 Israeli athletes who were taken hostages by a Palestinian terrorist organization, as a result of a failed rescue operation of German police in September 5, 1972.*

and homes (Akram & Johnson, 2002, p. 295-304). And, in the 1990s, the US government's policy of 'war on terrorism', focused on Iraq and its leader. America's anti-Islamist policy against Muslims continued at certain levels throughout the First Gulf War.

The events of September 11, 2001 can be identified as a turning point in American history in terms of Islamophobia. The September 11 events played a decisive role in making fundamental changes in the internal and external policy of the United States. The primary concern of this change was the Muslims. The US administration began to develop a policy based on suspicion, pressure and violence against non-Americans and Muslims, by holding 'Islamic terrorism' accountable for 9/11.

The reaction of the Western leaders of the time, such as Bush and Blair, immediately after the 9/11 attacks, and the language they used, were things that had not been used in international relations until that day. The fact that US President Bush said that he was going to launch a 'crusade' against Islamic terrorist organizations, and that he wanted the support of other Western allies, especially Britain on this issue, reflected the mood of Western statesmen, namely Bush and Blair, in other words, the mood of 'Muslim trauma' and also gave hints about the strategy they would choose for this new era (Birand, 2003). With the crusade rhetoric, Bush made theological attributions with references from the Old Testament that this war was between the 'good' and the 'bad', it would go on for a long-term, and in this war, the humanity would side with either the 'good', which was the US, and the 'bad', which were the ones that the US declared as enemy.

After the events of 9/11, Muslims and Islam, as a requirement of the policy pursued, have been consistently being mentioned together with terror. In this process, this policy, directly or indirectly, implies that Islam is a religion of violence and terror. Accordingly, a deep Islamophobia was created in America by bringing Islam and terror together. Islamophobia has also negatively affected the American people's relationship with Muslims. The US government, which is the leading actor in the formation of this phobia, has also followed a more repressive policy against Muslims with the increasing influence of Islamophobia. In this process, the fundamentalist Christian Right that contains many religious groups in America acted alongside the Neo-conservatives on

the Middle East. Islam, not only in terms of opposition, but also was perceived as the most powerful threat both culturally, politically and economically (Kaplan, 2006, p. 1-33).

Islamophobia evolved into a conception of anti-Muslim or anti-Islamism, which included discrimination and enmity. In order to more accurately define the Islamophobia phenomenon, instead of fear of Islam, anti-Islamism or more explicitly Islam antagonism must be mentioned. Although Islamic fundamentalism or radical Islamist movements are shown as the apparent reason for exhibiting Islamophobic attitudes and behaviors, it is clear that Islam is its real purpose (Marranci, 2004, p. 105-117).

Anti-Islamism that finds a strong place among American people as a result of the Islamophobia policy followed by officials or non-officials in the United States, has led to the development of disturbing behaviors of the administration and some citizens such as harassing Muslims in the common sense, labeling, threatening, discrimination, racist attitudes and misbehavior. Especially after September 11, there have been serious acts against Muslims living in America, which are also called 'hate crimes'. If we are to give some examples; there were 700 violent incidents targeting Muslims, including several killings, in the first 9 weeks following the 9/11 attacks. Between January 1 and October 11, 2002 there were 165 violent incidents. These include ranging from negative opinions and verbal assaults to wounding and killing and attacks to the business centers, as well as cultural and religious centers (Stewart, 2003, p. 121).

The attitudes of America and Europe after 9/11 attacks reveal a feeling that classical orientalism continues in a postmodern manner. Although the United States has many opponents, people prone to violence, etc. inside, it immediately declared Islam world as the terrorist enemy. In this context, the intervention in Afghanistan, Iraqi war and 'war with terrorism' appear as the results of the postmodern orientalist point of view. The United States searching for the source of terrorism in the East and acting with the slogan of global war against global terrorism, show the possibility that we are facing a different version of Orientalism.

Orientalism has shifted from using more technical and subtle concepts to using hate speech and casting out the other. In particular, the Orientalist language became Islamophobic when the conflicts in the Middle East came into question. The process

which began when George W. Bush stated that he launched a ‘crusade’ against terror, caused a serious confusion about whether the fight is against terrorism or Islam. For example, the Mujahedeen who were praised by the US in Afghanistan war, now were 'terrorists'. Although it is emphasized that the war is against terrorists, not against Islam and Muslims, anti-Islam discourse growing in the Western media disturbed all Muslims in the world and September 11 attacks, became a milestone in the widespread use of the word Islamophobia all over the world.

Although the anti-Islam discourse, which started especially in the United States with George W. Bush, presented a relatively moderate trend during Barack Obama’s term, it is possible to claim that current president Donald Trump's Islam and Muslim opposition both in his campaign process and in the subsequent period of his presidency has acquired an obvious dimension in the world. The Council on American–Islamic Relations (CAIR), the largest Muslim civil rights organization in the US, announced a 91 per cent increase in the Islamophobic incidents of the April-June period, which covers the second quarter of 2017 (Acar, 2017). The last example of these incidents is the Islamophobic massacre in New Zealand in March 2019. Two mosques were attacked with arms and 50 people lost their lives during the Friday prayer.

Islamophobia is produced, fed, reinforced and deepened in a wide range of fields and through a wide range of studies. The works of culture, art and literature are among the most important of these fields of study in which Islamophobia is produced and supported.

2.2. THE REPRESENTATION OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN AMY WALDMAN’S *THE SUBMISSION*

The September 11 attacks have affected almost all areas of life. Literature has also been influenced by this subject as an area fed by life and many works have emerged. Even though there are novels in American literature about September 11 or the period after that, such as *Falling Man* by Don DeLillo, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* by Mohsin Hamid, *Freedom* by Jonathan Franzen, *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* by Jonathan Safran Foer, *The Mirage* by Matt Ruff and others, in this part of the thesis, *The Submission* by Amy Waldman will be examined.

When we look at Amy Waldman's pre-writing career, we see her working for 8 years as a journalist in the *New York Times* and as a co-chief in the South-Asian bureau for 3 years. She was also a national correspondent in *The Atlantic* and is a graduate of Yale University. She is a fellow at the American Academy in Berlin and the Redcliff Institute for Advanced Study. Apart from *The Submission* being her first novel, her second book *A Door in the Earth*, inspired by the events she experienced in Afghanistan during her journalistic years, is scheduled to be published in August 2019.

