



## UNDERSTANDING INTERNATIONAL DRIVERS OF RADICALIZATION IN MUSLIM SOCIETY: THE TRAVEL FROM SOCIAL IDENTITY TO STIGMATIZATION

Noor-Ul-Huda

Ph. D Scholar

Center for International Peace & Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad - Pakistan

[nooraamir.pcs1cips@student.nust.edu.pk](mailto:nooraamir.pcs1cips@student.nust.edu.pk)

### Abstract

*This research seeks to explore the factors that played an enormous role at international level to push or pull the Muslim society to the path of radicalization. The researcher shines the light that U.S. and Europe in particular led the Muslim society towards in-group formation and this in-group formation brought about radicalization among Islamic world. Availing of the concept of Jihad for the containment of Communism, lack of counter-narrative and silence of west, the policy of global domination; the concept of clash of civilization; efforts to make the world unipolar, and involvement of international media in stigmatizing and manufacturing new narratives against Islam and Muslims are described in this meticulous study. By utilizing the concepts of in-group formation (us vs. them) borrowing from social identity perspective explored by Tajfel and Turner (1979) and social stigma theory of Goffman (1963) this project in specific, endeavors to find the answers of the queries: Why the Muslims drew the line between west and Islamic world as 'us vs. them'? How Islam and Muslims have been segregated, stigmatized and stereotyped by International community? To scrutinize the phenomenon and to illuminate the enablers of radicalization among Muslim society, this inquiry applies qualitative research design.*

**Key words:** In-group formation, Stigmatization, Religious Identity, Radicalization

### 1. Introduction

It has been argued in late 2000 world, that Muslim society has been engaged in the process of radicalization, but the fact has been neglected that from 1950 to the contemporary era, multiple drivers played their role to lead them to the path of radicalization on international level. Players as well as events happened globally, contributed a lot in developing radicalized views in Muslim Population by separating, marginalizing, excluding, stereotyping, and stigmatizing. The researcher illuminates that particularly United States of America and Europe sidelined Muslims from international stage and the stereotypical behaviors with the Muslims forced them to be radicalized.



As Campbell and Deacon (2006) denote that when individual/group faces negative labeling, its consequences may be escalation of violence, political/religious radicalization, or in some cases terrorism (Campbell & Deacon, 2006).

This investigative learning argues that the process of in-group formation began between the Muslim population and the west when the concept of Jihad was utilized to contain Communist Russia to be expanded by west. Furthermore, the western world until 2000, did not produce counter narratives for increasing radicalized acts in Muslim community and at consistent bases the response remained soften against those who brought about augmenting extremist ideologies and behaviors. During the era of Cold War, when Afghanistan was invaded by Soviet Union, the young Muslims throughout the Islamic society were engaged by U.S. and Europe to defeat Russia. The inquirer as well discusses in this study that when Israel occupied illegitimately the territory of Palestine, United States of America gave unconditional support to Israel against Muslims and this partial behavior of the super power not just helped to developed socio-religious identity among Muslims on the bases of Islam but likewise filled their minds with disliking thoughts regarding western world.

The policy of global domination after the demise of Russia (concept presented by Fukuyama), unipolar movement (explained by Krauthammer), and clash of civilization (described by Huntington) provided the energy to the establishment of social identity among Muslims and they adopted radicalized thoughts and views against those to whom they considered the members of out-group (U.S. and Europe) and they anticipated alone to themselves in newly international order subsequent to the collapse of Soviet Union (Huntington, 1993; Krauthammer, 1990). A very significant aspect is highlighted in this scrupulous project that when in-group formation occurred among the Islamic world, and international system altered into the unipolar, western policies turned at 360 angle and they energetic and young Muslims who were the Mujahideen and heroes in the era of Cold War, were declared and stereotyped as extremist, radicalized, misogynist, barbarian, fundamentalist, and terrorist. Goffman (1963) indicates that if stigma happens constantly, the stigmatized individual/group starts to behave as his stigmatizer (Goffman, 1963). Under this social inquiry it is claimed that consistent negative labeling by international community and media push and pull the Muslims to the track of radicalization where they thought west as the rival of Islam and western values a threat for Islamic identity. By availing the theoretical underpinnings of social identity explicated by Tajfel and Turner (1979) and social stigma expounded by Goffman (1963) (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Goffman, 1963), this research answers the basic questions: Why the Muslims drew the line between west and Islamic world as 'us vs. them'? How Islam and Muslims have been segregated, stigmatized and stereotyped by International



community? To scrutinize the phenomenon and to illuminate the enablers of radicalization among Muslim society, this inquiry applies qualitative research design.

