Islamophobia, Nativism, and Discrimination: President Donald Trump's Anti-Muslim Agenda

TABBI Badreddine[1]

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Mohammed Lamine Debaghine Sétif II

badreddine-tabbi@hotmail.com

Pr. BENSAFI Zoulikha

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Abou EL Kacem Saâdallah Algiers II

chorafa@hotmail.fr

Abstract

The aim underlying this research is to explore the relationship between Islamophobia, nativism, and anti-Muslim discrimination in the United States and focuses particularly on President Donald Trump's Islamophobic trend as a new benchmark in America's nativist history that once again blossomed out in contemporary time. The research analyses the present day hostility and the negative representations toward Arabs and Muslims in relation to Islam and American democratic values. In fact, Donald Trump's suspicions and Muslim bans are unwarranted since they are in fact an infringement over the kernel of the American Constitution and the axiomatic tradition of U.S.A. as a land of opportunity.

Keywords : Islamophobia; nativism; discrimination; Muslims, Donald Trump.

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة لاكتشاف العلاقة بين الإسلاموفوبيا، والعداء للمهاجرين، والتمييز العنصري المناهض للمسلمين في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية، كما تركز بشكل خاص على النزعة الاسلاموفوبية للرئيس الأمريكي دونالد ترامب كمرجعية جديدة في تاريخ أمريكا المعادي للمهاجرين والذي تطور مرة أخرى في الوقت الراهن. يحلل البحث أيضا العداء الحالي والتمثيل السلبي إزاء العرب والمسلمين فيما يتعلق بالإسلام والقيم الديمقراطية الأمريكية. في الحقيقة، شكوك دونالد ترامب وكذا منعه دخول المسلمين لأمريكا لا مبرر لها لأنها في الواقع انتهاك لجوهر الدستور الأمريكي والتقاليد البديهية للولايات المتحدة كأرض للفرص.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الإسلاموفوبيا، العداء للمهاجرين، التمييز العنصري، المسلمون، دونالد ترامب.

---

¹ - Corresponding author.

1- Introduction

Mounting awareness of Islamophobia and nativism, as catalysts for exclusionary procedures particularly after 9/11 events, may staunchly be perceived to be jarring with the overriding legacy of the American cultural hegemony and justifiably substantiated through imagined stances rooted in bigotry toward Islam and animosity against Muslims. All worries seem apprehensively to coalesce around unwarranted Muslims' threat and terrorism throughout the course of last century.

Even though there has been nationwide appeal that espoused a compartmentalized and an anti-Muslim agenda, the essence of the President Donald Trumps' islamophobic ideology has persistently become the operationalized trend to single out Arab and Muslims with all forms of exclusion and discrimination. While nativist attitudes have been vociferously articulated and resolutely open to all races of whatever background throughout the American history, the brazen Islamophobia emanating from Trump's policies is neither novel in substance nor new in form since his fearmorgening is not unfolded within vacuum but rather an extension of an old threatening outsider's scope. Trump's policies of banning entry of individuals from Muslim-majority countries, which the world has well understood as perpetuating anti-immigration and anti-Muslim rhetoric, has caused the U.S.A. to be seen as unwelcoming to immigrants from different arrays of the world.

2- What is Islamophobia?

Islamophobia, as unfounded prejudice and hostility toward Islam and thus fear or hatred of Muslims, has significantly surfaced at the beginning of the 21st century and has made obvious how easily bigotry against ethnic group can manifest to pit one part of the humanity against the other, generating a form of cultural fault lines in recent socio-economic and neo-liberalist status. The unthoughtful or ill-mannered actions, abiding the groundless and irrational phobia of Muslim other, bred by unwanted consequences on both the Muslim and Arab minority to an extent that has so far to critically reviewing the current state of Islamophobia through the lenses of immigration issues, globalization, and multiculturalism.

It is overwhelmingly believed that nowadays Islamophobia, as neologism and notion, has its tie origins in the Anglo-Saxon countries, particularly in the United Kingdom, referring to Muslims who are living in the West and susceptible to prejudice and discriminatory attitudes. The Oxford English dictionary shares the same view, suggesting that the term came to be used in print in the American periodical 'Insight' in 1991. Whilst these views may not completely true, it would often be considered that the term was first used by the Muslim French painter Etienne Dinet, known as Nacereddine after his conversion to Islam, and the Algerian intellectual Sliman Ben Ibrahim in 1925

Biography of Islam's Prophet Mohamed "accès de délire islamophobe"[1]. As much markedly and particularly occult term, Islamophobia has triggered contesting claims, including Caroline Fourest and Fiammetta Venner's claims that the concept was used by the 'Mullahs' to depict Iranian women who rejected to wear Hijab[2] during the Iranian Revolution as well as Chahdortt Djavann and Carla Amina Baghajati who shared the same confirmation. However, 1925 Dinet and Ibrahim's use of the concept Islamphobia didn't necessarily equate with nowadays usage as the context is different and not reflecting contemporary setting.

Despite the fact that Islamophobia was primarily a historical and paradigmatic anti-Muslim phenomenon that has long resided in the memory of the Western consciousness during the times of the Crusades and its junctures, contemporary Islamophobia, serving too much in the similar vein as anti-Semitism, is rather a modern and secular anti-Islamic discourse and practice appearing in the public sphere with the integration of Muslim immigrants' community after 9/11. Thus, the term is both retrospective and transitory, evidencing the proceeding duality of Islam and West narratives and functioning through periodic intervals of quiescence and intensification that attained outrageous levels in the aftermath of certain major global events such as 9/11 in the U.S., the incidents the 7th of July 2007 known as London terrorist bombings (7/7), and Madrid bombing (2004) (Allen, 2004).

Indeed, all such incidents have catalyzed Islamophobia, making it more blustering and normalized across various swatches of recent society. However, it is requisite to grasp that 9/11 events have magically intensified it and strengthened the widespread belief that it is its consequential without question. At whatever level, the legacy of 9/11 can never be dismantled as it germinated Islamophobia and, to a further extent, fed the increasing sprite of it. Surely, the manifestation of xenophobic and Islamophobic attitudes draw extensively upon long historical premises and 9/11 incidents relatively "gave a pre-existent prejudice a much greater credibility and validity" (Allen & Nielsen, 2002, p.16).

While there can be little doubt that the concept of Islamophobia covers a complex range of subjectivity, social, and mass mediated constructions in the orbit of intolerance to others, nowadays Islamophobia supplements what has been subtle in Eurocentric extremism against Arabs and Muslim people as well as their culture. The conceptualization of Islamophobia, as Stuart Hall described it, is another facet of "cultural racism" (Hall, 1992). Though a proliferation of sources argue that the term had been used before the English Think Tank report named Runnymede, the latter played a significant role in spreading Islamophobia. The Runnymede report on religious prejudices and Muslim problems has considerable repercussions in academic arena,

stating that Islam as a huge static, indifferent to change, unresponsive to new realities, and an isolated other. Henceforth, it is viewed as inferior, sexist, irrational, primitive, terrorist and engaged in clash of civilizations since its ideology is used for political or armed benefits with no accordance with other cultures and Western civilization (Welty, 1997).