The Submission became a national bestseller, with more than five awards and several positive reviews in 2011, which was its publication year. In 2003, an international design competition was held to choose the design for a national memorial to commemorate the people killed in terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993. Author Amy Waldman quotes the starting point of the book inspired by this contest, in an interview as follows:

In late 2003, I asked an artist friend why she hadn't entered the competition to design the 9/11 memorial. We started talking about how the competition worked and some of the issues around that, which led to a discussion about the controversy when the Asian-American artist and architect Maya Lin was selected to design the Vietnam Veteran Memorial. It got me thinking about what the rough equivalent would be for 9/11. I thought that if an American Muslim won, that would actually be much more controversial even than Lin's selection was. I thought, 'That's a novel, someone should write that.' and then, I kind of held onto the idea for a few years and it never went away. So, I finally sat down to write it (Franklin & Waldman, 2012).

The summary of the novel is as follows: In New York, a competition is held to build a memorial in the aftermath of an attack which is not exactly called 9/11, but gives the impression of a total 9/11. While the jury members include an art curator, a historian, a retired university president, the governor's aide, two most notable people are the head of the jury, Paul Rubin and Claire Burwell, a rich widow who lost her husband in the attack, as the representative of the relatives of the dead. In order for the competition to be fair, the applicants' applications are accepted without their names being known and there are two finalist designs in the competition: 'The Garden' and 'The Void'. With great efforts, Claire convinces members of the jury and 'The Garden' is chosen. Then comes the time when the envelope with the name of the winner is opened, and the fact that puts everyone into shock comes out: the name of the winner is Mohammad Khan, who is a Muslim.

Mohammad, whom his family and friends call Mo, is a young and talented

architect who is a Yale graduate, was born in the United States as a child of a immigrant family and raised in American culture. Although he is of Muslim origin, he is a non-practicing Muslim, and even an agnostic by his own definition. After the attack, Mo's Muslim identity gives him an ambiguous impression in the company he works for. He later goes to Afghanistan, to represent his company which enters the American Embassy's design competition, and this creates an ironic situation in the present complex environment.

In the competition process, Alyssa Spier, an unethical journalist who is ambitious and does not care about anything to reach her target, reports that the winner is a Muslim. Paul attempts to prevent the spread of the news and expresses that there is no winner yet, but the reactions from the public start to come into being. The most noteworthy of the protesters is Sean Gallagher, who lost his brother in the attack and is an uneducated and hateful man.

On the other hand, there is a Bangladeshi illegal immigrant woman named Asma Anwar, whose husband died while he was working as a janitor in the towers which were attacked. When she lost her husband she was pregnant and gives birth to her child, and then with the help of the Iranian-American lawyer Laila Fathi, she receives compensation for the relatives of those killed in the attack, which is of 1 million dollars.

Mo hears from the newspaper that he is the winner and meets with Paul, the president of the jury. He thinks that things will get more complicated. His Muslim identity creates controversy, overshadowing the fact that he is at least as American as any other Americans. On television, Khan listens to the President of the Muslim American Coordinating Council (MACC), Issam Malik's speech about him, and meets him thinking that he can help. He meets with everyone in the Council and they eventually decide to support him. Laila Fathi becomes Khan's lawyer. The architecture company he works for also publishes a statement to support him. While these happen; people, mostly 'the families', accuse Claire of supporting Khan, it is being discussed in the media that the Garden is an Islamic garden or a martyrs' paradise, journalist Alyssa writes an article that accuses Islam to aggravate the situation, Sean continues his actions and the governor announces that there will be a public hearing as a result of the reactions. Claire, upon all these news and reports, thinks that if Mo explains himself

and his design, everything will be all right.

Paul meets Mo again and asks him to withdraw from the competition. Or, at least, he could enter jointly with another name or to change his design. Khan opposes all these and does not deprive himself. This raises both admiration and concern in Paul. Alyssa, on the other hand, convinces Claire, who is her other target, that she has information about Khan and meets her, but she manipulates Khan's visit to Afghanistan. Especially after this meeting, Claire starts to suspect Mo and his design and her attitude changes. On the other hand, Sean Gallagher attacks a Muslim woman by pulling her headscarf and that makes waves. These acts of hate gradually increase. When he sees the reaction, Sean apologizes to the woman he attacked in front of the press.

Although Mo's family wants him to withdraw due to worry, they support their son. In this process, Mo turns a little to Islam and begins to fast in Ramadan and even though he shaves on the public hearing day, he grows his beard. In the public hearing, Mo explains his design, but his speech is often interrupted. There are people who support him as well as the ones opposing. But the most surprising thing is the emergence of Asma, as the last speaker. With the help of an interpreter, she makes a very impressive speech and becomes top of the country's agenda. After the public hearing, the jury re-assembles. While the majority favored Khan and supported the design as it is, Claire abstains from a vote and changes her mind in a confusing way. Finally the jury decides to wait.

After Asma's impressive speech, Alyssa goes after her and finds out that she is illegal with the information she obtained. Upon her revealing, Asma decides to leave the country due to the public reaction. Just as she is leaving her neighbourhood in company with a big crowd and with the presence of the press, she is stabbed to death. Although Alyssa is guilty of making Asma a focal point, she pressures Mo about Asma's death. This death also affects Sean and he says that he will no longer fight against Mo.

The last development that affects the process of the competition is the conversation between Claire and Mo. Claire asks Mo to explain that his design is not a martyrs' paradise or an Islamic garden, or that he changes the Islamic reflections in his design, but Mo rejects this. Claire then holds a press conference with the members

of the MACC and announces that they ask Mohammad Khan to withdraw. Claire states that she is not able to support him because of his refusal to make a statement or a modification, while the chairman of the MACC states that Mohammad Khan's ambitions are no more valuable than human life. Khan sees that the whole 'world' is against him, he withdraws from the competition, and at this stage we learn that he designed the Garden with being influenced by the Gardens of Babur (Bagh-e Babur) in his visit to Afghanistan.

In the last chapter, we pass 20 years and we find Mohammad Khan in Mumbai as a worldwide successful architect. A young girl named Molly and a young cameraman come to interview him for a documentary about the memorial. Before they came to him, they had interviewed all the people involved in the competition process they could reach to, even with Asma's son in Bangladesh. They show him these interviews, especially the one with Claire. When Molly asks if he has ever had a regret, Mo replies that he shouldn't have entered the competition. When Molly and the cameraman return to the US, they go to Claire and show her Mo's interview and the footage. Mo has built the Garden for a wealthy Muslim, instead of the names on the walls there are verses from the Qur'an, Claire's son, who is the cameraman, William, has written his father's name with the pebbles in a corner of the Garden.

