

https://dspace.org/

A critical analysis of the discourses on Muslims in the media before and after the events of September 11, 2001

Ebrahim, Hanifa

2008-08-06T13:25:14Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/5270

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Appendix D: Relevant articles, the New York Times

SECTION: Section B; Page 2; Column 1; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 275 words

HEADLINE: A NATION CHALLENGED: GULF ALLIES;
Six Arab States Offer Support

BYLINE: By WARREN HOGE

DATELINE: KUWAIT, Sept. 23

BODY:

The Gulf Arab states promised "total support and cooperation" today for the effort to find and punish those responsible for the suicide attacks in New York and Washington but pointedly coupled the pledge with a call for action against what they called terror acts by Israel against the Palestinians.

In a joint statement issued after an emergency meeting in the Saudi port city, Jidda, the foreign ministers of the six Gulf Cooperation Council nations -- Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar -- offered no clue as to how much military or other assistance the United States could expect from its Gulf allies.

They protested efforts to link the "heinous acts" that occurred in the United States with Islam and gave no specific promise of sharing intelligence that might aid the hunt for suspects.

The emphasis in the statement on the Palestinians reflected the delicate balancing act that the leaders of the prosperous, pro-Western Gulf states must strike between their alliance with Washington and the deep anger among Arabs over American support for Israel.

The leaders and the public also worry about the consequences of joining an American-led military coalition that could end up targeting other Muslims.

All six countries have sizable expatriate populations from less privileged Arab countries who often identify with the Palestinian cause and even with the Saudi-born refugee, Osama bin Laden, who is the prime suspect in the attacks.

Some 10,000 American troops are now in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, where the United States has been permitted to use air bases for patrols of no-fly zones in Iraq.

http://www.nytimes.com

LOAD-DATE: September 24, 2001

405 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 24, 2001, Monday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 1; Column 6; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 1339 words

HEADLINE: A NATION CHALLENGED: THE STRATEGY;
U.S. Seeks Afghan Coalition Against Taliban

BYLINE: By MICHAEL R. GORDON and ERIC SCHMITT

YAHOO! Mail

From: "LexisNexis(TM) Print Delivery" <lexisnexis@prod.lexisnexis.com>
To: hanifae2002@yahoo.com
Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2004 08:41:59 -0500 (EST)
Subject: LexisNexis(TM) Email Request (1821:0:6558192)

114K5R

Print Request: Selected Document(s): 401,402,403,404,405,406,407,408,409
410,411,412,413,414,415,
Time of Request: February 27, 2004 08:41 AM EST
Number of Lines: 1889
Job Number: 1821:0:6558192
Client ID/Project Name:

Research Information:

Power Search Results for: muslim or muslem and islam

Note:

401 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 25, 2001, Tuesday, Late Edition - Final
Correction Appended

SECTION: Section A; Page 16; Column 3; National Desk

LENGTH: 940 words

HEADLINE: Talk Radio, a Medium Noted for Vitriol, Shows Some Restraint

BYLINE: By TIMOTHY EGAN

DATELINE: SEATTLE, Sept. 24

BODY:

Vitriol, venom and unfiltered rage are still riding the airwaves of the nation's talk radio stations, but in recent days a huge audience has also heard something that is not usually associated with the medium: restraint.

At a time when stations report that calls are up by 50 percent or more, many talk radio personalities have gone from stoking verbal bonfires to trying to educate listeners on the fine points of Islam and world geography.

"The phones are so hot they're practically levitating," said Michael Spears, operations manager at KRLD-AM in Dallas. But because people are so hungry for information, Mr. Spears said, "we're trying to be Ted Koppel and not Jerry Springer."

Mike from Aurora, Colo., called KOA-AM in Denver to advance the notion that all Muslims were responsible for the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, adding that "You can't trust them."

"Who's them?" the host, Mike Rosen, asked in an exchange that is typical of the kind of steep learning curve taking place on the airwaves.

Of course, the staples of the kind of conservative talk radio that dominates the market -- bashing Bill Clinton and liberals, fine-sifting the details of sex scandals -- have not entirely disappeared. This morning, many of Howard Stern's jokes focused on the fashion tastes and speaking styles of the celebrities who led the Yankee Stadium prayer service on Sunday. And G. Gordon Liddy, the conservative talk show host, was urging that the United States attack at least five countries he contended were harboring terrorists.