3- Islamophobia and Racialization

Islamophobia more likely developed out of the grassroots situations being faced by Arabs and Muslims in different sociopolitical processes that didn't not happen in vacuum. Distinct Muslim hatred and prejudice have been identified almost simultaneously with immigration and the newly established immigrant communities. Such emerging immigrant countries, particularly the U.S.A. has witnessed shifting points from color in 1950s and 1960s to race and blackness during the 1970s and 1980s. Initially, the underlying racism was a reality in the heightening of political and legislative laboring that characterized the role of immigrants' countries in controlling immigration. Therefore, Islamophobia does not necessarily evoke cultural racism, but it "both result from and contribute to the racial ideology of the United States, which is based on socially constructive categories of phenotypical characteristics" (Love, 2009, p.412). A deeper examination of the racial dynamics that long existed in the U.S.A. society brings an analogical advantage for a better understanding of Islamophobia. This draws on patterns of racialization, discrimination, and prejudice targeted towards groups of particular physical traits such as those who are Asian Arab looking (love, 2009).

While race is a socio-cultural category, its ideology can be understood as a social construct, prone to adjustment (Banton, 1998, p.196). Individuals are viewed to belong to socially constructed categories and, hence, the racial scapegoating affects all the members in the American society. The role of race has also brought to the segment of whiteness domination and Euro-centric perspective, perceiving other groups as inferior. The other and its identity are continuously evolving. Accordingly, many researchers have argued that the human identity is in a process of perpetual change within time and context (Comack, 1999; Said, 1978, Memmi, 1982). Similarly, the other identity emerges from the process of other group construction that is flexible, changeable, and is influenced by specific political, social, historical, cultural and economic contexts. As Comack said: "race is not a homogenous or one dimensional category…it is a social construct with changing meanings that are historically specific" (p. 60). In this sense, identities are molded and manipulated in ways that further emphasize the domination of some groups over others. Racist ideology, like Islamophobia, provides the conceptual framework for building lines within a society and for understanding systems of dominance based on ideas of differences in ethnicity, race, gender, and class.

4- Anti- Muslim Discrimination and Hate Crimes against Arab and Muslim Americans

Several research have shown that national security issues have become an axial political concern in most of Western countries, particularly post 9/11 attacks in the United States of America. Since that time, a severe anti-Muslim and anti- Arab hate crimes have raised dramatically, reflecting contemporary irrational fear of Muslims along different forms of racism. A hurdle of security experts, academicians, policy makers, and elites have postulated that the prospectively catastrophic nature of new terrorism of Islamic fundamentalist network requires government pre-emptive modes of legislation, policing, and legislation. The constellation of threat stereotype has surfaced and led to the uplift of future based tools of danger detection, such as scanning, scenario testing, and scrutiny.

The post 9/11 securitization of domestic and foreign policies, Arab Spring avalanche, and the resurgence of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria 'ISIS' as a new global threat have enshrined a discernable shift in danger assessment from retrospective and probabilistic estimations of harm to a preemptive set of security discourses. All have heavily slatted to unprecedented future legislation and undesirable form of surveillance that problematize Arab and Muslim minority groups. Today, the practices, habits, experiences, cultural values, and identities of young Muslims and Arabs have become a perfect hotbed for heightened claims of steady suspicion and ring hostility suffered by Arabs; a situation worsened when amalgamated with racial, class, and gender discrimination.

It is commonplace that a rich body of empirical research has already demonstrated that individuals from minority groups are disproportionately prone to criminal justice intervention and penal sanction (Heaven & Hudson, 2007, p.367). While it has been fair for the U.S. and the whole world to come together to mourn for the loss of innocents' life and to strive for strengthening efforts to counter atrocities, relatively very slight number of outside academia has really paid attention to the impactful outcomes of 9/11 on thousands of Arab and Muslim Americans who were threatened under the auspices of the U.S.A. purported legislative initiatives. Thus, a range of controversial sentiments have emerged, inferring suspicion and culpability of all Arab and Muslims who have become conflated and understood as one in the same. To the extent that within few hours of 9/11 attacks, the phones flooded into the Arab American Institute in Washington D.C. throughout the U.S. and members of the Arab American Institute were receiving threats and didn't know what to do or how to deal with the situation. The next day (10/11), Dr. Zoghby, Arab American Institute founder and president, received threats and he confirmed:

> "[T]he second day, I got the first death threat. It was, 'Zogby you Arab dog. You'll die. I'll murder you and slit the throats of your children.' It stung. It stung both because of the personal threat of what it represented, but also as I described it, we were in mourning collectively as a country and then someone decided to say to me, 'you can't be part of this,' and pulled me away. I had to look over my shoulder; I couldn't just be part of this process of grief that was engulfing the rest of the country." (Dr. James Zogby, Arab American Institute).

Data from different research have demonstrated that immediately within few hours after 9/11 attacks, there has been a considerable increase in hate crimes against Muslims and Arabs in the United States. The rise of hostility and hate crimes, increasingly in the wake of 9/11, has appeared to topper in the months that followed, led to problems of internal security and breaks of fragmentation of the society cohesion, fueled drastic discourses, and positioned Muslims' lives under the impacts of suspicion. In their book: *Arab Detroit 9/11: Life in the Terror Decade* (2011), Nabeel Abraham, Sally Howell, and Andrew Shryock highlighted such frantic decade after 9/11 attacks and reinvigorated the detrimental treatment of Arabs and Muslims in the United States. Examining the situation of Arabs and Muslims of Detroit, the authors depicted the first decade of post 9/11 as a space in which they were associated to the "enemy other" and were required to prove their loyalty in ways other Americans were not expected to do (Nabeel, Howell and Shryock 2011).

Further, some Arab and Muslim Americans have brought many cases of distrust, aversion from the part of non-Muslim neighbors, colleagues, friends, and classmates. Many of them have realized that 9/11 introduced a period of an exalted suspicion, law enforcement, homeland security agents, and elected politicians. All have shifted into a systematic and sometimes extralegal scrutiny of Arab and Muslim communities (Joseph, 2013). For instance, the Federal Bureau of Investigation 'FBI' reported that the early threats of violent acts and hate crimes against Arab and Muslim Americans occurred within few hours following 9/11 attacks. The FBI showed 1.6000 percent raise in anti-Arab and Muslim hate crime incidents during the next three weeks after 9/11, lately stabilizing but never decreasing below the percentages recorded before 9/11. Even though, hate crimes lessened after the first three weeks, it immediately took another bias related incidents, including religious, employment, and education discrimination. For instance, in the month post 9/11 in Detroit, one of the largest Muslim American population, thousands of Muslim and Arab ancestry have been arrested, convicted, detained, and deported by FBI officially because of national origin or religion.