In addition to creating a beautiful composition by writing about the characters step-by-step, the novel makes us question many things. The novel successfully portrays the themes of trauma and mourning, intertwined with politics, in order to show the chaotic environment and the prejudices that have risen. According to Dr. Karolina Golimowska from Freie Universität Berlin, the events described in the novel reveal the complexity of the period, reflecting the extreme prejudice, fear and restlessness experienced in American society after the attacks of September 11 (Golimowska, 2016, p. 98). At this point, the most striking sections of the novel will be examined, especially in terms of Islamophobia.

Firstly, the name of the novel is noteworthy. The root of the word Islam is Arabic and it consists of the letters sīn-lām-mīm (S-L-M [س ل م]). Although there are many different words with different meanings derived from this root, Islam is derived from the root verb 'istaslama' (استسلاما); which means 'to submit' or 'give in' or 'surrender' and Islam's literal meaning is 'submission' (to the will of Allah) (Axius,

2014). In this context, the name of the book is synonymous with Islam and Mohammad Khan's project is a submission to the competition and this is an intriguing selection. Besides, the architect's name is the same as the prophet of the religion of Islam, but his being so backslider creates irony.

Initial reactions come from a couple of jury members. The governor's man says "I'm not sure I want it with the name Mohammad attached to it. It doesn't matter who he is. They'll feel like they've won. All over the Muslim world they'll be jumping up and down at our stupidity, our stupid tolerance" and Claire reacts sensibly by saying "Tolerance isn't stupid, prejudice is" (Waldman, 2011, p. 22). This expression reveals the general approach of America in that period. The approach of the 9/11 attacks to the Muslim and immigrant societies was shaped exactly around the words 'tolerance' and 'prejudice'.

Islamophobic attitudes, which are clearly seen in public life, public institutions, educational institutions and airports in the period, and still active, show itself in the novel with Mohammad Khan's interrogation at the airport, where we first meet him. One week after 'the attack', he is about to return to New York- home, from Los Angeles, his name causes him to be interrogated at the airport. The agents' attitude during the interrogation and the nonsense questions asked are the products of Islamophobia. "The agents' questions were broad, trifling, and insinuating; his replies laconic" states Waldman. The dialogue between the agents and Khan is also irritating:

"Do you love this country, Mohammad?"

"As much as you do."

"What are your thoughts on jihad?"

"I don't have any."

"Well, perhaps you could tell us what it means. My colleague here isn't good with the foreign languages."

"I don't know what it means. I've never had cause to use the word."

"Aren't you a practicing Muslim?"

"Practicing? No."

"Know any Muslims who want to do harm to America?"

"None. I don't know any Communists, either."

"We didn't ask about Communists. Do you believe you'd go to your heaven if you blew yourself up?"

"I would never blow myself up."

"But if you did ..."

Mo didn't answer.

"Been to Afghanistan?"

"Why would I go there?" (p. 30-32).

The media, as the number one source of creating perception in the society, have

often overheated the debate and played a major role in the spread of Islamophobia. We see this fictionalized in the same way in the novel. Especially, the journalist character of the novel Alyssa Spier, who is a reporter from The Daily News, shows us what kind of a perspective the mainstream media presents on September 11 attacks and Islam with the news she produces. An example of this is the fact that one of her columns starts with the sentence; “The problem with Islam is Islam” (Waldman, 2011, p. 139). On the other side, we see a debate on Fox News with the caption; “Should Muslims be singled out for searches at airports?”. Radio host Lou Sarge says “We know who the enemy is! Let’s stop walking around like the emperor has clothes! He’s naked! Radical Islam—naked radical Islam—is the enemy” (Waldman, 2011, p. 51). “A *Wall Street Journal* op-ed calls Khan’s design ‘an assault on America’s Judeo-Christian heritage, an attempt to change its cultural landscape. It would appear to be a covert attempt at Islamization. Two decades of multicultural appeasement have led to this: we’ve invited the enemy into our home to decorate.’” (Waldman, 2011, p. 149). The questions which are formed with ‘if’ or ‘maybe’ in the beginning, turn into definite judgments over time and become the facts that the society can believe with the help of the media. An example of this is the dialogue of two anchors that speak on television: “He’s made a tomb, a graveyard, for them, not the victims. He would know that the Arabic word for tomb and garden are the same”, as well as “He’s trying to encourage new martyrs-see, here’s a taste of where you’ll get if you blow yourself up” (Waldman, 2011, p. 116).

When Sean’s father speaks to a reporter on the phone, he openly reacts to Khan’s being selected by saying,

Yes, we plan to fight this until our last breath. What? No, sir, this is not Islamophobia. Because phobia means fear and I’m not afraid of them. You can print my address in your newspaper so they can come find me. They killed my son. Is that reason enough for you? And I don’t want one of their names over his grave. Yes, we found his body. Yes, we buried him in a graveyard. Jeez, you’re really splitting hairs here. It’s the spot where he died, okay? It’s supposed to be his memorial, not theirs (p. 70).

We learn about the Islamophobic reactions that Mo faces after the revelation of his winning the contest, from the following lines of Waldman:

The threats began soon after Mo’s official anointment. By phone, by letter, by email, his countrymen promised to burn him as the terrorists had incinerated their victims, to stab him in the heart as he was stabbing America. The FBI placed him under watch. Agents much like his interrogators in Los Angeles posed, ineptly, as his assistants. Next came the picketers. Two, or three, or ten

of them, mostly women, footdarned a circle in the park across from his house. They held signs with by-now familiar slogans—NO MECCA IN MANHATTAN or STOP JI-HIDING—and at the sight of Mo, they hooted, shouted, and shook rattles (p. 157).

With the trauma and pain, people's not being able to keep the design separate from its architect's personal life, leads to the misinterpretation of the design, different conflicts and deviating from its aim.