## **2. Theoretical Underpinnings**

To understand and to analyze the enablers that push or pull the Muslim world to the path of radicalization at global level from 1950 to the contemporary era, this study develops the nexus between social identity and social stigma. Social identity theory was described in 1979 by Tajfel and Turner in their article "The social identity theory of intergroup behavior". This theory argues that individuals on the bases of cognitive processes (social categorization, social identification, and social comparison) and collective ideologies (shared belief system, common goals, and same threat) divide them into groups. As collective identity develops, the process of in-group and out-group accelerates and minimal group paradigm occurs where the members of in-group consider the members of out-group as an enemy and feel threat from out-group for their identity. When minimal group paradigm gets activated, stereotyping, negative labeling, and stigmatizing begins. To understand the process of stigmatization, this article utilizes theory of social stigma.

This theory was first explored by the French philosopher Durkheim but it was fully explained by the influential sociologist of 20<sup>th</sup> century Goffman in 1961 in his article "Stigma". This concept argues the individual/group when is disapproved from the society, it faces stigma. The constant negative behaviors of society push that individual/group into solitude. As a consequence, social exclusion, marginalization, and discrimination becomes visible and horizontal inequality augments. The stigmatized population starts to behave in such a way as the stigmatizer expects from that population.

By taking support from above mentioned two theoretical underpinnings, the researcher endeavors to highlight those drivers that contributed to trigger the process of radicalization among Muslim world. This exploratory and explanatory study illuminates that some international players utilized Muslims for their own benefit and in addition, some events happened at global surface that forced Muslims to be attached with their religious identity. They have been divided between us vs. them (Islam and west). When the Muslims through cognitive processes categorized themselves on the bases of religion, they identified different entity in international system, and when they compared their economic; social; and political position with the western world, they felt deprived relatively. Furthermore, their consistent stigmatization as extremist, fundamentalist, and terrorist by media, government agencies, and international organizations sidelined and marginalized them. As an aftermath multiple individuals from Islamic society espoused extremist ideas and beliefs



and moved towards the process of radicalization as they felt threat from west for the survival of Islam.

### **3. Understanding Radicalization**

Prior to go in the deep detail of the dynamics that led the Muslim world to the path of radicalization, it is significant to comprehend the word 'radicalization'. For taking a very trouble-free understanding, the researcher borrows two definitions of radicalization.

- a. Clark McCauley & Sophia Moskalenko (2008) in there research, describe radicalization as: "radicalization is a dimension of increasing extremity of beliefs, feelings, and behaviors in support of intergroup conflict and violence, across individuals, groups, and mass publics" (McCauley & Moskalenko, 2008).
- b. Wilner and Dubouloz (2010) define radicalization as: "radicalization (or radicalisation) is a process by which an individual or group comes to adopt increasingly extreme political, social, or religious ideals and aspirations that reject or undermine the status quo or undermine contemporary ideas and expressions of freedom of choice" (Wilner & Dubouloz, 2010).

By excavating the above mentioned definitions, the researcher makes the case that radicalization is a process by which, people become increasingly motivated to use violent means against members of an out-group or symbolic targets to achieve behavioral change and political goals. If the Islamic world is contemplated under the light of these definitions, it can be said that there are radicalized views and beliefs among Muslim population. However, the radicalized societies do not develop in one night. They take long time to turn into radicalized ones. Behind this radicalization process, a host of factors work side by side or in a sequential way. Under this piece of research, the factors that forced the Muslims to the path of radicalization, are explored.

### **4. Muslim Society and Drivers of Radicalization**

#### **4.1 Using the Concept of Jihad and Containment of Communism**

Before World War II international system was multi-polar, but during this war, the world was divided into two groups, The Allies and the Axis powers. These group fought with each other in different parts of the world. The Axis powers were Germany, Italy, and Japan, while the Allies were Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States. As the war ended, the Axis powers have been defeated, from the Allies, two superpowers (USSR and U.S.) have emerged at the map of the world, and international system has changed from multi-polar to bi-polar



(Weinberg, 1994). These powers although, in war, were collaborators but as they overcome their common enemy, they started to confront each other indirectly because their political; cultural/social; and economic ideologies were conflicted. USSR was communist, while, U.S. was capitalist. Communism was based on collectivism at the other hand, capitalist was based on individualism. As both the superpowers possessed nuclear weapons this is why, they never thought to engage in war. Although, they for 45 years, fought a Cold War in Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa. Under this Cold war, the two powers endeavored to make more and more allies to beat each other (Lewis, 2006).