Moreover, violence and hatred against Muslim and Arab Americans, and those Muslim looking sky rocked after 9/11. In the immediate wake of 9/11, Muslims or Muslim looking individuals were killed. Most of them were sheikh who were stereotypically thought to be Muslims because they are generally bearded and wear turbans that are much the same to the turbans worn by Osama Bin Ladin and the Taliban (Sahar, 2009). In 2007, the Council on American Islamic Relations noticed the reception of 1.000 grievances of abuse and reported that anti-Muslim physical violence rose by 52 percent between the years of 2003 and 2004 (Moore, 2010).

The American anti-Arab and Muslim vehement is to some extent a new phenomenon with many groups emerging only after 9/11. That is not to confirm that generalized bigotry and discrimination against Muslim and Arab did not exist in previous decades as it certainly targeted people of color with hatred against blacks, Jews, Catholics, and others. Nevertheless, the rise of a sophisticated network whose fret is addressed particularly to Muslims and Arab communities is quite contemporary. It is generally postulated that 9/11 is not exactly the case. The roots of many of nowadays main anti-Muslim organizations originated in the years after the terrorist attacks in Oklahoma when the Congress passed and President Bill Clinton officially signed the 1996 Federal Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act in efforts to reinforce the U.S.A. defense agent terrorist. Though the terrorists in Oklahoma City were American citizens, the Federal Antiterrorism and Effective Penalty Act had great impact on Arab Muslims. Most of all immigrants who were imprisoned and had secret evidence against them even before 9/11 were of Arab and Muslim descent.

5- American Nativism

The United States has always been preoccupied with the pivotal question as to who counts as an American? Plausibly, being viewed un-American constitutes a big threat to every American. Analyzing the detriments of racial public policy attitudes toward racial outgroups is nothing new in the political discourse. Some political scientists have asserted that it is impossible to understand American policies without at the same time taking into account the tradition of racial exclusion and inequalities among both the mass public and the elite who fashion public policy. Yet, the question that should be raised is how can one understand and explain the fundamental motives of nativism as well as its consequences through the American history? Due to its relatively short history, the U.S.A. has recourse to nativism as indispensable factor to understand American national identity. What makes nativism significant in the U.S.A. is that it has run around the racial and ethnic setting. In this regard, the nativist stance is a recurring phenomenon in American political history and as a different movement that has appealed to the innate sense of national identity. To put it into the American political

context, one of the continuous ways to understand people's fear is through redefining the boundaries regarding who is considered as prototypical true American or marginalized American. It is, thus, through such a vision that nativism has become pervasive in social and political debates.

Before delving into the myriad controversies over nativism as in the case of any ideological concepts, the concept nativism was initially coined by Louis Dow Scisco at the beginning of the nineteenth century to describe the inability of America to cope with the rampant tide of Catholic imagination over the protestant ideas; resulting in the birth of the Know Nothing Party which advanced primarily the principles of anti-foreigners and anti-Catholics in 1850s (Anbinder, 1992). From 1850s onward, the concept has been used essentially to describe the American context, but in irregular way. Perhaps, it was until the late 1930 when the phenomenon of nativism drew the attention of American scholars. Precisely, the most earliest seminal and academic work on nativism is the American historian John Higham's '*Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American' Nativism* (1988).

Higham explains that "nativism as habit of mind illuminates darkly some of the large contours of the American past; it has mirrored our anxieties and marked out the bounds of our tolerance" (Higham, 1988). According to him, nativism is a convoluted ideology, and thus he identified traditions of American nativism targeted against Catholics, radicals, and racial groups that were interrelated together to shape its fabric. The first tradition of anti-Catholicism sprouted out of Protestant evangelical robust, the second tradition of anti-radicalism nativism directed stranger who sought to topple stable institution, and the third and the most significant type of nativism was racial nativism which was framed out of the credence of the Anglo-Saxon origin of the United States. Hence, the essence of nativism is concerned with the vehement opposition against the outgroup individuals who are seen as alien people by the ingroup for the sake of securing and protecting the interests of those native born.

6- Racial Minorities' Threat and Exclusion

American nativism stand is not a recent phenomenon in the American political history, but rather an old attitude that is reminiscent to those perpetrated nearly century ago. And for that start, the sweeps and detention of immigrants during the early history of the U.S. immigration were not relatively disparate from the heavy handed stances of contemporary nativism. But, it is worthy to understand that nativism and exclusion are hardly exclusively American phenomenon. What renders them remarkable is that they generally raise doubts about the American nation's founding ideals. Probably, since the enshrinement of enlightenment notions of justice, as democracy in the American founding document, being a nativist in the new nation is a violation to the American

creed. From the founding of the American nation, Americans have strived about the same quests: who belongs to the American mainstream? What is the American? Or who is the good American and who is the alien? It is obvious that the American nativism and its historic ambivalence about immigration-at times rigorously hosting immigrants, and other times slamming doors for them-are extremely intertwined in the vision of the American nation.

It is quite obvious that the self-image "City upon the Hill", the world best shining archetype, has entailed a particular kind of people. But what kind of immigrants America called for? Apart from the ignominious American nativism against native population, Black Americans and Latinos, the U.S. raised hues and cries about the sweeping of new immigrants into what was viewed as the Anglo-Saxon land. The United States stood firm in its identification as a society built upon the Anglo-Saxon culture during great migration and the Anglo-Americans were stuck by fear of the destruction of their virgin land. As they felt threatened by newcomers with different religious and social backgrounds, these dispossessed attempted to seek a solace by attempting to regain the good old days, particularly when White Anglo-Saxon Protestant hegemony went almost unchallenged. Realizing their nation slipping away and their Anglo-Saxon dream retrograding, Anglo-Americans enthusiastically espoused increasing nativist resentment, aspiring to blend new immigrants into the Anglo-Saxon model. It was through the setting of racial boundaries between deserving ingroup and the undeserving outgroup that nativist surpassed their worries and sensed an order and stability.

Throughout the 1800 and the 1960, the U.S. bore witness of the nativist first large scale eruption, as substantial waves of penniless and guilty criminals of Catholic background from Ireland and Germany, began to rush to the U.S. fleeing religious oppression and gravest famines in the old world. Those newcomers' religion instigated a powerful nativist repercussions since the unbridled Catholicism was deemed dissonant with the American constitutional tenets and cultural values. Fearing that Catholic Irish and German Jews were harvesting greater impact, they were subject to fierce nativist backlash and were discouraged entry into the Anglo-Protestant colonies.