As the competition process continues, hatred acts due to increasing Islamophobia throughout the country are summarized as follows:

Fourteen headscarf pullings across the country; twenty-five Muslim self-defense squads patrolling in response. Eleven mosque desecrations in eight states, not counting a protest pig roast organized outside a mosque in Tennessee, but including the dog feces left at the door of a mosque in Massachusetts. Twentytwo Muslim countries expressing concern about America's treatment of Muslims and its media's portrayal of Islam. Six serious threats to American interests abroad by Islamic extremists vowing retaliation for the persecution of Khan. And, most worrying for a country previously free of indigenous jihadist terrorism, three thwarted plots at home (p. 265).

We see that the fear and security concerns created by the attacks are reflected in every aspect of life, in an architectural seminar which Khan also attended. Dialogues in the seminar express how Islamophobia is felt in every field:

...DESIGN AGAINST TERRORISM along one wall and a roomful of architects, Mo among them. 'So how do you think we could reduce the risk?' asked the British counterterrorism expert leading the seminar. His name was Henry Moore, which had evoked sad, wry smiles from some of his pupils. His skin was the texture of a shepherd's-pie crust, his teeth surprisingly excellent. 'Stop invading other countries,' one man muttered. 'Search everyone—that's what they do in Israel.' 'Ban backpacks.' 'But those aren't really ... architectural solutions,' Henry said. 'Shatterproof glass,' said a brownnoser. 'And truck barriers, obviously.' 'Great. Anything a little more ... creative?' 'Maybe we should just get rid of public spaces,' said the man who had suggested banning backpacks. 'Or get rid of Muslims, for that matter.' (p. 53-55)

On the other hand, thoughts that criticize the policies followed by America and partly state that Islamophobia is the result of these policies are seen in the novel. As an example, when Khan visits MACC, a man named Ansar, who deals with foreign-policy related works, criticizes:

But does America want to live in peace with Muslims? Since we're talking about memorials, where is the memorial to the half-million Iraqi children killed by U.S. sanctions? To the thousands of innocent Afghans killed in response to this attack,

or the Iraqis killed on the pretext of responding to this attack? Or to all the Muslims slaughtered in Chechnya, or Kashmir, or Palestine, while the U.S. stood by? We keep hearing that it takes three hours to read the names of the dead from this attack. Do you know how long it would take to read the names of half a million dead Iraqi children? Twenty-one days (p. 101).

Lawyer Laila Fathi also confirms his critic as saying;

As for Ansar, he's annoying but he's not wrong. Not about the history of our foreign policy, not about how many Muslim civilians we've killed since the attack because of what was done to us or what might be done to us. We barely even pretend anymore that we're trying to spread good in the world; it's only about protecting us because we 'are' good (p. 105).

Another self-criticism comes from Claire's ex-date Jack. He says the following about both the competition process and the general approach of people:

Your support needs to be unconditional. There's more, much more, at stake here than a memorial—don't you see that? I know you've had so much of your own pain to deal with, maybe it's been hard to follow what's been happening in this country. The attack made everyone afraid of appearing unpatriotic, of questioning government, leaders. Fear has justified war, torture, secrecy, all kinds of violations of rights and liberties. Don't let it justify taking the memorial away from Khan. Everything these past couple of years has been about abdications. Don't succumb to the fear; don't mistake the absolutism of Khan's opponents for morality... (p. 257)

No one's interested in my point of view... Like a lot of Americans, I've felt really helpless the past few years, powerless to stop the change in this country's direction, and bolstering you is a way to do something. Look, I'm not saying it's easy, I know there are all kinds of pressures, but this really matters. You need to be strong. There's no evidence our Muslim population is a threat; why should we make them one? (p. 259)

In the novel, it is Mohammad Khan who directly expresses that American policies have led to attacks and Islamophobia. Khan reacts and asks in the last conversation, in which Claire asked him to explain:

How would you feel if I justified what happened to your husband by saying it wasn't about him but about his country and its policies—damn shame he got caught up in it, that's all—but you know, he got what he deserved because he paid taxes to the American government. I get what I deserve because I happen to share a religion with a few crazies?(p. 348)

CONCLUSION

After the September 11 attacks, the rapid increase of Islamophobia is something so sensitive that anything associated with Islam has become upsetting to the people of the US. On the other hand, this scapegoating has become a source of moral panic and shared hysteria that feed the central risk in terms of Muslims' religious values (Thompson, 1998, p. 256). As accusations, hate crimes, etc. has caused Islamophobia to increase, they have also created difficulties for the Muslims who try to feel comfortable in society and try to live as ordinary citizens after the attack. When we look at the fact that Islamophobia did not occur overnight; we see that it has historical and cultural origins.

In his book *Orientalism*, Edward Said expresses that there are three main reasons which have directly or indirectly developed an excessive animosity and fear towards Islam and politicize them. The first reason is the typical Western prejudice against Islam and the Arabs, which also manifests in the history of *Orientalism*. The second is the Arab-Israeli and Zionism conflict that highly affects the American Jews, the liberal society and the population in general. The third reason is the lack of cultural perception to associate with, talk about or understand the Arabs and Islam. Said also states that "because the Middle East is now so identified with Great Power politics, oil economics, and the simple-minded dichotomy of freedom-loving, democratic Israel and evil, totalitarian, and terroristic Arabs, the chances of anything like a clear view of what one talks about in talking about the Near East are depressingly small" (Said, 1979, p. 26-27). In addition, the role which the United States plays by paying regard to its political and economic interests in the region has a big part in the perception of the orient, in other words Islam and/or the East (Said, 1979, p. 2).

During the Cold War, the US maintained its economic interests on the one hand while trying to keep the Middle East countries away from Soviet influence, that is to say, communism. For America, which has become the only hegemonic power in the world with the end of the Cold War, its interests in the region and especially the protection of the oil flow to the West have been a priority in all circumstances. By supporting Israel in the Arab-Israeli conflicts that would later become a bleeding wound in the Middle East, the US has added to its priorities the security of Israel,

which is seen as a permanent ally in the region.

Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were killed as a result of the massacres, bombings and armed attacks carried out by Israel in an effort to justify its occupations in the Palestinian territories, as well as millions of others, who continue to live as refugees. America, not refraining to support Israel both militarily and politically since the very day it was founded, has drawn reaction from many countries in the world in this context, and has also gained the hatred of the Arabs. As a result of this animosity, the US, which believed in its exterritoriality depending on its isolated geographic location and developed military power, was deeply shaken by the September 11 attacks. Those responsible for the attacks emerged with the terrorist organizations that were formed after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 by the guerrillas, who were armed and trained with America's own hands in order to fight with the Soviets. Immediately after the attacks, the number one goal of the American security policy became the fight against terrorism and the countries that support it, and as the 'evil' was communism during the Cold War, the new 'other' was now Islam (Muscati: 2003).