But elsewhere, a sharp change in tone has taken hold.

"There's less of the frivolous, less playing to hate," said Michael Harrison, publisher of Talkers, a trade magazine for talk radio. "There will always be jerks calling in, but this time around, these people are actually being called jerks and cut off the air."

After driving from the Midwest to Seattle after the terrorist attacks, Carl Jeffers said he was heartened by the civil tone of most of the voices he heard on talk radio.

"The people who were calling in were terrific," said Mr. Jeffers, a marketing consultant.

"Very few people were cynical," he added, "and I was pleased with so many people hoping that people would not lash out at Arab- and Middle Eastern-Americans."

Reflecting a nation where virtually every aspect of life is being looked at in a different way, talk radio is following its audience, not leading it, station managers and hosts say. "I really think this is the end of an era, and the beginning of a new one in our popular culture," Mr. Harrison said.

In Denver, Peter Boyles, a host on KHOW-AM known to his morning drive-time audience for his tirades against the parents of JonBenet Ramsey, has been host to experts on Islamic fundamentalism and global terror. Of late, Mr. Boyles has sounded a cautious, even somber note.

"Some of the stuff I hear on the air, some of the stuff I read, some of the stuff I watch, the sort of 'let's go get 'em' crowd, I wonder where we end up if we go get 'em," Mr. Boyles said on his Thursday morning show. "Once we step through that door, God protect us, because it's going to be a long 20 years."

As a fount of usually anonymous opinion, talk radio often presents the kind of voices rarely heard on network television or in big-city papers. In general, listeners tend to be white, male and conservative. Talk radio was credited with helping to elect the first Republican-controlled Congress in decades, and it has stirred tax revolts across the country.

It has also been criticized as pandering to ignorance and raw emotion. In Spokane, Wash., the Police Department was so concerned about indiscriminate rants against Muslims on talk radio that, as a pre-emptive measure, it issued a statement denouncing such sentiments as "hateful and potentially injurious to innocent Spokane-area residents."

The advice seems to have worked, police officials said, as callers have gone from bashing Arabs to a more specific discussion about war in Afghanistan.

Other stations that tried to stoke emotions have been reined in by their own callers. In Dallas last week, Scott Anderson of KLIF-AM suggested that the United States should not rule out the use of nuclear weapons in response to a terrorist attack. He was quickly taken to task by several callers who said his view was inappropriate.

Even talk hosts who revel in the outlandish have toned it down slightly. Tom Leykis, whose syndicated show is heavy on comic allusions to female body parts, invited callers sympathetic to the aims of radical Islam to explain their side.

Mr. Limbaugh, who reaches about 20 million people a day, has gone after some of his usual targets, criticizing the facial expressions of Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton as she listened to President Bush's speech to Congress.

But even Mr. Limbaugh, whose bombast is almost always reserved for people who are not conservatives, has been softening a small bit of late.

When a caller criticized "Hollywood liberals" for last Friday's television fund-raiser, Mr. Limbaugh urged people to withhold judgment.

"We're hearing about unity," Mr. Limbaugh said, "and I personally am getting a tremendous amount of e-mail and phone calls from liberals who say their partisanship has been set aside because of this. Let's give them all the benefit of the doubt."

Mr. Harrison said Mr. Limbaugh's shift was in line with the mood of the country.

"As the country has gotten more educated in the last couple of days," he said, "the usual Limbaugh style is starting to seem out of place. To Limbaugh's credit, he's thinking it out as the days go by."

http://www.nytimes.com

CORRECTION-DATE: September 26, 2001, Wednesday

CORRECTION:

Because of an editing error, an article yesterday about comments on talk radio about the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington omitted the given name of a conservative talk radio host whose criticism of liberals has softened slightly. He is Rush Limbaugh.

LOAD-DATE: September 25, 2001

402 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 24, 2001, Monday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 31; Column 5; Editorial Desk

LENGTH: 712 words

HEADLINE: Essay;
The Ultimate Enemy

BYLINE: By WILLIAM SAFIRE

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

"We're looking for links" between Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda terrorist group and Iraq's Saddam Hussein, said Colin Powell yesterday. So far, our secretary of state can see "no clear link" between bin Laden's forces in Afghanistan and the

America-hater publicly laughing at our grief in Baghdad.