Most of the Muslim countries after getting independence from their colonial lords, supported United States because of two reasons: firstly, ideology of communism was based on Godless society and Soviet Union was communist while, U.S., due to Christian majority believed in one God. For the Muslims, U.S. in this way, became more preferable. Secondly, the communist Russia with the intention of expansionism, started to control small Muslim majority areas. For the Muslim countries, Soviet Union, in this way, became more hostile than before (Subrahmanyam, 2009).

With the time being, U.S. and Muslim states made an alliance to contain communist Russia. It was a great achievement for U.S. because without engaging in direct war, America was become able to defeat Soviet Union because of two elements of Muslim world: firstly, there was a magnitude of energetic youth and this youth has been used to contain Russia. Secondly, the concept of 'Jihad' was exploited to overpower Russia by U.S., 'Jihadist' ideology has been promoted and Muslim youngsters were motivated to be died for a noble cause (removal of Soviet Union). This policy of containment of Communism via 'Jihad' at the one hand gave the sense of a separate identity (in-group formation) on the bases of religion while at the other, ignited the flames of radicalization among young Muslims. West just not utilized the concept of 'Jihad' for its own objective but as well did not produce any counter narrative against radicalization during Cold War.

#### **4.2 Silence from West: No Counter Narrative from the Liberals and Softening Western Response**

When US. And European countries, with the support of Muslims, were busy to contain Russia, no literature by the West has been produced to declare or stigmatize Muslims as 'radicalized', 'extremists', or 'terrorist' (Saikal, 2003). The revolutionary text related to 'Jihad' by Muslim orthodox was being popularized and due to the utility of Muslims and the narrative of 'Jihad', any counter-narrative has not been presented by liberal west. Not only this, many other activities of Muslim world have been neglected by U.S. and Europe.



Hizbullah in Lebanon in 1980, took Western hostages into custody and the West did not react to it. In October 1983, American and French marines were attacked in Beirut, hundreds were killed and dozens of French also died but there was no subsequent reaction. Moreover, U.S. withdrew from Lebanon and Britain withdrew from Persian Gulf in 1971. Meanwhile, Vietnam War was happened and differences occurred between the Europe and America upon this war (Kepel, 2006). As an aftermath of this conflict, power vacuum was created because of the fact that West was losing its ability to keep exercising its tight control over international system. Islamists and other were ready to take advantage of it. The oil producing countries and the challenging leaders like Qaddafi went untouched. One view is that rise of Islamic identity and radicalization based on this identity is because of softening Western response towards Muslim world during Cold War. The liberal west however, did not give counter narrative to tackle Muslim radicalization likewise, by declaring 'Mujahidin' as 'Islamic Heroes' during Afghan invasion, U.S. watered the plant of radicalization among the Islamic world.

#### **4.3 Sowing the Seeds of Radicalization: Role of U.S in Afghan Invasion**

The Soviet Union after getting control over central Asian states, intended to invade Afghanistan because from this territory, the Communist Russia could have access to south Asia and hot waters. The rage against USSR was already existed among Muslims, this incident gave them a reason to collapse communism (Collins, 2011). A gigantic and vigorous youth with motivation of 'Jihad' was present and huge finance by selling oil was available to fight with Soviet Union. It was a golden opportunity to U.S. to fulfil its objectives (new world order from bi-polar to uni-polar). From different parts of the world, a host of young, dynamic, active, and devoted men with strong motivation of 'Jihad', have been gathered through the intelligence agencies particularly Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) of United States. The group of these people has been declared as 'Mujahidin' and these 'Mujahidin' have been trained by Pakistani intelligence agency named as Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). At that time, these people were proclaimed as 'Islamic heroes' rather to be stigmatized. U.S. and Europe was supporting them politically, militarily, economically and morally.