Islam, has become a hateful, guilty, and feared phenomenon after the 9/11 attacks, and it is not difficult to say that the media, as well as political propaganda just like in the period of Trump, have a great contribution to this. People's perspectives have changed, tolerance has been replaced by violence and hate. Islamophobia, which is felt in every area of life, has also found its place in literature. *The submission* by Amy Waldman, which was published in the 10th anniversary of the attacks, has taken its place among the post-9/11 novels with his engaging fiction story. Upon the discovery that the winner of an anonymous competition organized for a memorial to replace the destroyed towers is a Muslim architect, Islamophobic actions and discourses become inevitable with the controversies and reactions. In contrast to what the mainstream media does, Waldman reminds us that other perspectives can be found, and that, although the characters cannot do so, there may be mutual tolerance.

As a result, Islamophobia is not a new concept, and it, especially the one seen in America, is based on American policies. This hostility towards the 'other', which is fueled by media and political propaganda, still exists today and will continue to emerge in many areas of life.

REFERENCES

Abootalebi, A. R. (2000). *Islam and Democracy: State-society Relations In Developing Countries, 1980-1994*. Psychology Press.

Abrahamian, E. (1991). “Fekr-e Towteh-eh Chini Dar Farhang-e Siyasi-e Iran” (Conspiratorial Thinking in Iranian Political Culture), In *Kankash* No.7: 95–105.

Abufayyad, O. (2015). *Filistin-İsrail Çatışmasının Tarihi Seyri ve Temmuz 2014 Gazze Saldırısının Türk Yazılı Basınına Yansıması* (Published master's thesis). Erzurum/Ataturk University.

Acar, S. (2017, July 18). ABD'de İslamofobik olaylarda büyük artış. *Anadolu Agency*. Retrieved from <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/abdde-islamofobik-olaylarda-buyuk-artis/863714>

Afsaruddin, A. (2019, January 18). Caliphate. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Caliphate>

Ahmedov, R. (2005). The US Policy Toward the Middle East in the Post Cold War Era. *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 4(1-2), 138–150.

Akram, S. M., & Johnson, K. R. (2002). Migration Regulation Goes Local: The Role of States in US Immigration Policy: Race, Civil Rights, and Immigration Law After September 11, 2001: The Targeting of Arabs and Muslims. *NYU Ann. Surv. Am. L.*, 58, 295-304.

Altunışık, M. B. (2009). Ortadoğu ve ABD: yeni bir döneme girilirken. *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, 1(1), 69-81.

Arı, T. (2017). *Geçmişten Günümüze Orta Doğu, Irak, İran, ABD, Petrol, Filistin Sorunu ve Arap Baharı*, C. 2, Alfa Akademi Press, Bursa.

Armaoğlu, F. H. (2012). *20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi 1914-1995*. İstanbul: Alkım Yayınevi.

Ataman, M. (2006). Değerler ve Çıkarlar: ABD'nin Ortadoğu Politikasını Belirleyen Temel Unsurlar ve İlkeler. *Ortadoğu Yıllığı*, 399-431. Retrieved from https://ormer.sakarya.edu.tr/uploads/files/17_degerler_ve_cikarlar_abdnin_ortadoğu.pdf

Atikkan, Z. (2006). *11 Eylül Amerika'yı Nasıl Değiştirdi?: Amerikan Cinneti*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Press.

Atwan, A. B. (2008). *The secret history of al-Qaeda*. University of California Press.

Axius. (2014, February 6). The Meaning of Islam. Retrieved from https://wikiislam.net/wiki/The_Meaning_of_Islam

Ayoob, M. (2008). *The Many Faces of Political Islam: Religion and Politics in the Muslim World*. University of Michigan Press.

Azar, K. T. (2011). *U.S. Foreign Policy & Its' Link to Terrorism in the Middle East*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse Publishing.

Bag, M. (2019, January 3). Taliban örgütü nedir? Nasıl ortaya çıktı? Amacı nedir? Arkasında kimler var? *Euronews*. Retrieved from <https://tr.euronews.com/2019/01/03/taliban-orgutu-nedir-nasil-ortaya-cikti-amaci-nedir-arkasinda-kimler-var>

Balfour, A. J. (1917, November 2). Balfour Declaration 1917. *The Avalon Project*. Yale Law School Lillian Goldman Law Library. Retrieved from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/balfour.asp

Barnett, T. (2003, March). The Pentagon's New Map. *Esquire*, 174–228. Retrieved from <https://classic.esquire.com/article/2003/3/1/the-pentagons-new-map>

Beinin, J., & Stork, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Political Islam: Essays from middle east report*. IB Tauris.

Beneton, P. (1991). *Muhafazakârlık*. (Akalin Cüneyt, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim.

Bennett, C. (2003). Combating Terrorism. *NATO Review*, (Interpreting Prague). Retrieved January 02, 2019, from <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003/issue1/english/art2.html>

Birand, M. A. (2003, September 11). 11 Eylül'ü Tam Anlayamadık. *Hürriyet*. Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/11-eylul-u-tam-anlayamadik-170664>

Boot, M. (2004). Think Again: Neocons. *Foreign Policy*, 20-28.

Boyer, A. (1995). *Siyonizmin Kökenleri* (2nd ed.) (V. Aytar, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim.

Burgat, F. (2005). *Face to Face With Political Islam*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Burke, J. (2004). Al-Qaeda. *Foreign Policy*, 142, 18–26. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4147572>

Bush, G. (1993). *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George Bush, 1992-1993*.

Bush, G. W. (2001) Radio Address of the President to the Nation. Retrieved from <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010915.html>

Bush, G. W. (2001, September 20). President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the nation. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html?noredirect=on

Chomsky, N. (2010). *Power and Terror: Post-9/11 Talks and Interviews*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Chossudovsky, M. (2005). *America's "War on Terrorism"*. (2nd ed.). Pincourt, Québec: Global Research, Center for Research on Globalization (CRG).

Churchill, W. (1922). British White Paper of June 1922. *The Avalon Project*. Yale Law School Lillian Goldman Law Library. Retrieved from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/brwh1922.asp

Cleveland, W. L., & Bunton, M. (2016). *A History of the Modern Middle East*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Cooley, J. K. (2000). *Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America and International Terrorism*. Pluto Press.