Powell does not want to acknowledge any evidence of sponsorship of bin Laden by Iraq because that would demand a crushing blow at an Arab state. It might limit the diplomatic convoy of consensus he is assembling, which will travel at the rate of its most grudging member.

The clear link between the terrorist in hiding and the terrorist in power can be found in Kurdistan, that northern portion of Iraq protected by U.S. and British aircraft from Saddam's savagery.

Kurdish sources tell me (and anyone else who will listen) that the Iraqi dictator has armed and financed a fifth column of Al Qaeda mullahs and terrorists that calls itself the Jund al Islam ("Soldiers of Islam"). Its purposes are to assassinate the leaders of free Kurdistan, to sabotage the relief efforts of the U.N. and to whip up religious fervor in that free Muslim region. That is how Saddam plans to reconquer the no-flight zone that has been a thorn in his side for a decade.

According to a key member of the Kurdish resistance reached by cellphone in Suleymaniyah, some 400 "Arab Afghan" mercenaries armed with Katyusha rockets transported by Toyota Land Cruisers, have been infiltrated into the liberated region by Saddam's secret intelligence force, the Mukhabarat. They have already murdered a high Kurdish official as well as a Muslim scholar who dared to interpret the Koran humanely.

This current, direct threat by Muslim fanatics doing Saddam's bidding is uniting the two squabbling democratic parties in the free zone. Some 75,000 Kurdish warriors, protected from air attack by our fighter patrols, are headed by longtime rivals Massoud Barzani and Jalal Talabani. These Kurds are not Arabs or anti-Turkish terrorists. Nor are they pseudo-religious extremists humiliating women and moderates; on the contrary, the Muslim faith practiced in northern Iraq has long been marked by tolerance.

As Kurds get reports from compatriots in Baghdad that Saddam's security services are hastily moving out of their offices, anticipating an allied strike, Barzani and Talabani are identifying and isolating Saddam's fifth columnists. The Kurds await word from Washington about when to move on Afghan terrorists in their midst, and eagerly look forward to joining an allied assault on Baghdad.

That brings us to the strategic decision now being debated in President Bush 's war council.

Do we respond to our initial, catastrophic defeat in a wholly multilateral way? That would mean seeking intelligence crumbs from Saudi and Egyptian potentates, negotiating cautious U.N. resolutions, hunkering down to limit the damage of suicide bombers, and beginning a phased air and ground assault on bin Laden's "base" in Afghanistan to be followed up with joint police work for years around the world. It would fight yesterday's terrorist war.

Or do we recognize now the greater danger of germ warfare or nuclear attack from a proven terrorist nation, and couple expected retribution for this month's attack with a strategy of pre-emptive retaliation? Such use of our superpower need not require our "going it alone"; civilized nations unafraid of internal revolt will understand the threat to their citizens and stand with us.

Suicidal fanatics have proved they can kill by the thousands, and in time our commandos and bombers -- perhaps joined by a Muslim brigade including Afghans, Turks and Kurds -- will penetrate their cells and obliterate their camps and firebomb their caves. But Iraqi scientists today working feverishly in hidden biological laboratories and underground nuclear facilities would, if undisturbed, enable the hate-driven, power-crazed Saddam to kill millions. That capability would transform him from a boxed-in bully into a rampant world power.

It's troubling when Powell says that President Bush "has not worked out what he might do in later stages." Now is the time to work out how to strike down terrorism's boss of all bosses. "Later" may be a stage too late.

http://www.nytimes.com

LOAD-DATE: September 24, 2001

403 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 24, 2001, Monday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section B; Page 7; Column 1; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 1297 words

HEADLINE: A NATION CHALLENGED: THE PAPAL TRIP;
Pope, in Central Asia, Speaks Out Against Any Overzealous Military Response by the U.S.

BYLINE: By MELINDA HENNEBERGER

DATELINE: ASTANA, Kazakhstan, Sept. 23

BODY:

At an outdoor Mass attended mostly by Muslims, Pope John Paul II spoke out today against an overzealous military response to terrorist attacks on the United States and said a religious war was a contradiction in terms.

In remarks that seemed to speak to both the United States and Islamic militants, he said that "we must not let what has happened lead to a deepening of divisions" between Muslims and Christians, adding, "Religion must never be used as a reason for conflict."