As, a consequence, not only the Communist Russia was defeated in Afghanistan but also the demise of Soviet Union has occurred in 1989 (Ronald, 2009). Ultimately, one superpower has disintegrated in 1991 and the other superpower remained unchallenged at international stage. As the goal of U.S. has been achieved and world order has been changed from bi-polar to uni-polar, America has withdrawn its patronage from 'Mujahidin'. When in 2001 these 'Mujahidin' gave the challenge to the power of U.S. and other European countries, they were declared and stigmatized as 'extremist' 'radicalized', and 'terrorist' by Western government officials, politicians, media,



and academia. The Islamic heroes of past now were turned into Islamic terrorist. It is argued that this journey from heroism to stigmatization provided the fuel to the flame of religious radicalization in the Muslim world. In Afghan invasion, however, west as a whole was with the Muslims whereas, in Arab, U.S. was supplying its all energies to Israel against Muslims.

#### **4.4 Strengthening the Concept of 'Us vs. Them': U.S. Unconditional Support to Israel**

At the one hand, Muslims were a great need of U.S. to contain communism, while, at the other, U.S. was unconditionally supporting to the establishment and survival of Israel (Martin, 2003). This behavior of United States towards Israel, was unacceptable among Muslim world because the Jewish state was made on the territory of Palestine's which was a Muslim state and all Islamic countries were against of its existence. Because of this unconditional support of Israel by America, there were also a disappointment in Islamic world for United States and Europe. It was a common perception among Muslims that Israel in itself is not as powerful as it show but the highly capable U.S. is giving fuel to the Jews to fight against Palestinians and this fueling is the reason of survival and security of Israel. As Israel on constant bases, became potent, the flames of revulsion among Muslims against America, flickered up and they realized that despite of the Muslim support against Communist Russia, U.S. gave its unconditional assistance to Israel, it means, non-believers are one group either they are Christians or Jews and Muslims are the other group. Hence, the sense of 'us vs. them' became resilient among Islamic world. United States not only provided unconditional support to Israel in middle-east but also designed the policy of global domination and this policy created distance between the Muslims and west.

#### **4.5 Policy of Global Domination: In-Group Formation and Radicalization of Muslim Society**

As Soviet Union collapsed, Liberal internationalist Francis Fukuyama wrote an article named as the 'End of History' (Fukuyama, 1989). The main argument of this book was, "at the planet of human beings, no one is capable of challenging the power of America and Europe, Western economy, (capitalism); Western social/cultural values; and Western political system (democracy) will flourish in all corners of the world. This article gave a new thought that the world order has been changed and U.S. is the only global dominant power (Brooks & Wohlforth, 2002). Although, communism was defeated but Muslim world felt also a hazard from West and America in two ways: one) monarchy of many Muslim countries was under threat by democratic wave. Two) Islamic social/cultural values could be prevailed over by Westernization.

Moreover, the Afghan government of Taliban's dream to implement 'Sharia' at global level remained unfulfilled if America stays as only dominant actor at world stage. Because 'Mujahidin'



were congregated from many Muslim countries and Afghanistan was not their native state. In addition, U.S. left them unreformed and their courage was so high as they already overwhelmed one superpower (Soviet Union). Under these circumstances, they used Afghanistan as laboratory for the implementation of 'Sharia', and they decided to take down America so that a universal Islamic political system could put into practice. Any other Muslim state did not as well, intervene in the matters of Taliban, for the reason that America was popularized in Muslim world due to its hegemonic behavior and dominant foreign policy. It is argued that this hegemonic behavior of U.S. gave the firewood to the Islamic Identity and the Muslims divided the world into in-group and out-group and this sense of in-grouping further accelerated the process of radicalization among Islamic world. Besides the policy of global domination, the hypothesis of clash of civilizations further strengthened the concept of 'us vs. them' among Muslims and as an aftermath, the process of radicalization grasped the thinking of Muslims.

#### **4.6 Clash of Civilization: Building Separate Identity and Radicalization**

The Clash of Civilizations is a hypothesis that posits, people's cultural and religious identities will become the main cause of conflict after Cold War (Murden, 2011). The American political scientist Samuel P. Huntington gave this argument in his book 'Clash of civilizations' that future wars would be fought not between countries, but between cultures. This book was a response to his former student Francis Fukuyama's 1989 article and 1992 book, *The End of History* which has been already mentioned previously. Alike Fukuyama, Huntington makes the case that history is not ended after Cold War but it is the development of human history (Huntington, 1993). Although, the phrase 'Clash of Civilization' was not used first time, in 1990, Bernard Lewis gave this term in an article "The Roots of Muslim Rage" (Lewis B. , 1990).