Crystal, J. (2017). *Kuwait: The Transformation of an Oil State*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Currier, J. M., Smith, P. N., & Kuhlman, S. (2017). Assessing the Unique Role of Religious Coping in Suicidal Behavior Among US, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 9(1), 118-123.

Daalder, I. H., & Lindsay, J. M. (2005). *America Unbound: the Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*(Reprint). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Daalder, I. H., & Stavridis, J. G. (2012). NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention. *Foreign Affairs*, 91(2), 2-7. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23217215>

Dalacoura, K. (2005). US Democracy Promotion in the Arab Middle East Since 11 September 2001: A Critique. *International affairs*, 81(5), 963-979.

Dehghan, S. K. (2018, May 9). What Is the Iran Deal and Why Does Trump Want to Scrap It? *The Guardian*. Retrieved July 18, 2018

Delibaş, K. (2004). İslami Fundamentalizmden İslam Fobisine: Batı Dünyasında Gelişmekte olan İslamophobia Yeni Bir Eşitsizlik Kaynağı Olarak Görülebilir mi? *Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Sayı:9 (1-41), 2, ISSN:1302-1761.

Dorrien, G. (2012). *Imperial Designs: Neoconservatism and the New Pax Americana*. Routledge.

Drakos, K. (2004). Terrorism-Induced Structural Shifts in Financial Risk: Airline Stocks in the Aftermath of the September 11 Terror Attacks. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 20(2), 435-446.

Drury, S.B. (2007). Leo Strauss and the American Imperial Project. *Political Theory*, 35(1), 62-67.

Edwards, D. B. (1993). Summoning Muslims: Print, Politics, and Religious Ideology in Afghanistan. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 52(3), 609-628.

Eisinger, P. (2004). The American city in the age of terror: A preliminary assessment of the effects of September 11. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(1), 115-130.

Elahi, F., & Khan, O. (Eds.). (2017). *Islamophobia: Still a challenge for all of us*(pp. 1-106, Rep.). London: Runnymede.

El-Efendi, A. (2009). *Nasıl Bir Devlet*. (H.T. Kösebalaban, Trans.) Second Ed. İlke Yayıncılık.

Ercan, S. (n.d.). İsrail'deki Arap Azınlığın Kimlik Sorunu. *Avrasya Dosyası*,238-250. Retrieved from https://21yyte.org/tr/assets/uploads/files/238-250_suna.PDF

Esposito, J. (1999). *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Esposito, J. (Ed.). (2003). Ummah. *The Oxford Dictionary of Islam*. Oxford University Press.

Esposito, J. ve Voll J. (1996). *Islam and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Eveland, W. C. (2018). *Ropes of Sand: America's Failure in the Middle East* (Vol. 26). Open Road Media.

Fawcett, L. (2018). Virtual issue: The Middle East in International Affairs. *International Affairs*.

Franklin, M., & Waldman, A. (2012, October 11). Dialogue. *Idaho Public Television*. other, PBS. Retrieved from <https://video.idahoptv.org/video/dialogue-amy-waldman/>

Fukuyama, F. (2006a) *After the Neocons: America at the Crossroads*. Profile Books, London, 2006,

Fukuyama, F. (2006b). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Simon and Schuster.

Fukuyama, F. (2007). *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy*. Yale University Press.

Gartner, S. (2008). Ties to the Dead: Connections to Iraq War and 9/11 Casualties and Disapproval of the President. *American Sociological Review*, 73(4), 690-695.

Gerges, F. A. (1999). *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests?*. Cambridge University Press.

Gerges, F. A. (2013). *The Obama Approach To The Middle East: The End of Americas's Moment*. *International Affairs*, 89, 2013, 207.

Gershkoff, A., & Kushner, S. (2005). Shaping Public Opinion: The 9/11-Iraq Connection in the Bush Administration's Rhetoric. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(3), 525-537.

Golimowska, K. (2016). *The post-9/11 city in novels: Literary remappings of New York and London*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland et Company.

Gökçınar, D. (2009). *Arap-İsrail Uyuşmazlığında Filistin Sorunu* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara/Atılım University.

Griffin, M. (2004). Picturing America's 'War on Terrorism' in Afghanistan and Iraq: Photographic motifs as news frames. *Journalism*, 5(4), 381-402.

Gunaratna, R. (2006). Ideology in Terrorism and Counter Terrorism: Lessons From Al-Qaeda. *The ideological war on terror*. Routledge, 39-52.

Gürel, O. (2018, July 14). Neo-Con Yaklaşımın George W. Bush Dönemindeki Etkisi Ve Donald J. Trump Dönemi Olası Beklentiler. *Ege Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(2), 145-167.

Hagopian, E. (1975). Minority Rights in a Nation-State: The Nixon Administrations Campaign against Arab-Americans. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 5(1/2), 97-114. doi:10.2307/2535685

Hahn, P. L. (2005). *Crisis and Crossfire: The United States and the Middle East Since 1945*. Washington, D.C: University of Nebraska Press.

Hahn, P. L. (2006). *Caught in the Middle East: U.S. Policy toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1945-1961*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Halliday, F. (1999). 'Islamophobia' reconsidered, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22:5, 892-902, DOI: [10.1080/014198799329305](https://doi.org/10.1080/014198799329305)

Hardy, R. (2005, September 22). The Iran-Iraq war: 25 years on. *BBC News*. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4260420.stm

Harunoğulları, M. (2017). Enerji Kaynaklarının Jeopolitiği ve Küresel Güçlerin Enerji Politikaları. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 3(1), 146-171.

Hegghammer, T. (2006). Global jihadism after the Iraq war. *The Middle East Journal*, 60(1), 11-32.

Hellmich, C. (2005). Al-Qaeda—terrorists, hypocrites, fundamentalists? The view from within. *Third World Quarterly*, 26(1), 39-54.

Hilali, A. Z. (2005). *US-Pakistan relationship: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan* (1st ed.). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hoffman, B. (2004). The changing face of Al-Qaeda and the global war on terrorism. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 27(6), 549-560.

Holy Bible. (1994) (New International Version). London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Hoseinizadeh, M. A. (2010). Eslam Siyasi Dar İran, Daneshgah Mofid Yayınları, Second edition. Tehran.