Around the 1850s and 1870s, the paradigm of anti-Catholic nativism continued to be the American distinctive characteristic on inquiries about American identity. To an extent that the founding father Benjamin Franklin aroused plain warnings about the Englishness of Pennsylvania which was becoming "a colony of aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our anglifying them and will never adopt our language or customs, any more than they can acquire our complexion." Subsequently, Thomas Jefferson, in his '*Notes on the State of Virginia*' (1785), augmented similar worries that immigrants stemming from foreign distances "will

infuse into American legislation, their spirit, warp and bias its directions, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass." In a decade preceding the Civil War, for most of the concerns was the worry that Irish and German Catholics, escaping the Old World disastrous potato famine to the promised Land, would impede and change the peculiar nature of the city upon the hill. Because this sweeping tide of Catholics differed measurably from their forefathers as they "were the most impoverished destitute, unskilled group ever to arrive to the United States", they became more assertive on various realm (Anbinder, 1992, p.7).

7- Know Nothing Party and Ku Klux Klan

Indeed, fearing the Catholic plot of taking over the country alongside the education controversy, anti-Catholicism gave rise to the full-blown nativism of the Know Nothing movement (Bennett, 1988, pp.61-79). Its ultimate cry was that "Americans must rule America", and it vowed to solely keep elect-native-born in decision making process (Anbinder, 1992, p.25). In the wake of the 20th century, immediately after WWI, the Knights of Ku Klux Klan reignited new nativist sentiments, as the aftermath of the war resulted in many wide ranging changes in the American society. Owing to the second Industrial Revolution, social changes led to an urbanized industrial economy that was accompanied by the influx of huge number of catholic immigrants to American shores (Lipset & Earl, 1970).

Once again, White native-born Christians felt victimized by the more visible threats from Southern and Eastern Europeans, and African Americans who were assaulted as un-American outsiders imperiling the American hegemony. To champion White-Protestant supremacy and to protect pure Americanism, the Klan tried to epistomolize as counterweight to massive shifting landscape in the society by targeting the 1965 civil right movement militating for new freedom and opportunities for Americans. Restoring to Darwinism theories to confirm the Anglo-Protestant stock superiority, the Ku Klux's members fervently applied a larger nationalist agenda through which African Americans, Southern and Eastern Catholics stood no chance to be categorized as Americans, as they were still identified as different and inferior race than the Anglo-Saxons (Pegram, 2011)

Though the Southern and Eastern Europeans were of White race, the Ku Klux Klan still bluntly contended that their whiteness didn't belong to the prototypical model of the Anglo-Saxon core. Though the huge swarm of Catholics and their White complexion offered them considerable privileges in comparison to other minorities, they were likewise considered as dawn to the America's future. Along with such upheavals, a heightened skepticism emerged along with panic in a variety of circles about Southern and Eastern immigrants' driven racial degeneration. Probably, the most influential voice

of Southern and Eastern immigration hysteria was the Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts in the 1880s and the subsequent decade. Such a hysteria resounded through his articles and speeches, warning the dangers of the increasing waves of Southern and Eastern immigrants. To blame other immigrant of all the American ails at that time, they were depicted as ' birds of passage' who only migrated to make little money and return back their homelands, bringing with them crime, anarchism, disease, filth, and most of all competing with real Anglo-Saxon American workers.

With anxieties over race suicide and dispossession on multiple levels, Klan's nativists' backlash augmented due to the competition of Blacks and the prominence of Jews who apparently benefited from the switch to extensive capitalism. To withstand the dispossessed American sense of victimization, the Ku Klux Klan attempted to restrain their loss by setting protective boundaries around White native-born Protestants. This nativist group, according to Lipset Seymour and Earl Raab, attempts to curtail the influx of new immigrants and to keep strict racial boundaries between the real American and the unreal American outsiders. They stated that:

> The fluidity of the American social structure – the fact that no group has enjoyed a status tenure in the style of European social classes – has meant that the problem of status displacement has been an enduring characteristic of American life. New areas, new industries, new migrant groups, new ethnic groups, have continually encroached upon the old as important and influential. On these occasions, various formerly entrenched American groups have felt disinherited. (Lipset and Raab, 1970, p. 24)

The authors demonstrate that White middle class Protestants have been reactionary conservatives who oppose all types of change and would instead long to be free of past traditions through which they were powerful in their hegemonic and unchallenged society. What is remarkable that the Ku Klux Klan's political clout was rather meagre as they never really succeeded in interpreting their agenda to a tangible policy proposals. With the legislation of Johnson-Reed Act in 1924, imposing quotas to cut off the country's growing diversification along the triumph of Herbert Hoover in the 1928 election, the Klan came to halt quickly with its final demise from the political scene in a very brief time span. Beginning just after the turn of the 19th century, as theories about the new eugenic 'science'that virtually bolstered the idea of new immigrants' inferiority, the gate keeping ideology began as safeguard to the American borders. As with other different minority groups, native resentments against Chinese and Asians arose proportionately from the perception; they were unassimilable to the Anglo-Saxon mold, even disruptive minority whose inferior race, customs and habits were a social menace to the American hegemony (Jones, 1960).

Chinese were regarded as unassimilable as their culture was labeled not only as primitive and backward, but also as a constant challenge to the American democratic institutions. Throughout the parlance of that time, Chinese were cast as 'Yellow Peril'. They represented a fierce competitors to White natives for jobs in gold mines and railroad industry, and often with low payments (Fuchs and Forbes, 2003). All such upheavals of both economic competition and nativist resentment had pervasively fueled retaliation against Chinese, all culminating in a series of more successful laws that both restricted the Chinese rights and even humiliated them in the U.S.A. Most notably, the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, banning Chinese immigrants from entry to the country, was reenacted periodically till 1943. The significant success of the anti-Chinese exclusion prompted the support of a stranger nativist framework and subsequent akin restrictionist operations against Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, and Indians in the West (Jones, 1960, p.264).

8- The Immigration Reform Act of 1965

By the end of WWII, the nativist drumbeat grew impossible to ignore, particularly, with the passage of the Civil Right Act of 1965 that marked a watershed moment in the U.S.A. history. Indeed, the 1965 Act marked the influence of the liberal view of immigration since the new law put an end to the national origin quota system, and it replaced it instead with an annual quotas on the basis of the principles of family relationships and professional skills. Though the ultimate objective behind the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act was to restrain the influx of the of Southern and Eastern European immigrants, the unexpected outcome of the new law was the sleepy rise in immigration from Asia and the Americas, eclipsing European immigration and changing the ethnic makeup of the U.S.A.(Chishti, Hipsman, and Ball, 2015).