Like Fukuyama, Some theorists and writers after Cold War, argued that human rights, liberal democracy, and the capitalist free market economy is the only alternative for nations. But Huntington was thinking differently. According to him, the age of ideology was ended, but the world was entered in a new era where it would face cultural conflict and cultural identities are the key to analyze future conflict (Huntington S. , 1996). Moreover, Harrison and Huntington further explain, "In the past, world history was mainly about the struggles between monarchs, nations and ideologies, such as seen within Western civilization. But after the end of the Cold War, world politics moved into a new phase, in which non-Western civilizations are no longer the exploited recipients of Western civilization but have become additional important actors joining the West to shape and move world history" (Harrison & Huntington, 2001).



This theory gave a new shape to the foreign policy of U.S. and West. Because the primary concept of 'Clash of Civilization' was West vs. rest. At the one hand, America and West was looking at Islamic civilization as a threat for them, as Muslims already defeated Soviet Union with gigantic youth and the solid concept of 'Jihad' (Barber, 1996). While, at the other, Muslim world was feeling apprehension by Westernization. A common perception among Muslims prevailed, 'Clash of Civilization' became the cause for invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq and U.S. and Europe are at one page to devastate Muslim culture/civilization (Köchler, 2002). It is argued that this perception provided energy to develop socio-religious identity of Muslims but gave the way to radicalization in Muslim world. Likewise the policy of dual containment, global domination, and clash of civilization, Uni-polar movement generated negative sentiments for west among Muslims.

#### **4.7 Uni-Polar Moment: Interplay of Radicalization and in-group Formation**

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the questions, on future world politics raised up. How the new world order will be? Who and how will control the world? What kind of war and conflicts will be uprising (Nye, 1992)? Many theorists proposed multiple concepts for managing international system. Mearsheimer (2011) suggested a multipolar system as it was in the 1930s (Mearsheimer, 2011). Fukuyama presented a spread of liberal democracies throughout the world. According to him, humankind has no other alternative system to run international affairs than liberalism (Fukuyama, 1989). While, Huntington (1993) offered the idea 'clash of civilizations'. He explained that rather states will fight with each other. International politics would now be centered by the interplay of West and non-Western civilizations and thus lead to conflict (Huntington S. P., 1993).

In contrast to these theories, Krauthammer established a new assumption to which he called 'the unipolar moment (Krauthammer, 1990).' He argued in his article 'Uni-Polar Movement' in 1991 that U.S. after the era of Cold War, emerged the sole superpower, any other state in the world, is not capable of competing United States. In his point of view, in near future also no power will become a challenge for uni-polarity of America. Krauthammer further, described that U.S. should maintain its economic, military superiority and political influence as well, throughout the globe, because these are the currency to sustain the unipolar moment of United States of America. Krauthammer highlighted that the U.S. will not be able to hold on to uni-polarity if it will run its economy into the ground, the challenge to America's uni-polarity is itself: its "low tax ideology of the 1980s, coupled with America's insatiable desire for yet higher standards of living without paying any of the cost" (Krauthammer, 1990).



Although, after the attacks of 9/11, Krauthammer sanguinely labeled U.S. as unipolar in his revision of his theory (Krauthammer, 2002). But there was a shift in his idea, he elucidated by saying, “if today’s American primacy does not constitute uni-polarity, then nothing ever will” (Krauthammer, 2002). In his opinion, instead of a combination of economic and political superiority supported by Europe, exclusively military power is significant for retaining uni-polarity of U.S. He justified that if use of force is needed to preserve uni-polar system, America has to exercise force upon its challengers. Qassem in 2013, expounded that after the era of Cold War, U.S. emerged as sole superpower in the world as “global policemen” (Qassem, 2013).

If the theory of Uni-Polar Movement is taken into account, it becomes clear that this theory is not just an idea like ‘Clash of civilization’ or ‘Liberal Internationalism’, but this is a practical foreign policy of U.S. (Lustick, 2008). However, the main focus of Communist Russia and U.S. during Cold War, was west Asia and North Africa Due to its strategic importance and oil resources, but after the demise of Soviet Union, Middle Eastern soil caught the attention of U.S. to keep uni-polarity preserved. One view is that the invasion and occupation of Iraq to promote regime change and to neutralize weapons of mass destruction, the United States kept uni-polarity sustained and revealed its military, conventional and intelligence, superiority, “no one is stronger than the United States of America” (Qassem 2013).