Though obviously under great physical strain, the 81-year-old pope, who suffers from Parkinson's disease, was forceful in his remarks to the crowd in Motherland Square here, which ended, "With all my heart, I beg God to keep the world in peace."

After reading President Bush's speech to Congress on the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks several times, the pope decided on Saturday night that he had to speak out more directly on the international situation and to say something beyond the text already prepared for his homily at today's Mass, said his spokesman, Joaquin Navarro-Valls.

"Yesterday in the plane, we exchanged views," Dr. Navarro-Valls said of the discussion of Mr. Bush's speech. "Last night, he said he would say something more, and he wrote it."

Dr. Navarro-Valls suggested that the pope believed that the extremists directly responsible for the attacks on the United States could and should be distinguished from the wider threat of Islamic fundamentalism and that any response should be limited to punishing the guilty.

The pope's spokesman chose not to answer questions about what the pope thought of Mr. Bush's speech. Instead, Dr. Navarro-Valls said that "he's concerned and asking for more information on the topic of refugees in the whole area."

At a time when Central Asia is expecting the United States to strike nearby

SECTION: Section 6; Page 22; Column 1; Magazine Desk

LENGTH: 473 words

HEADLINE: The Way We Live Now: 9-23-01: Close Reading: Elements of Tragedy; The Villains

BYLINE: By Robert Stone

BODY:

In 1993, I wrote a New York Times Op-Ed article about the bombing of the World Trade Center that occurred that year. Writing then, I offered the readers the mind's eye of an anonymous conspirator watching from a safe house in Queens or New Jersey, praying for the explosion, knowing it was God's will. Those towers thrusting so immodestly more than a thousand feet in the air, I wrote, must have mocked his passionate intensity.

I was thinking of "The Second Coming," by Yeats, the chilling prophetic dream of "mere anarchy" loosed on the world. "The best lack all conviction," Yeats wrote, "while the worst are filled with passionate intensity."

A dozen or so individuals as human as we fly planes full of doomed, terrified people into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, a teeming city in the air. Are they moral monsters? Are they really the worst, driven by sheer evil?

Though we are being judged, despite our grief and loss, we cannot really judge. We are steeped in relativism, as confined by our narrative as the murderers are confined by theirs. History is a story we have accepted; our lives are the stories we tell ourselves about the experience of life.

In the Middle East, where the gods were born, the ancient narratives are glorified again. After the 1967 war, for example, Jewish settlers awaiting the Messiah founded settlements among their ancestral stones, risking their lives, ready to kill and to die in the name of a sacred narrative, soon to be vindicated.

So in the Muslim world the sacred historical destiny of Islam is reasserted. The will of God is to be done on earth. One narrative contained in the Koran speaks of the people of Ad. "Their sin is arrogance," the book says. The people of Ad rely on their power and their material wealth to prevail in the world. "They will be brought low."

The unreality we experienced on Sept. 11 was of something fictive. We witnessed, in the elemental horror that our conscious minds denied, the violent assault of one narrative system upon another. People deeply enclosed in their sanctified worldviews were carrying out what they experienced as a sacred command to annihilate the Other.

The expressions from Washington are nothing surprising -- assurances of "resolve" and retribution. But in various ways, our internal narrative, our social and political foundations, circumscribe our capacity for revenge. The internal narrative of our enemies, their absolute ruthless devotion to an invisible world, makes them strong. Our system, too, is a state of mind. We need to find in it the elements that will serve our actual survival.

The power of narrative is shattering, overwhelming. We are the stories we believe; we are who we believe we are. All the reasoning of the world cannot set us free from our mythic systems. We live and die by them.

among all nonbelievers. "It's 90 percent secular -- a lot of them are Muslim in the sense that their grandfather went to a mosque, but they don't -- so it's a unique trip in that way," he said.

He said that was why the pope had spent extra time dusting off his Russian. "They've never heard these words before," he said.

http://www.nytimes.com

GRAPHIC: Photo: Pope John Paul II listens to the president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, after arriving yesterday in the capital of Astana. (Associated Press)

LOAD-DATE: September 23, 2001

413 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 23, 2001, Sunday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section 1A; Page 1; Column 5; National Desk

LENGTH: 1263 words

HEADLINE: A NATION CHALLENGED: CIVIL LIBERTIES;
AMERICANS GIVE IN TO RACE PROFILING

BYLINE: By SAM HOWE VERHOVEK

DATELINE: SEATTLE, Sept. 22

BODY:

Ron Arnold understands racial profiling. "I'm a black American, and I've been racially profiled all my life," said Mr. Arnold, a 43-year-old security officer here, "and it's wrong."