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49. <http://doi.org/10.2307/20045621>

Hurmi, A.B. (2010). Bush ve Obama Karşılaştırması Çerçevesinde Amerikan Dış Politikası Analizi. *Alternatif Politika*, 2 (1), 56-81.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2017). The plot against American foreign policy: Can the liberal order survive?. *Foreign Affairs.*, 96, 2.

İnsel, A. (2003). Amerika'da Yeni Muhafazakârlık. *Birikim*, 169(Mayıs).

Jacobson, G. C. (2010). George W. Bush, the Iraq War, and the Election of Barack Obama. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 40(2), 207–224. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23044817>

Jeffrey, J. F., & Eisenstadt, M. (2016). *U.S. Military Engagement In The Broader Middle East*. Washington, DC: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. 60-61.

Johnson, A. (2007) The Neoconservative Persuasion and Foreign Policy: An Interview with Joshua Muravchik. *Democratya*, 1 (11). pp. 260-287.

Kaplan, F. (2016, January). Obama's Way: The President in Practice. *Foreign Affairs*, 95(January/February). Retrieved October 14, 2018, from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2015-12-07/obamas-way>

Kaplan, J. (2006). Islamophobia in America?: September 11 and Islamophobic Hate Crime. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 18(1), 1-33.

Katovsky, B., & Carlson, T. (2003). *Embedded: The media at war in Iraq*. Guilford, CT: Lyons Press.

Kaussler, B., & Hastedt, G. P. (2017). *US Foreign Policy Towards the Middle East: The Realpolitik of Deceit*. Routledge.

Kellner, D. (2004). 9/11, Spectacles of Terror, and Media Manipulation: A critique of Jihadist and Bush media politics. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 41-64.

Kennedy, P. (2000). *Yirmi Birinci Yüzyıla Hazırlanırken*. (F. Üçcan, Trans.) (3rd ed.). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Kennington, D., Battle, J., & Byrne, M. (2004). The Origins, Conduct, and Impact of the Iran-Iraq War, 1980-1988. In *Iran-Iraq War Timeline and Declassified US Government Documents*. 1–256. Washington, D.C.: Wilson Center. Retrieved from https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Iran-IraqWar_Part1_0.pdf

Kepel, G. (2006). *The War for Muslim minds: Islam and the West*. (P. Ghazaleh, Trans.). Belknap Press.

Kepel, G. (2016). *Peygamber ve Firavun*. (İ. Bendiderya, Trans.) (2nd ed.). Özgün Publishing.

Klose, K. (1978, December 6). Soviets Sign Treaty With Afghanistan. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1978/12/06/soviets-sign-treaty-with-afghanistan/20bf658b-a229-44e7-a08b-70e92fd488c0/?utm_term=.690c9d1d5375

Knudsen, A. J. (2003). *Political Islam in the Middle East*. Chr. Michelsen Institute. 3. Retrieved from <https://www.cmi.no/publications/file/1548-political-islam-in-the-middle-east.pdf>

Kongar, E. (2016). *Küresel Terör ve Türkiye* (13th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Krieg, A. (2016). Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East. *International Affairs*, 92(1), 97-113.

Lansford, T. (2017). *A Bitter Harvest: US Foreign Policy and Afghanistan*. Routledge.

Lewis, B. (1996). Islam and Liberal Democracy: A Historical Overview. *Journal of Democracy* 7(2), 52-63. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Liptak, K., & Gaouette, N. (2018, May 09). Trump Withdraws From Iran Nuclear Deal, Isolating Him Further From World. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2018/05/08/politics/donald-trump-iran-deal-announcement-decision/index.html>

Little, D. (2008). *American Orientalism: the United States and the Middle East Since 1945*(3rd ed.). The University of North Carolina Press.

Mackenzie, R. (1998). The United States and the Taliban. In W. Maley (Ed.), *Fundamentalism Reborn?: Afghanistan Under the Taliban*(pp. 90-103). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Mansfield, P. (2013). *A History of the Middle East*(4th ed.). Penguin Books.

Marples, D. R. (2016). *The collapse of the Soviet Union, 1985-1991*. Routledge.

Marranci, G. (2004). Multiculturalism, Islam and the Clash of Civilizations Theory: Rethinking Islamophobia. *Culture and Religion*, 5(1), 105-117.

Marret, J. L. (2008). Al-Qaeda in Islamic Maghreb: A “Glocal” Organization. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 31(6), 541-552.

McCriskin, T. (2011). Ten Years On: Obama's War on Terrorism in Rhetoric and Practice. *International Affairs*, 87(4), 781-801.

McCracken, T. (2013). Obama's Drone War. *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 55(2), 97-122. Retrieved July 5, 2018, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2013.784469>.

Mearsheimer, J.J.. (2005). Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq War: Realism Versus Neoconservatism. *Merkur*. 59.

Moghadam, A. (2008). *The Globalization of Martyrdom: Al-Qaeda, Salafi Jihad, and the Diffusion of Suicide Attacks*. JHU Press.

Moten, A. R. (2012). Understanding and Ameliorating Islamophobia. *Cultura*, 9 (1), 155-178.

Muscata, S. A. (2003). Reconstructing 'Evil': A critical assessment of post-September 11 political discourse. *Journal of Muslim minority affairs*, 23(2), 249-268.

NATO. (1949, April 4). The North Atlantic Treaty. Retrieved from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

Nebi, M. B. (1992). *İslam ve Demokrasi*. (E. Göze, Trans.) (2nd ed.). Boğaziçi.

Neumann, R. E. (2017). America's War for the Greater Middle East: A Military History. *Middle East Policy*, 24(2), 160-166.

Norberg, N. (2019). U.S. Syria Withdrawal Impact on Kurdish Partners. Retrieved January 10, 2019, from <https://www.lawfareblog.com/us-syria-withdrawal-impact-kurdish-partners>

Obama, B. (2008). Full text: Obama's foreign policy speech. Retrieved December 24, 2018, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/jul/16/uselections2008.barackobama>

Obama, B. (2011). Remarks by the President on the Middle East and North Africa. Retrieved December 24, 2018, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/05/19/remarks-president-middle-east-and-north-africa>

Obama, B. (2014, May 27). *Statement by the President on Afghanistan* [Press release]. Retrieved January 03, 2019, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/05/27/statement-president-afghanistan>

Öke, M. K. (2013). *Siyonizm ve Filistin sorunu* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi Yayınevi.