Furthermore, the U.S. military interventions in Libya, Yemen and Syria are also the endeavors to retain its uni-polarity. Nonetheless, it was considered that “United States was the leading country of the world, a lonely superpower ‘able to impose its will on another countries’” (Varisco, 2013). But terrorist attacks of 9/11 ruined the concept of uni-polarity of America and challenged the security apparatus of superpower. While, the subsequent action (attack on Afghanistan) of U.S. depicted its uni-polarity and proved that America is still remained unchallenged and at a standstill is the most powerful country (Crowley, 2013).

This aspect of U.S. foreign policy (uni-polarism) provided the Muslims different angles to think and ignited the flares of radicalization in Muslim world for multiple reasons: 1) U.S. made Middle Eastern soil battlefield to maintain its uni-polarity. 2) Muslims were declared as terrorist as U.S. feels a threat from the Muslims for its uni-polarity. 3) A global War on Terror has been begun so that Muslims can be contained from challenging U.S. uni-polarity. 4) U.S. engaged Muslims in civil wars for the cause that they remained scattered. 5) Afghanistan was attacked to keep an eye upon China and Russia so as they can defy the uni-polarity of America. 6) In the name of terrorism, U.S. penetrated in almost all the Muslim countries to show that it is the only uni-polar actor at world stage, Islam can never become the replacement of this solid and strong power. Besides the policy of global domination, the concept of clash of civilization, and unipolar



movement of United States of America, the wave of globalization augmented radicalized thinking among Muslim world as it provided opportunity to the Muslims to be activated beyond state borders. Hence, many extremist groups came into existence as Al-Qaida, and ISIS/DAISH.

#### **4.8 Impact of Globalization on Radicalized Muslims**

As the human planet became the global village due to revolutionized media; economy; and politics, the awareness in people, about international issues, increased (Hoffmann, 2002). The person who sits in France, may be conscious of Palestinian humanitarian crisis. Similarly a person became able to contribute in Afghan 'Jihad' through funding or propagating 'Jihadist' ideology (Scruton, 2003). The process of globalization also gave the energy to the old concept of Muslims 'universal Caliphate'. The perspective started to be developed that if U.S. can dominate the world why not Islam? In addition, interconnectedness among Muslims, because of media and internet, augmented this concept.

The religious groups run global campaigns regarded the atrocities of Muslims in Palestine and Kashmir (Shay, 2017). Not only this, military intervention by U.S. and Europe, in Muslim world, was highlighted and global networks by Al-Qaida, Taliban, and ISIS/Daish, were developed to motivate and engage Muslims for a noble cause of implementing 'Sharia'.

Another contribution of globalization was, it enlarged relative deprivation among young Muslims. The concept of relative deprivation worked in two ways: at the one hand, this deprivation influence those who were living under poor conditions in Muslim majority states. When they compared themselves with those who live in America and Europe, they felt relatively deprived. Since, they did not have even filtered water, whereas, the people in West have an easy access to pure milk (Scruton, 2003). While at the other, relative deprivation also gave a great impact upon those Muslims who were living in U.S. and Europe. When they felt that the job and educational equal opportunities, even, they are living there for three generations. Their sentiments were ignited by global religious groups through internet and online literature and they turned into radicalized ones (Moghaddam, 2008).

Flow of information gave another benefit to these deprived young Muslims that they learnt about weapons preparation at their home, working or educational place. In a globalized world, for learning and training, it was not necessary to come Afghanistan or Pakistan. If any deprived young or someone who was inspired with 'Jihadist' ideology and lived in any Western country, but he wished to give a reaction over Muslim atrocities in Iraq or Afghanistan, he himself became capable of preparing weapons and running them in Belgium, France, or England (Pedahzur, 2006).



Globalization supplied the fuel to the radicalization in following ways: firstly, it highlighted violent actions upon Muslims, secondly it gave awareness about deprivation, and thirdly, it offered a solution that how to keep deprivation away. To trigger the process of radicalization in Islamic world, international media played a vital role as well. It just not helped to build socio-religious identity but by stigmatizing and manufacturing new narratives against Muslims supplied energy to religious-based radicalized mechanism.