As exclusions on the national origins and race were eliminated, 1965 legislation has contributed to a sleep growth in illegal immigration until 2005. The usher number of Latinos, particularly Mexicans, inflamed harsh anti-immigration sentiments around the 1980s and 1990s, along another great wave of nationalism with briskly erupted to target Central America. Particularly, Mexicans have been prone to extreme nativist suspicions, narrowly stemming from their threat and non-assimilation to the Anglo-Saxon culture again. In this vein, political professor Samuel Huntington, regarded the first to mount alarmist worries about the question of Mexican immigration in contemporary America, advanced ungrounded theoretical speculation about the Mexican challenge and hispanization of the U.S.A., predicting a breakup of the American nation because they haven't assimilated into the American mainstream culture, forming instead their "own political and linguistic enclaves" and refusing the " Anglo-Protestant values that built the American dream" (Huntington, 2004 p.30).

Tracing back history, it is obvious that previous racial minorities such as the Southern and Eastern Europeans pursued the historical path of socio-cultural, economic and political assimilation, and that the controversies between Anglo-Protestantism and Catholicism were vanished by the process of assimilation. Hence, why Huntington has such a pessimistic vision regarding Mexican non-incorporation to the U.S., and why he asserts that their linguistic, cultural, and religious backgrounds are hindering their full fusion to the American mainstream. In the face of Huntington's exaggerated speculations and in reworking ideas about assimilation, one can assert that the American mainstream, despite fears about non-assimilation and split, is larger to embrace more newcomers than before. Despite ungrounded nativist alarms about Hispanic immigration in general, Mexicans are sharing the American dream with a desire to blend politically, socially, and culturally. Thus, their assimilation is always an incontrovertible fact of America as a nation of immigrants. It seems that contributory factors to the resurgence of nativism, anger, and xenophobia are almost endless. The exclusion and the sweeps of early newcomers of the last century were not terribly different from the heavy-handed nativism of recent year to deport and assault racial groups along with them.

What really makes the American mainstream a historical magnet is that the immigrants who were previously demeaned by one generation were the parents and the grandparents of the successes of coming generation. Possibly and not paradoxically, most of them or their offspring later joined the ranks of those who despised and abased the new arrivals with similar intense violence that had been acted against them or their predecessors. Nowadays, it is up for discussion whether nowadays nativism is a new phenomenon, or whether it is simply a continuous trend that has been persistently existent through the course of last century.

9- Donald Trumps' Islamophobia

During his most acrimonious and influential presidential campaigns in the American history, President Donald Trump successfully and peculiarly exploited anti-Muslim incentives, along with other factors, to win the White House. In fact, the 2016 presidential election was blemished by unprecedented political rhetoric, outburst of discriminatory tones, and intact of Muslims as others (Nuruzzaman, 2017). Several research and studies have shown that the election of Donald Trump, in spite of his political background deficiency, was a real astonishment that left the world and many pundits, international politicians, and citizens, even his partisans and party advocates surprised due to his extraordinary campaign.

Before his election, Trump hopefully promised to ban Islam, and branded it as a religion of violence. Through his 2016 presidential period, Trump's speeches and

declarations were full of dissension and anger not only domestically in the United States, but also on the global scope. Immediately, after pledging oath as the U.S. American president on January 20, 2017, Trump and his future administration started to become clearer as it would follow in the footsteps of their predecessors, and stickled to interpret terrorism as Islam or Muslim problem. Most importantly, he enacted an executive order of "protecting the nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States" on January 27th , 2017, outlawing Muslim entry from seven Muslim-majority states of Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen, and followed by a watered down version of the executive order which was officially ratified on March 6th , 2017 , excepting Iraqi from the ban (Husain 2018).

Surprisingly, Donald trump suggested his Muslim ban proposal in response to Obama's desire for indulgence and concord with Muslim community. Even his advocates and party leaders, such as Mitch McConnell, Paul Ryan, and Mike Pence, severely expressed their criticism regarding this debatable Muslim ban. Trump's historical statement 'Muslim ban' stirred a rampage of traumatic news among Muslim world since it was unexpected. His hatred and anti-Muslim tirades have been excessively on an increase in the United States of America since his presidency. In an interview on CNN in March 9th, 2016, Trump expressed his discriminatory attitudes when he responded to Anderson Cooper, arguing that: "I think Islam hates us. There's something there that-there's a tremendous hatred there. There's a tremendous hatred. We have to get to the bottom of it. There's a vulnerable hatred to us" (Trump, 2016). The American and International press found it an engrossing bone of contention and started to shore up the President rhetoric and policies and to tag Trump's political initiative as trumpism. Whatsoever the interpretations and implications of trumpism, president Trump is the pioneer self-declared anti-Muslim American President throughout American history.

9-1- Donald Trump's War on Terror : In fact, throughout his pre and post striving campaigns to the White House, he neither stoved his anti-Muslim bias nor he concealed his rife antipathy for Islamic religion. Through historical and political perspectives, Trumps anti-Muslim rhetoric can be better grasped in context of two major narratives: the Cold War consensus and War on Terror, which defined the basic parameters of America's foreign policy, particularly the Muslim Middle East and North Africa, and located pits reaction to confront potential threats to reinvigorate its global status and supremacy in the world (Thompson, 2016).

President Trump's frequent use of the term 'America First' is partly a persistence and a continuation of the Bush administration's anti-Muslim stance, rationalized under the precept of War on Terror, partially a hidden response to overwhelm and overmaster America's interior weaknesses first, and ultimately strengthen the American global

standing. In other words, his anti-Muslim rhetoric serves at galvanizing his political support base of the white underclass Americans, and further broaden an abrupt gap between Islam and the west, previously vitalized by 9/11 and America's so-called War on Terror.

President Trump enthralled the Americans by his gist of America first narrative, through injecting fresh ideas into America's domestic and foreign policies. His decision of America first arose out of the necessity to target a different public which is culturally conservative, dislike Muslims, assiduous to master America's global decline, terrified by the negative consequences of a globalized world for the common American and weary of the continuous collapse of the economy (Thompson, 2016). Though considered unconstitutional and directed particularly against Muslims and Islam, the ban, as a result of Trump's anti-Muslim biases, to a further extent set a preamble to a welcome of other policy alterations that he is endeavoring to follow in the issues of Iran nuclear weapons, Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and Bush's democracy promotion. As a matter of fact, Islamic world, for Trump, is his top concern as he annouced several times his flagrant declarations that the fight against Islam, which is also known by the acronym ISIS or Daesh, has to be reactivated for a total eradication of terrorism. More importantly, in the Republican National Convention Speech in late July, 2016, he rebuked the United States reaction to topple the regime in Iraq, Egypt, and Libya by both Bush and Obama administrations, and dubbed democracy promotion in the Middle East as a failed policy of governmental system alteration. He went further to strongly argue that Bush policies were in fact undermining security and American counterterrorism efforts.