But Mr. Arnold admits that he is engaging in some racial profiling himself these days, casting a wary eye on men who look to be of Middle Eastern descent. If he saw a small knot of such men boarding a plane, he said: "I'd be nervous. It sickens me that I feel that way, but it's the real world."

Adrian Estala, 27, a risk-management consultant in Houston who is Hispanic, is struggling with the same emotions. Mr. Estala is "absolutely against" racial profiling, he said, because it a fundamental violation of liberty. But asked about sharing an airplane flight with Arab-looking men, he said he would be anxious.

"Absolutely I have to be honest," Mr. Estala said. "Yes, it would make me second-guess."

On the other side of the divide, Arab-Americans find such views offensive. "Think what it really means," said Nadeem Salem, a second-generation American who leads the Association of Arab-Americans in Toledo, Ohio. "People's civil liberties are being tarnished, compromised. That's not what this country is all about."

For many Americans who say they have deeply believed that it was wrong for law enforcement officers to single out members of minorities for special interrogation or searches, the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11 have prompted a painful confrontation with the sudden anxieties they acknowledge feeling in the

presence of one minority in particular. With all of the hijackers involved believed to have Arab backgrounds, these Americans say, officials have ample reason to zero in on that group. "It's not right," said Virginia Hawthorne, a retired accountant from Bremerton, Wash., "but it's justified."

Such sentiments seem to have been in play on Thursday in Minneapolis when three Middle Eastern-looking men were denied permission to board a Northwest Airlines flight after several passengers complained of their presence, an airline spokesman said. The men were later permitted to take a Delta flight.

While expressing regret at what they portrayed as the need for more detailed interrogations of people of Arab background, many people said the subjects should understand and accept it.

"They shouldn't be offended," said Leslie Brenaman, a retired Boeing graphics designer, who is white. "They shouldn't take it personally after what's happened."

Wali Khairzada, owner of Kabul Afghan Cuisine here, said he felt heartsick about a decision he made the other day: not to take his father-in-law, who is German, to the airport for his flight home.

"It makes me feel sad, but I feel I should stay away," said Mr. Khairzada, who came to this country in the late 1970's and became an American citizen in 1986. "I would be checked there far more thoroughly than the average person."

On the other hand, he added, he had been buoyed by racial profiling of a different sort in recent days. "So many people have come in to the restaurant to offer some support," Mr. Khairzada said. "I'm amazed, I'm grateful, I'm flabbergasted."

Ashraf Khan, 32, a mobile phone salesman from New Braunfels, Tex., who was ordered off a Delta Airlines flight from San Antonio on Monday while bound for his brother's wedding in Pakistan, said he was distressed by the pilot's action, which the airline said it was investigating. Delta offered a later flight, but by that time Mr. Khan had missed his connecting flight and the wedding.

"I am really depressed about the whole situation," he said, "the way they've treated me, like I'm some sort of criminal."

In interviews around the country, many people expressed revulsion at the spate of attacks on Muslims, as well as on Hindus and Sikhs, and the vandalism at mosques. Those interviewed spoke of national ideals of colorblindness -- but in nearly the same breath they said that for the sake of national safety, the police should single out Arab-looking men for questioning.

Kathy Komlance, 43, who was wearing an American flag T-shirt as she worked at a taffy stand at the Mid-South Fair in Memphis, said she favored checking their credentials. "I think a person who is Arab should be questioned if they get on a bus or plane or go in a government building," Ms. Komlance said. "You don't want to be afraid of Arabs, Iranians or other foreign people. But how do you differentiate and figure out which one is the bad one from those who love freedom and our country?"

A CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll taken a few days after the attacks showed that Americans were supporting special measures intended for those of Arab descent. In the survey, 58 percent backed more intensive security checks for Arabs, including those who are United States citizens, compared with other travelers; 49 percent favored special identification cards for such people, and 32 percent backed "special surveillance" for them.