#### 4.9 Stigmatization of Muslims and Islam: Role of International Media

In a globalized world, media has a strong impact in shaping foreign policies, formulating cultures, and fabricating public opinion. However, media displays that material, to which it is permitted to be showed by the policy makers, interest groups, or governments. According to 'framing theory of media', news in real form is not disclosed on screen. Before giving on air, this news is passed through different stages. Raw information is gathered, it is framed to favor some interest group (private or government), at the last stage, it goes on air (Chong & Druckman, 2007). According to 'agenda setting theory of media' news is presented to fulfil some agenda either political, economic, social/cultural, or religious (Shaw, 1979). 'Propaganda theory' argues that most of the news are based on some propaganda. Through media, the pressure groups propagate those concepts among public which give them a great favor. The theory further makes clear that it is media which constructs or destructs perceptions of the people. It stereotypes or labels negatively or positively some one's personality, identity, or thoughts (Pedro-Carañana, Broudy, & Klaehn, 2018).

In his 'propaganda model' Nom Chomsky expounds that media operates through five filters: "ownership, advertising, the media elite, flak and the common enemy." Firstly, **OWNERSHIP:** Chomsky argues the owners who run big media houses, they frame the fabric for those who give them profit. Secondly, **ADVERTISING:** In Chomsky's view advertisers have a great role to frame the news and to set the agenda because through advertisers, media houses are run. In this way, great multi-national and national companies influence mass media. Thirdly, **THE MEDIA ELITE:** Here, Chomsky makes the case that establishment or government manages media as, it know how to play the game, how to influence the news narrative. The government institutions feed media scoops, so, who are in power and who report on them are in bed with each other. Fourthly, **FLAK:** Chomsky explains, if generalists challenge the powers or do not set narrative as they are guided by the powers, they are thrown away. "When the story is inconvenient for the powers that be, you'll see the flak machine in action discrediting sources, trashing stories and diverting the conversation." Fifthly, **THE COMMON ENEMY:** Chomsky highlights that to manufacture consent in favor of powers and to corral public opinion, "you need an enemy — a



target.” These targets can be as: ‘Communism’ ‘Terrorists’ ‘Immigrants’. Media houses propagate negative stereotyping or labeling to make the public afraid of the enemy (Chomsky, 1989).

Edward Said in his explanation of orientalism, describes that if newspapers are read carefully, it is easily understood that how narratives are built through framing and imaging. How stereotyping of cultures, and regions are done by media (Grabar, Said, & Lewis, 1982). Europeans are modern. Americans are liberal and have freedom of thought. Africans are robbers, pirates or there is a starving situation. Latten Americans are footballers, drug lards, or there are authoritarian regimes. Asian are software engineers or religious fanatic. Arabs are terrorist or misogynist (Said, 1980). Who gave these labels? Who stereotyped? Simple answer is, International media.

It is argued that the analysis of Mujahidin/terrorist case clarifies that how international media negatively labeled or stereotyped this group During the decade of 80, when Muslims with ‘Jihadist’ ideology, were fighting against Communist Russia in Afghanistan, international media used to called these fighters ‘Mujahidin’. As Cold War ended, the Taliban took the control of the country, they tried to implement ‘Sharjah’ there. Traditional Islamic punishments were imposed for crimes, ‘Pardah’ was made compulsory for females, formal education for women were banned in most local areas, and all means of entertainment (music; dramas; films) were prohibited. International media highlighted these actions and framed as human rights violation. Not only this, media also started to label these ‘Mujahidin’ as ‘terrorist’, ‘radicalized’, or ‘extremist’. This framing, stereotyping, or labeling went on the sky, when media began to interlinked Muslims and terrorism.

This partial behavior of international media led a host of Muslims towards radicalized ideas or beliefs in multiple ways: firstly, they started to accept that they are radicalized and terrorist [theory of social stigma argues, the stigmatized individuals or groups instigate to behave as stigmatizers expect from them]. Secondly, they not only conducted terrorist attacks but also took the responsibility for these attacks. Thirdly, the Muslim world rather to develop counter-narrative to tackle radicalization, saw the phenomenon as framing, agenda-setting, or propaganda by West or U.S. against Islam. Fourthly, A debate in Muslim world began that the ‘Mujahidin’ of yesterday why, turned into terrorist (agenda of West against Islam)? Fifthly, the Muslims started to think according to the propaganda model of Chomsky that West and U.S. are powerful, they through impacting media, declared Muslims an enemy after communism. Sixthly, The Muslims burnt when international media stigmatized pure Islamic values as terrorist activities just as the person who says prayer, is considered as extremist or radicalized.