What certainly made Trump's uneasy was his radical position toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. To exactly hurt the Muslim emotions and in an attempt to gain the backup of the Jewish voters in his campaign, he plighted to relocate the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. As the latter is a symbolic holy place for Muslims, the Muslim and Arab community beheld such a promise as an affront to Islam, started to criticize trump's intention, and have even halted him not to do previously (Trump, July 22th , 2016). Through a dismissal view, he has not stood up to pursue the traditional policy to bolster the time state solution and to resolve the tension, but rather he has revitalized the Israeli wig forces to dismiss or to elongate peace talks for both sides. Thus, Trump's dereliction and neglect toward the Israeli-Palestinian solution have animated much ambiguity about the future prospect of Palestine state.

All such anti-Muslim reactions and speeches against the Muslim Middle East have worsened Muslim- American relations as they were interpreted as a malice against their religious beliefs. In this regard, the open- siding with Israel and Trump's official refusal for mutual talks between the two states was perhaps more surprising as the

complete shutdown of Muslim entry to U.S.A. In order to construct a broader impact, Trump utilized the striking slogan of 'Make America Great Again' as technique of campaign and populism that were intended to create bonds between ingroup members. Therefore, by this compelling expression, he attempted to establish a strong link between him as a president and U.S. glorious past. In this way, he sought to maintain a particular categorization in his declaration through which he viewed himself and his strategies as beneficial and effective, while all ex- politicians and his rivals are indirectly described as bad and insufficient. Trump also draws parallels between good America's past and its current history, by invoking a rhetoric that links the struggle of the past to those of the current era through grounding Muslims as recurring antipode to the United States' cultural values.

To sway the American public toward waging a war against Islam, he began to reconsider that: "Today, we [the United States of America] begin a conversation about how to make America safe again" (Trump, August 15th, 2016). Thus, he mistakenly claimed that the United States had been secure and safe in the past, but sudden threats have interfered and begot a danger that terrified America. This is quite a forgetful aberration from Trump to overlook the struggling part of the United States from its early thread of its birth. Through the repetitive association of the newest threats to past wars and previous enemies to the United States, Trumps acknowledged a coordinate pattern that equates the claims of Islamic terrorism to the past evils that America had incurred. Trump further craved to confirm that "in the 20th century, the United States defeated Fascism, Nazism, and Communism." (Trump, August 15th, 2016).

Radical ideologies, according to Trump, are analogous to Islamic fundamentalism and the violence it breeds. Trump's crystal clear anti-Muslim sentiments were well recorded across a proliferation of official declarations, statements, and speeches. In his interview with Fox Business on March 22, 2016, and in confirming his call for the Muslim ban, he stated that: "We're having problems with Muslims, and we're having problems with Muslims coming into the country" (Mark & Jesse, 2016). Similarly, when questioned to explain whether "the Muslim ban still stands", Trump replied that: "The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into a[n] extreme vetting from certain areas of the world." (Daniel, 2016).

From the first days of his tenure in office, advisors, holding anti-Islam voices, took steps into the White House and started to occupy central roles within his administration. A triad of advisors: Steve Bannon, the President's Senior Advisor; Michael Flynn, the President's National Security Advisor; and Sebastian Gorka, President's Deputy assistant, appeared to be the main hand in issuing atrocious racist policies as the Muslim ban and the extreme vetting. Relatedly, most of these advisors

cloaked in the U.S.A. safeness reasoning and began to launch their aggressive campaigns against Muslims and Islam to repress American Muslims at home through tight surveillance, racial and religious sketching, and the jettisoning of the main constitutional protections for religious freedom. For instance, Sebastian Gorka has repulsively argued that accepting Muslims refugees in the United States would be "a national suicide" and argued that Islam and Koran are the main source of much of terrorism (Stampler, 2017). Similarly, Michael Flynn endorsed the idea of suspecting Islam and subjecting Muslims to extensive unrelenting hostility; he has described Islam as "vicious cancer inside the body of 1.7 billion people" that should be "excised" and explained that "fear of Muslims is rational" (Andrew, 2017). Besides, Steve Bannon ostensibly targeted Islam through ginning up an increasing fear about the safety of Americans from Muslims because "Islam is not a religion of peace. Islam is a religion of submission", and ruminated the dichotomous battle in which the West is at war with Islam. All of these mentor's agendas should be viewed as an amplification and an extension of former policies that have become equivalent of the course in post 9/11 America.

Trump is simply espousing his predecessors' doctrines in a new American frame. The dilemma of Muslim-American relations has destabilized the entire Middle East. A concrete solution is likely to linger a long as Trump stays in the White House and his administration keeps shaping new laws and policies between the two sides. Probably, the starkest initiative of Trump, however, comes from his new plan of 'extreme vetting' from Muslim entering to the United States.

9-2- Donald Trump's Muslim Bans and Extreme Vetting: As the world's most rigorous act, the vetting system operated as a de facto Muslim shutdown that was regarded as just a transient measure, projected to pave the way for the indefinite stoppage of immigration from certain countries as well as extreme vetting. After being elected and taking office in January 2017, Trump fullfiled his promise by implementing an extreme vetting process for visa application and requiring the Department of Homeland Security to more rigorously scrutinize foreign nationals' visa procedures. Beginning in May 2017, the State Department started applying such procedures with certain categories of visa applicants; the encumbrance of which will likely fall most excessively on Muslims. President Trump made his aim limpid repeatedly on September 24th , 2017 when he released a proclamation that infinitely barred almost immigrants to the United States from six Muslim countries: Chad, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria , and Yemen, and undergo Iraqis to additional scrutiny and information (Proclamation No. 9645, 2017).

Trump claim that travel bans as well as extreme vetting are indispensable to maintain security against terrorists' threat since it is unsupported by proofs, particularly the precedent policies of barring Muslims, which seem spurious. In his second presidential election, Trump himself stated that: "Muslim ban is something that is in some form has morphed into an extreme vetting from certain areas of the world …" (Full transcript: Second 2016 presidential debate, 2016). Lately, with the immigrants ban restrained campaigns by courts, President Trump was more conspicuous, tweeting: "In any event we are EXTREME VETTING people coming into the U.S. in order to help keep our country safe. The Courts are slow and political!!" (Donald Trump, Twitter 2017).