In the interviews, many people said they hoped the need for the sort of racial profiling they favored would be temporary, while others were firmly against racial profiling and said there was no justification for it.

"They should interrogate everybody the same way," said LaVonne James, a Seattle parks department worker. "I mean, at airports, they should stop everybody the same way, search luggage, ask all the questions. You just don't know. That little old grandma from Sioux City could be carrying something."

Others made a strong distinction between thinking and acting.

Tina Wells, 19, a shoes saleswoman here, said "there might be a little inkling in my mind" if she saw a group of Arab-looking men together.

"But I'd just get past it, as quickly as possible," Ms. Wells said. "I wouldn 't change the way I behaved. I wouldn't not get on an airplane. It would just be wrong."

And some said they were going out of their way to be friendlier than ever to Arab-Americans. Sasha Nyary, who works for a community development organization in Brooklyn and is the mother of a daughter, Lily, 2, said she was seeking out a mosque and Arab-owned businesses.

"There are a couple of ways I can walk to get to Lily's school at Third Avenue and Atlantic," Ms. Nyary said, "and this week I've deliberately chosen to go down the south side of Atlantic so I can maximize the number of Arab shopkeepers I see."

Many people who belong to minorities said they felt especially torn by their newfound acceptance of at least one form of racial profiling.

"I've seen prejudice all my life, with me growing up as an African-American male," said Jermaine Johnson, 19, a business management student at Southwest Tennessee Community College in Memphis. "I try not to judge."

But Mr. Johnson added: "I would not feel comfortable at all if an Arab-looking person sat next to me on a plane. I would be nervous, I mean right now it could be anyone and that's not good if they sit next to you on a plane. I don't feel comfortable with the ones I don't know. It's hard to know who to trust."

Others said they were consciously trying to put aside any snap judgments based on race.

"I think it's just wrong to do anything like that, even with what's happened, " said Viridiana Chaveste, 18, a cleaner at Seattle's Safeco Field who is Hispanic.

Her friend Karen Calderon, 20, agreed. "Honestly, thoughts would go through my head," she said when asked how she would react to seeing a group of Arab men on the street or in at airport departure gate. "But I wouldn't do anything about it. I wouldn't treat them any differently."

http://www.nytimes.com

LOAD-DATE: September 23, 2001

414 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

The New York Times

September 23, 2001, Sunday, Late Edition - Final
Correction Appended

SECTION: Section 4;Page 8;Column 1;Week in Review Desk

BUT it underscores the notion that the Middle East is a region that defies common notions of friend and foe. In his speech, Mr. Bush declared war not only on terrorists, but on any country that "continues to harbor or support terrorism." But he named only Al Qaeda and the Taliban, leaving many others wondering whether they would be invited into the coalition or crushed by it. Countries like Sudan, Libya and Syria, all pegged as crucibles of terror, rushed to express support for Washington. Pakistan sent envoys to put pressure on the Taliban leaders of Afghanistan.

Certainly for all of them, as for Israel, America's rage carries both risks and opportunities. There is the chance that they could be made to feel America's wrath. And there is the chance that America could prove generous with those who come to its side.

And, this being the Middle East, there is the fact that many of the despots regarded as sponsors of terror, like Saddam Hussein of Iraq or Bashar al-Assad of Syria, are secularists who would not bemoan the eradication of Osama bin Laden, any more than Mr. Arafat would mourn the passing of Hamas, or Egypt's Hosni Mubarak that of the Islamic Brotherhood.

http://www.nytimes.com

CORRECTION-DATE: September 30, 2001, Sunday

CORRECTION:

An article last Sunday about the relationship of the Israel-Palestinian conflict to the Sept. 11 attacks on the United States referred incorrectly to President Bush's speech to a joint meeting of Congress on Sept. 20. Mr. Bush indeed mentioned the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: he said that terrorists and the nations that support them "want to drive Israel out of the Middle East."

GRAPHIC: Photo: In Jerusalem, Orthodox Jews at the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site for prayer. (Reuters)

LOAD-DATE: September 23, 2001

416 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 23, 2001, Sunday, Late Edition - Final
Correction Appended

SECTION: Section 4;Page 1;Column 1;Week in Review Desk

LENGTH: 1518 words

HEADLINE: Aftermath: Invaders;
Who Hates the U.S.? Who Loves It?