## **5. Conclusion**



This article was an effort to analyze that what had been gone at international level and how west and U.S. push or pull to the Muslim world to the path of radicalization by developing among them the sense of a separate identity based on religion, by utilizing them to contain Communist Russia, by giving them opportunity to grow and to flourish freely with radicalized thoughts and beliefs, and by stigmatizing them through international media.



## References

- Barber, B. (1996). *Jihad vs. McWorld: Terrorism's Challenge to Democracy*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Brooks, S. G., & Wohlforth, W. C. (2002). American Primacy in Perspective. *Foreign Affairs*.
- Campbell, C., & Deacon, H. (2006). "Unraveling the Contexts of Stigma: From Internalisation to Resistance to Change. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16(6), 411–417. doi::10.1002/casp.901
- Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control In Democratic Societies*. New York: Pantheon.
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103-126.
- Crowley, L. (2013). "US Grand Strategy Options" *e-International Relations*. Retrieved March 12, 2022, from <<https://www.e-ir.info/2013/06/13/us-grand-strategy-options/>>
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). "The End of History. *The National Interest*(16), 3-18.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Grabar, O., Said, E., & Lewis, B. (1982). Orientalism: An Exchange. *New York Review of Books*, 29(13).
- Harrison, L. E., & Huntington, S. P. (2001). *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hoffmann, S. (2002). Clash of Globalizations. *Council on Foreign Relations*.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations?: The Debate*. New York: Foreign Affairs.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49.
- Kepel, G. (2006). *Jihad: The trail of political Islam*. London: IB Tauris.
- Köchler, H. (2002). *After September 11, 2001: Clash of Civilizations or Dialogue?* Manila: University of the Philippines.
- Krauthammer, C. (1990). The Unipolar Moment. *Foreign Affairs*, 70(1). Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1990-01-01/unipolar-moment>
- Krauthammer, C. (2002). The Unipolar Moment Revisited. *The National Interest*(70), 5-17.
- Lewis, B. (1990). The Roots of Muslim Rage. *The Atlantic* .
- Lewis, J. (2006). *The Cold War: a new history*. London: Penguin.
- Martin, L. G. (2003). *Assessing the impact of US-Israeli relations on the Arab world*. Retrieved March 12, 2022, from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA416591>
- McCauley, C., & Moskalenko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of Political Radicalization: Pathways Toward Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20(3), 415-433 .
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2011). Imperial by design. *The National Interest*(111), 16-34.



- Moghaddam, F. M. (2008). *How globalization spurs terrorism: The lopsided benefits of "one world" and why that fuels violence*. Praeger Security International.
- Murden, S. (2011). Cultures in world affairs. In B. J. & O. P. Smith S, *The Globalization of World Politics* (pp. 416-426). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (1992). What New World Order. *Foreign Affairs*.
- Pedahzur, A. (2006). *Root causes of suicide terrorism: The globalization of martyrdom*. London: Routledge.
- Pedro-Carañana, J., Broudy, D., & Klaehn, J. (2018). *The Propaganda Model Today: Filtering Perception and Awareness*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Said, E. (1980, April 26). *Islam Through Western Eyes*. Retrieved March 9, 2022, from The Nation: <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/islam-through-western-eyes/>
- Saikal, A. (2003). *Islam and the West: Conflict or Cooperation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scruton, R. (2003). *West and the rest: Globalization and the terrorist threat*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Shaw, E. F. (1979). Agenda-setting and mass communication theory. *Gazette (Leiden, Netherlands)*, 25(2).
- Shay, S. (2017). *The Globalization of Terror: the challenge of Al-Qaida and the response of the international community*. London: Routledge.
- Subrahmanyam, K. (2009). A historical overview of the Cold War. In C. Chari, *Superpower Rivalry and Conflict The Long Shadow of the Cold War on the 21st Century* (pp. 39-57). Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47).
- Weinberg, G. L. (1994). *A world at arms: A global history of World War II*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Wilner, A. S., & Dubouloz, C.-J. (2010). Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: an interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. *Global Change, Peace, and Security*, 22(1), 33-51.