Öktem, N. (1995). Dinler ve Laiklik. *Köprü*, (51), 1-10.

Özipek B. B.(2005) *Muhafazakârlık: Akıl, Toplum, Siyaset*, Ankara: Kadim Yayıncılık

Öztürk, O. M. (2007) *Amerika Çökerken-Yeni Kutuplaşma*. Fark Press, Ankara.

Pipes, D. (2017). Ike's Gamble: America's Rise to Dominance in the Middle East. *Middle East Quarterly*, 24(2), F2.

Pyszczyński, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2003). In the wake of 9/11: The psychology of terror. Washington, DC, US: *American Psychological Association*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10478-000>

Ramazani, R. K. (1964). The Changing United States Policy in the Middle East. *Virginia Quarterly Review : A National Journal Of Literature & Discussion*,40/3(Summer).Retrieved from <https://www.vqronline.org/essay/changing-united-states-policy-middle-east>

Rapoport, D. C. (1990) Sacred Terror: A Contemporary Example from Islam.Walter 19 Reich (eds.) *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, pp. 103-130.

Rapoport, D. C. (2001). The Fourth Wave: September 11 in the History of Terrorism. *Current History*, 100(650), 419.

Rashid, A. (2008). *Descent Into Chaos: the US and the Failure of Nation Building in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Central Asia*. Penguin.

Rennack, D. E. (2018). *Iran: U.S. Economic Sanctions and the Authority to Lift Restrictions* (Rep.). Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R43311.pdf>

Ritchie, N., & Rogers, P. (2006). *The Political Road to War with Iraq: Bush, 9/11 and the Drive to Overthrow Saddam*. Routledge.

Ross, R. S. (2012). The Problem with the Pivot: Obama's New Asia Policy Is Unnecessary and Counterproductive. *Foreign Affairs*, 91, 70.

Roy, O. (1994). *The Failure of Political Islam*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Roy, O. (2008). Al-Qaeda in the West as a Youth Movement: The Power of a Narrative. *Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) Policy Brief*, 168, 1–8. Retrieved from <https://www.ceps.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/1698.pdf>

Rubin, B. R. (2005). Russian Hegemony And State Breakdown In The Periphery: Causes and Consequences of the Civil War in Tajikistan . In B. R. Rubin & J. Snyder (Eds.), *Post-Soviet Political Order* (pp. 119–150). essay, Routledge.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism* (1st ed.). Wintage Books.

Sander, O. (2013). *Siyasi Tarih: 1918-1994* (23rd ed., Vol. 2). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Schmierer, R. J. (2016). America's Continuing Misadventures in the Middle East. *Middle East Policy*, 23(3), 165-168.

Schreuer, C. (1993). The Warning of the Sovereign State: Towards a New Paradigm for International Law. *Eur. J. Int'l L.*, 4, 447.

Sedgwick, M. (2004). Al-Qaeda and the Nature of Religious Terrorism. *Terrorism and Polirical Violence*, 16(4), 795-814.

Shaheen, J. G. (2003). Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 588(1), 171–193.

Sheridan, L. P. (2006). Islamophobia Pre- and Post-September 11th, 2001. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(3), 317-336.

Simpson, G. L. (2018). Revisiting the US Role in Three Middle East Crises. *Middle East Quarterly*.

Smith, C. (2013). The Arab-Israeli Conflict. In L. Fawcett (Ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East* (3rd ed., pp. 245–267). essay, Oxford University Press.

Smith, K. (2006). *A Congruence of Interests: Christian Zionism and U.S Policy Toward Israel, 1977-1998*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>

Stewart, A. (2003). *Report on Hate Crimes and Discrimination against Arab Americans: The Post-September 11 Backlash, September 11, 2001-October 11, 2002*. Ed. Ibish Hussein. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee.

Taylor, A. R. (2017). *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy, 1897-1947*. Valmy Publishing.

Tessler, M. A. (2009). *A history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2016, July 19). Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica, inc. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Strategic-Arms-Limitation-Talks>

Thompson, K. (1998). *Moral Panics*. London: Routledge.

Truman, H. (1946, October 13). Immigration into Palestine - Statement by President Truman. *The Avalon Project*. Yale Law School Lillian Goldman Law Library. Retrieved from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad163.asp#1

Ulutaş, U., Bölme, S. M., Demir, G. N., Torlak, F., & Ziya, S. (2012). *İsrail Siyasetini Anlama Klavuzu* (1st ed., pp. 1-202, Rep. No. 19). Ankara: Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı (SETA).

USA, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Library. (2007, April 23). *Iraq Economic Data (1989-2003)*. Retrieved January 15, 2018, from https://www.cia.gov/library/reports/general-reports-1/iraq_wmd_2004/chap2_annxD.html

Waldman, A. (2011). *The submission*. London: Windmill.

Welch, M. (2006). *Scapegoats of September 11th: Hate crimes & state crimes in the war on terror*. Rutgers University Press.

Wells, M. (1999). Thermidor in the Islamic Republic of Iran: The Rise of Muhammad Khatami. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 26(1), 27-39. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/195599>

Whitaker, R. (1987). Neo-Conservatism and the State. *Socialist Register* 1987, 23, 1–31. Retrieved from <https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/download/5539/2437>

Wilson, S. P. (2007). *The Evolution of Al-Qaeda* (thesis). U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS.

Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at War* (First Edition edition). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wolf, R. (2017). Donald Trump's Status-driven Foreign Policy. *Survival*, 59(5), 99-116.

Wolfson, A. (2004). Conservatives and Neoconservatives. *Public Interest*, (154), 32-49.

Wright, L. (2006). *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11* (1 edition). New York: Knopf.

Yanardağ, M. (2013). *Yeni Muhafazakârlık Neo-Conlar* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Destek Press.

Yoo, J. (2003). International Law and the War In Iraq. *American Journal of International Law*, 97(3), 563-576.

Yurdakurban, İ. (2007). *Devrim sonrası İran dış politikası (1979-2005)* (dissertation). *Selcuk University Digital Archive Systems*. Selcuk University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Konya. Retrieved from <http://acikerisim.selcuk.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/9705/217392.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Zelin, A. Y. (2014, June). The War between ISIS and al-Qaeda for Supremacy of the Global Jihadist Movement. The Washington Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/the-war-between-isis-and-al-qaeda-for-supremacy-of-the-global-jihadist>