BYLINE: By ELAINE SCIOLINO

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

THERE are barbarians out there who hate America, President Bush has warned, and Americans are struggling to understand why.

The president himself had an answer: "They hate what they see right here in this chamber," he told the joint session of Congress Thursday. "Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms, our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other."

He was speaking of terrorists, of course. But are they the only ones Americans need to understand as they gird themselves for a war against fear? What of the masses of Muslims in North Africa, the Middle East and south Asia, where denunciations of the West, Israel and the United States became a staple of politics long ago?

Certainly the family of nations sent condolences and uttered condemnations of the killings on Sept. 11 -- a profound violation of every religion's prohibition against the slaughter of innocents. Muslim leaders throughout the world were quick to label the attacks contrary to the Koran and Islamic teachings. Only Iraq withheld sympathy.

But that global display of unity in this crisis obscures an unsettling reality. The most devastating terrorist act in American history coincides with a deep sense of ambivalence about the United States throughout the Muslim world (and not only there). Admiration and envy commingle with resentment and outright hatred. Political extremists masterfully play on these emotions, leaving some weak and undemocratic governments like Egypt's feeling powerless to control them.

The absence of democracy in these lands -- and there is very little democracy in the Arabic-speaking and Muslim lands from Algeria all the way to Pakistan -- creates an atmosphere in which demagogy is easy, reason and tolerance difficult. And the perception that America bolsters authoritarian governments even while it heralds democracy as an ideal fuels a sense of betrayal throughout the Muslim world. One nightmare of American policy makers is that the government in Pakistan led by Gen. Pervez Musharraf, who took power in a military coup, will not survive an American-led war against Afghanistan.

An important feature of this complicated landscape is a broad chasm between the way Americans see themselves and the way they are seen. In fact, a good deal of the struggle is over something that has long troubled traditional societies: the invasion of their cultures by powerful outside influences, forces like social mobility and cosmopolitan thinking that can undermine the authority of clans and religious elders, kings and dictators. Americans sometimes call the new influences freedom. Older societies have other names.

Take Iran. In the 1960's the writer Jalal Al-e Ahmad identified what he called a cultural "illness" that had stricken the country's cities and towns. He coined a new word to describe it: gharbzadegi -- "West-stricken-ness," or "Westoxication." He mourned the villager who "in search of work flees from the village to the town so he can drink Pepsi-Cola and eat a five-rial sandwich and see a Brigitte Bardot film." No matter that Al-e Ahmad drank alcohol and seldom prayed. The only authentic strain in Iranian culture for him was religion. His message had profound resonance. Two decades later, the elimination of "Westoxication" was a central goal of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Now Osama bin Laden is accusing Saudi Arabia of becoming Westoxicated by allowing American military forces on its soil.

Saudi Arabia is America's closest ally in the Persian Gulf, and its cooperation will be crucial for any coalition. But its king rules by accident of birth, with members of the royal family whom he appoints. Islam is the only religion that may be practiced. While America's military presence is viewed by the royal family as crucial for the kingdom's security, it is resented in some religious and political circles and a feeling is growing that its purpose is to help keep the royal family in power. As for Saudi women, unlike their Iranian sisters who are allowed to drive, vote, practice law and hold political office, those rights are denied.

Yet the Saudis seem resistant to self-examination. On Thursday, American officials met with four members of the appointed consultative body that substitutes for a parliament. They were asked whether they felt that Mr. bin Laden's message, which includes labeling the Saudi leaders as corrupt and calls for ridding the kingdom of American troops, was resonating. No, they replied; the real motivations for the Sept. 11 attack were Israel and the sanctions against Iraq. "It was clear they were trying to deflect the issue," said one American official. "It was a classic case of looking for the outside problem."

Yearnings for freedom do pose a problem for terrorists who fight in the name of a pure, just rule of God on earth. If they want proof of the impossibility of their task, they only have to look to Iran. With its anti-Western slogans, Ayatollah Khomeini's revolution swept aside a repressive king who had linked his country to the United States. But when it replaced him with a cleric whose version of Islam proved intolerant, the people turned out to yearn for -- guess what? -- more freedom and a better life. Today, Iran's Islamic Republic endures only because it has adapted, because it has tolerated and even encouraged experimentation that seeks to reconcile the forces of Islam and some degree of democracy.