Despite the fact that Trump's Muslim ban and extreme vetting are clearly intertwined, the extreme vetting is extremely infused with religious and ideological bases. As Trump's ultimate ideological target, he assumed the responsibility to recapture the Cold War style "ideological screening test" (David Iaconangelo, 2016). He openly declared, at Phoenix rally, that 'extreme vetting' would require that the U.S. distinguishes between 'the right people' and the 'bad people', implementing "ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people." (Transcript: Donald Trump, 2016). Trump's many official declaration about Islam explicitly explained who is pinpointing as being ideologically disqualified to migrate to the United States of America and he has alluded to gender inequality, sexual orientation, and honor killing as characteristics of Islam that are inconvenient with America values (Transcript: Donald Trump, 2016).

The aims behind the implementation of ideological test is reflected in Trump's Executive Order 13769 known as the travel ban and the Executive Order of 13780. For instance, with several detected signals to Islam, Executive Order 13769 was enacted to expel people who place violent ideologies over American law (Beauchamp, 2017). Such a declaration is a lucid indication to Jihad as 'violent ideology' that is a priority of Trump's counterterrorism policy, as well as it corresponds the vision held by islamophobes who have been allowed to decide within Trump administration. For them, Muslims are not eligible to be part of democratic societies because they hold Islam as a "higher law" (Beauchamp, 2017).

The democratic order would have exempted Jihadists or those who committed 'honor killing' or would discriminate between Americans on the ground of racial differences, gender, and sex (Executive Order 13780, 2017). Actually, through all such reprehensible attitudes that are common in many world countries; including the United States, the Western mind always attribute them to Islam (Mayell, 2002). Furthermore, the executive order would have excluded Muslim countries and he keenly mentioned

Muslims' bad treatment toward Christians in the Muslim world, as they have become frequently unforgettable within Trump rhetoric (Daniel, 2017).

The other version, Executive Order 13780, was intended to counter plain burdens of anti-Muslim as it impeded the first version in court. Thus, it stripped many of the references to Islam, considering that the White House had realized that the original version stereotypes were objecatable (Executive Order 13780, 2017). The White House didn't purge them completely, but retained them such as an instruction to Department of Homeland Security's Secretary to provide reports on the number of honor killing by foreigners in the U.S. (Executive Order 13769, 2017). In fact, it appears that the first order corresponds more with the administration's real intention. In this regard, Trump himself has observed that the sharp discrimination that characterized the first order brisked its former. The most astonishing is that officials view that Trump's ideological screening would interrogate travelers about the role of women in the society, honor killing and legitimate military targets (Laura Meckler, 2017). One can see no connection between an immigrant's view of women's role in the society and terrorism, however the relation between such queries and criticism upon the rights of women in the Muslim societies is quite evident. Particularly, travelers have started to deal encroaching questions about their beliefs while others have been subject to more peculiar questions related to Sunni or Shiite denominations and whether they are carrying Quran in their baggage or not (Kreiter, 2017).

Questions like these led the federal in Maryland to conclude that: "these statements, which include explicit, direct statements of President Trump's animus towards Muslims and intention to impose a ban on Muslims entering the United States, present a convincing case that the First Executive Order was issued to accomplish, as nearly as possible, President Trump's promised Muslim ban" (International Refugee Assistance Project, 2017).While these policies seem applicable on worldwide visitors, the emphasis on ideological matters that are predominantly related to Islam means that it is quite certain to be incommensurately aimed at Muslims.

10- Conclusion

The increasing rates of xenophobia and nativism, along the well-reported increase in hate crimes and violence against Muslim and Arab Americans or those perceived as Muslims, are not only distressing and alarming , but are at the same time an underlying threat to multicultural landscape and the democratic nature of the U.S.A., as enshrined in the American constitution. Trump's policies of banning entry of individuals from Muslim-majority countries, a stance rooted in an anti-Muslim and Arab animus, is a well-conveyed message that they are not worthy of a society's equal respect and they are seen as inassimilable to the American mainstream.

As part and parcel of a larger anti-immigrant policies, Trump's skepticism about Muslim threat is ungrounded. Henceforth, for the sake of ensuring safety, equality, and justice for all the Americans, Trump should reconsider his anti-Muslim agenda, and his policy makers have to keep a keen eye and to strongly voice their objection to laws, practices aroused by prejudice against Muslims. Trump's overzealous Muslim suspensions of entry to the U.S. are unlikely to secure borders and protect the American nation from foreign terrorists. However, his policies will assuredly dampen the inherent cultural norms that characterize its pluralistic nature, and erode the nation's strength to promote mutual contact, economic cooperation with other world countries. Simply, Trumpism might impact Muslims in the United States through its restrictive bans and ardent vetting that would lessen the temporary visitors coming to America for business and tourism. In this regard, it seems that current presidential administration is characterized by historical amnesia since it has forgotten the American inbred values as a nation of immigrants and immigration.

bibliographiques :

Allen, Chris & Nielsen, Jorgen (2002). Summary Report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001. Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, p.16.

Allen, Chris. (2004). "Endemically European or a European Epidemic? Islamophobia in Contemporary Europe". In Islam and the West: a Post September 11th Perspective. (Eds). Geaves, Ron et al. Ashgate, pp.130-145.

Anbinder, Tyler. (1992). *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Andrew Kaczynski, "Steve Bannon in 2010: 'Islam is not a religion of peace. Islam is a religion of submission'," CNN, January 31, 2017, http://www.cnn.com/2017/01/31/politics/kfile-bannon-on-islam/ (Accessed: April 24th, 2019)

Ashley, Moore. (2010).American Muslim Minorities: The New Human Rights Struggle, HUM. RTS. & HUM. WELFARE 91, 92-93.

Burke, Daniel. "Trump says US will prioritize Christian refugees." CNN. January 30, 2017. Accessed September 27, 2017. http://www.cnn.com/2017/01/27/politics/trump-christian-refugees/index.html. (Accessed: January 27th, 2019).

Chishti, Muzaffar, Faye Hipsman, & Isabel Ball. (2015). Fifty Years On, the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act Continues to Reshape the United States. Washington, D.C: Migration Policy Institute.

11-CNN. "Donald Trump's speech at the Republican convention, as prepared for delivery", July 22, 2016. http://edition.cnn.com/2016/07/22/politics/donald-trump-rncspeech-text/

Comack, E. (Ed.). (1999). *locating law: Race/class/gender/connections.* Toronto: Fernwood Publications.