A yearning for democracy does not automatically translate into love for America, however.

"They don't hate us because we have a Congress," said Jon B. Alterman, an analyst at the United States Institute of Peace who has written extensively on the flow of information in the Arab world. "They hate us because we seem so indifferent to their problems and their suffering. Whenever there is a survey of Palestinians, they always rate Israeli democracy higher than American democracy. The reason is that they see American democracy as beholden to interest groups, whereas Israeli democracy reflects what the Israeli people want."

Yet the tug of American culture, and the shared dream of a prosperous, enjoyable life on earth, is a point on which many in these lands strongly identify with America. Iranians, living under a regime that has long demonized the United States as "the Great Satan" and presented it as a scapegoat for all of Iran's troubles, also call America "the Fortune Land." One of the main reasons Iran will not allow an American consular officer to process visas in Teheran is worry that the crowds would be overwhelming -- and embarrassing.

Today, American CD's, videos and computer programs are pirated and sold on the streets of Teheran for a fraction of their price in the United States. In the holy city of Qom, a shop sells knock-offs of Wranglers blue jeans just down the street from the main mosque, one of Iran's holiest sites. At the Teheran airport, pirated copies of Danielle Steele novels are available. Clerics in Qom have a sophisticated Islamic computer center where Koranic teachings and interpretations are on the Internet.

A part of this fascination with America's most secular achievements may be traceable to the way information about the United States arrives -- with the distortions of the lens of American television, beamed in through illegal satellite dishes. Even without satellite dishes, viewers in Bushehr on the Persian Gulf can watch CNN.

That means that for many Iranians, America is a country full of the scantily-clad, available women of Baywatch and MTV. First-time visitors to the United States are often shocked by the more spiritual and socially conservative side of America. "What surprised me the most when I came to the United States was how many churches there were," said Mohammad Atrianfar, the head of Teheran 's town councils and editor of the daily newspaper Hamshahri. "I certainly didn 't know how religious Americans are."

SO perhaps a key to deflecting the hatred aimed at the United States is information. "There are three reasons for hatred: fear, anger and incomprehension," said Shashi Tharoor, an Indian novelist whose new book, "Riot"

(Arcade Books) deals with a fictional Hindu-Muslim riot, and who is a special assistant to Kofi Annan, the United Nations secretary general. "Fear involves both a sense of what others might do to you and the past wrongs whether real or imagined that have been done. Anger is seemingly a more rational reaction to perceptions of injustice and wrongdoing. Incomprehension is the failure to understand the other, which makes it easy to demonize. September 11 underscores the need to eradicate that incomprehension."

But that may be hard for many Americans to admit, particularly in the midst of a war. Nearly four decades ago, another novelist, Kurt Vonnegut Jr., captured the problem when he put these words into the mouth of a fictitious American ambassador who had been fired for pessimism: "The highest possible form of treason is to say that Americans aren't loved wherever they go, whatever they do."

http://www.nytimes.com

CORRECTION-DATE: September 30, 2001, Sunday

CORRECTION:

Because of an editing error, a picture caption last Sunday with an article about mixed feelings in the Islamic world toward the United States misidentifed people who had gathered near a Kentucky Fried Chicken advertisement in Islamabad, Pakistan. They were bystanders who were watching, not the protesters who were gathering.

GRAPHIC: Photos: Protesters against Pakistan's cooperation with Washington gathered last week near a Kentucky Fried Chicken ad in Rawalpindi. (Vincent Laforet/The New York Times)

LOAD-DATE: September 23, 2001

417 of 514 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

September 22, 2001, Saturday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section B; Page 4; Column 3; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 993 words

HEADLINE: A NATION CHALLENGED: THE MUSLIMS;
More Extremists Find Basis for Rebellion in Islam

BYLINE: By DOUGLAS JEHL

DATELINE: CAIRO, Sept. 21

BODY:

Even in World War II, troops were sent into battle with assurances from Protestant, Catholic and Jewish chaplains that God was on their side and that their deaths would make them martyrs.

In that sense, some arguments used to justify the attacks on the United States, calling them a mandate from the teachings of Islam, may simply be the latest example of how religion can be hijacked by politics and rage. But in a Middle East swamped by unresolved grievances, the lure of religion as giving license to fight has, at least in some quarters, gained unusual sway.