Daniel, Strauss, "Trump defends proposal for Muslim ban as call for 'extreme vetting'," Politico, October 9, 2016. http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/2016-presidential-debatedonald-trump-muslim-ban-extreme-vetting-229468. (Accessed: April 26th, 2019)

David, Iaconangelo, "Why Donald Trump's 'ideological screening' wouldn't be a first for the US," *Christian Science Monitor,* August 17, 2016,

https://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2016/0817/Why-Donald-Trump-s-deologicalscreening-wouldn-t-be-a-first-for-the-US (quoting presidential candidate Trump's remarks at Youngstown State University in Ohio). (Accessed: February 23rd, 2019)

Donald Trump (@realDonaldTrump), "In any event we are EXTREME VETTING people coming into the U.S. in order to help keep our country safe. The courts are slow and political!," Twitter, June 5, 2017, 3:44 a.m. (Accessed: January 15th, 2019)

https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/871679061847879682?lang=en.

Erik, Love. (2009*). Islamophoibia and Racism in America*. New York University Press.

"Exclusive Interview with Donald Trump," Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees, *CNN*, March 9, 2016, http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1603/09/acd.01.html. (Accessed: April 20th, 2019).

Executive. Order No. 13769, 82 FR 8977 (January 27, 2017).

Executive. Order No. 13780, 82 FR 13209 (March 9, 2017).

Fuchs, L. H. & Forbes, S. S. (1981). Immigration and U.S. history:The Evolution of the Open Society. In T. A. Aleinikoff, D. A. Martin, & H. Motomura. Fernwood, Publications.

Hall, S. (1992) New Ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi *(Eds.) 'Race', Culture and Difference*. London, Sage. (Originally published in 1988.)

Heaven, O. & Hudson, B. (2007), Race, Ethnicity and Crime. In Hale, C., Hayward, K., Wahidin, A. and Wincup, E. (Eds.), *Criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Higham, John. (1988). *Strangers in the land: patterns of American nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hillary, Mayell, "Thousands of Women Killed for Family 'Honor,'" *National Geographic News,* February 12, 2002,
 http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2002/02/0212_020212_honorkilling.html

Hussain, Nausheen. (2018). Timeline: Legal Fight over Trump's 'Muslim Ban' and the Supreme Court Ruling. Chicago.

International Refugee Assistance Project, et al., v. Donald J. Trump, et al., TDC-17-0361 (D. Md. Mar. 15, 2017) (memorandum opinion).

https://www.mdd.uscourts.gov/news/international-refugee-assistance-project-et-al-v-donald-j-trump-et-al-tdc-17-0361-2017-03. (Accessed: March 14th, 2019)

Jefferson, Thomas. (1743-1826). *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Philadelphia: Prichard and Hall, 1788. The electronic edition of the book is available at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2006. https://docsouth.unc.edu/southlit/jefferson/jefferson.html. (Accessed: May 10th, 2019).

Joseph, Margulies (2013). *What Changed When Everything Changed: 9/11 and the Making of National Identity*. New Heavean: Yale University Press.

Laura, Meckler, "Trump Administration Considers Far-Reaching Steps for 'Extreme Vetting'," *Wall Street Journal*, April 4, 2017, https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-administration-considers-far-reaching-steps-for-extreme-vetting-1491303602. (Accessed: March 17th, 2019)

Laura, Stampler, "Trump's Deputy Assistant, Sebastian Gorka, Has Frequently Denounced Islam," Teen Vogue, February 22, 2017, http://www.teenvogue.com/story/trumps-deputy-assistant-sebastian-gorka-has-frequentlydenounced-islam. (Accessed: May 10th, 2019)

Lipset, Seymour Martin, & Earl Raab. (1970). *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1970*. Harper & Row.

Marcy, Kreiter, "Muslim Ban? Border and Immigration Officers Question Muslims About Their Religion and Politics, Civil Rights Group Complains," International Business Times,

January 18, 2017, http://www.ibtimes.com/muslim-banborder-immigration-officials-question-muslims-about-theirreligion- 2477312. (Accessed: May 17th, 2019).

Mark, Hensch & Jesse, Byrnes, "Trump: 'Frankly, we're having problems with the Muslims," The Hill, March 22, 2016. http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/presidential-races/273857-trump-frankly-were-having-problems-with-the-muslims. (Accessed: May 19th, 2019).

Memmi, A. (1982). *Racism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Michael, Banton. (1998). *Racial Theories*. Cambridge University Press.

Nabeel A., Howell, S., & Shryock, A. (2011) *Arab Detroit 9/11: Life in the Terror Decade.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Nuruzzaman, Mohammed. (2017). President Trump's Islamophobia and the Muslims: A case study in crisis communication. International Journal of Crisis Communication 1: 16–20.

Proclamation No. 9645, "Enhancing Vetting Capabilities and Processes for Detecting Attempted Entry into the United States by Terrorists or Other Public-Safety Threats," September 24, 2017. https://s3.amazonaws.com/publicinspection.federalregister.gov/2017-20899.pdf (an unpublished Presidential Document by the Executive Office of the President). (Accessed: May 4th, 2019).

Sahar F. Aziz, Sticks & Stones. (2009). The Words That Hurt: Entrenched Stereotypes Eight Years after 9/11, 13 N. Y. City L. REV.33, 34-48.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Samuel, Huntington P. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thomas R. Pegram. (2011). One Hundred Percent American: The Rebirth and Decline of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s.

Thompson, J. "Donald Trump and the Emergent Dominant Narrative in U.S. Foreign Policy, E-International Relations, February 4, 2017. http://www.eir.info/2017/02/04/donald-trump-and-the-emergent-dominantnarrative- in-us-foreign-policy/. (Accessed: May 4th, 2019)

Welty, Gordon. (1997). Review of Edward Said, Covering Islam, Vintage Books, Dayton Voice, August 10, 1997.

Zack, Beauchamp, "Trump's counter-jihad," *Vox*, February 13, 2017, https://www.vox.com/world/2017/2/13/14559822/trump-islam-muslims-islamophobia-sharia. (Accessed: May 7th, 2019)

Références:

---

[1]- Dinet, Etienne & Ben Ibrahim, Sliman (1925). *L'Orient vu de l'Occident* (Paris: Piazza-Geuthner). Whilst having not been able to access this text directly, this reference has been substantiated by Professor Jocelyne Cesari of CNRS-Paris & Harvard University via electronic communication (2 October 2005). In addition, this early usage is referenced in a number of French and German based texts and websites including Alain Gresh, *A propos de l'Islamophobie,* 19 February 2004, (3 October 2005). <http://oumma. com/article.php3?id_article=964> & Alain Gresh, *L'utilisation du mot 'Islamophobie',* 20 February 2004, (3 October 2005). <http:// toutesegaux.free.fr/article.php3?id_article=21&date=2004-02>

[2]- The hijab (meaning partition or barrier) is worn as a traditional head-covering by millions of Muslim women throughout the world. For these women, the hijab is a visible expression of their faith and culture and a major determinant of being identified as Muslim. Indeed, wearing this item of traditional Muslim clothing appears to exert considerable influences on how others perceive the individuals concerned.