

Spring 2016

From Thomas Jefferson to Donald Trump: The Recurring Muslim Xeno-Archetype in American Politics and Government

Christopher S. Saladin
Augustana College, Rock Island Illinois

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/histstudent>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Other Religion Commons](#)

Augustana Digital Commons Citation

Saladin, Christopher S.. "From Thomas Jefferson to Donald Trump: The Recurring Muslim Xeno-Archetype in American Politics and Government" (2016). *History: Student Scholarship & Creative Works*.
<http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/histstudent/2>

This Student Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Augustana Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in History: Student Scholarship & Creative Works by an authorized administrator of Augustana Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@augustana.edu.

From Thomas Jefferson to Donald Trump: The Recurring Muslim Xeno-Archetype in American
Politics and Government

Christopher S. Saladin

ABSTRACT:

This paper connects the Islamophobic discourse of the 2016 presidential primary candidates to that of past American politicians through a historical analysis of their rhetoric and policies towards Muslims. I argue that Western discourse about Islam has long appealed to what I refer to as the Muslim “xeno-archetype,” which is a recurring but unchanging understanding of Islam in the Western mind. This xeno-archetype theory is derived from Edward Said’s concept of Orientalism, but is distinct in that it explains why unique misconceptions of Islam existed long before European colonialism. The xeno-archetype consists of specific stereotypes and fears of a given ethnic or religious group that are constant in the Western conscience and recur in times of perceived crisis. I explain that the xeno-archetype specific to Muslims was passed down by Europeans to future Americans during colonization and greatly influenced the way American leaders have understood and interacted with Muslims both at home and abroad throughout the nation’s history. This analysis identifies the specific stereotypes of Islam that were held by past Americans and reveals that they are the same ones that have been expressed by the 2016 candidates, which allows Islamophobia to be understood as a recurring feature in the Euro-American tradition.

INTRODUCTION

In his State of the Union speech on December 3, 1822, President James Monroe expressed regret that the “gloomy despotism” of the Muslim Ottomans had spread over much of the world.¹ For Monroe and his audience, this Islamic despotism was a threat to Western civilization and American democracy. Nearly 200 years later, in an interview with NBC on September 20, 2015, presidential primary candidate Dr. Ben Carson proclaimed, “I would not advocate that we put a Muslim in charge of this nation.” Dr. Carson’s reasoning was that Islam is “inconsistent with the values and principles of America.”² Even with 200 years separating them, a president and a man who aspired to be president both agreed that Islam has no place in American democracy.

It seems out of place that one of the nation’s earliest presidents was ideologically opposed to Islam, for the “Muslim problem” is a fairly new concern for most Americans. The recent 2016 presidential primary has been full of hostility towards people of the Muslim faith, which has manifest itself in repeated hateful comments and suggestions of discriminatory policies from presidential candidates. These comments, which have come primarily from the GOP candidates, have shocked many Americans, but also resonated with others. The turbulent relationship between the U.S. and Muslim majority countries over the last 15 years has brought these anti-Muslim sentiments, which were previously forgotten pieces of America’s past, back to the forefront of American politics.

The rhetoric coming out of the 2016 race marks the largest rise in anti-Muslim ideologies in nearly 100 year, which has made it seem like an anomaly to most Americans. For this reason, many have argued that the current campaign against Islam is a strategy recently constructed by political leaders to achieve national security goals. However, this rhetoric really comes from a

complex archetype of Islam that has always been part of the American conscience and repeatedly implemented by past and present political leaders. This essay is an analysis of the history of anti-Muslim rhetoric and proposes this rhetoric is just the latest resurgence of a centuries old “xeno-archetype” of Islam that has always alienated Muslims from America’s understanding of its own Western identity.

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF “ISLAMOPHOBIA”

Orientalism and the Muslim Other

There has been a heated debate over where the hate of Islam, commonly referred to as “Islamophobia,” comes from and when it came about. In 1978, literary analyst Edward Said introduced the concept of Orientalism in his book bearing the same name. According to Said, orientalism is “a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient’s special place in the European Western experience.”³ This process has allowed misconceptions about the Orient, and particularly the Muslim world, to develop in the Western imagination over time without any actual input from these regions.

Said points out a series of stereotypes that Orientalism typically carries with it, including that Easterners are unchanging, irrational, and barbaric. This view of the Orient relies heavily upon a concept of European superiority which Said argues identifies “‘us’ Europeans as against all ‘those’ non-Europeans.”⁴ In this perspective, white Europeans and Americans are the “Self” while all non-Europeans, including Muslims, are the “Other”. Said believes that this understanding of otherness was a deliberate Western colonial creation that has been perpetuated by Western academia and politics. The problem with Said’s theory is that it’s hard to pin-point the creation of otherness to one time or place in European or American history because

constructions of Self and Other have always been prevalent in Western society. Despite this issue, Said's theory is important for understanding the tendency to discuss the Orient in a purely Western context and has become the centerpiece for most academic discussions about Islamophobia.

Said's theory was proposed in 1978, but became increasingly supported 2 decades later after the 9/11 attacks. As anti-Muslim rhetoric soared, academics looked back on Said's theory for an answer to why this was happening. Many academics latched onto the principle of a "created" Orientalism and used this to argue that the recent surge of Islamophobia was a political tool formulated by the political and intellectual elite. Historian Richard Bonney argues that our concept of the Global War on Terror as a clash of civilizations between West and East was carefully formulated in recent history by right-wing intellectuals.⁵ Bonney describes how the political ideology of theorists such as Bernard Lewis and Daniel Pipes, who implemented many orientalist tropes in their writing, came to affect actual U.S. foreign policy. Many of the phrases that came to be used by politicians and the media, including "Islamofascism" and "clash of civilizations," were introduced by these academics right before and after 9/11.⁶ From this perspective, current stereotypes towards Muslims and Islamophobia in general are a relatively recent phenomenon created for achieving political goals.

In a similar argument, political scientist Lisa Stampnitzky claims that the notion of "terrorism" in particular was created by experts. She argues that "political violence was transformed into 'terrorism'" and "terrorists" were made out to be "dangerous and irrational."⁷ When the "irrational terrorist" was created as a recurring trope, it fit in well with the Orientalist notion that Muslims are irrational, creating an organic link for Westerners between terrorism and Islam. While her argument about the creation of terrorism is mostly well founded, previous fears

towards Muslims existed long before they synthesized with this new concept of terrorism. Experts may have created the concept of terrorism, but it doesn't mean that the concept of the Muslim Other came from these same experts.

Another theory of Islamophobia's origins comes from professors Humayun Ansari and Farid Hafez, who argue that Muslims were deliberately placed into the same stereotypes of other traditionally othered groups. They attribute this transformation of old xenophobias into Islamophobia to the Western media and especially that of the evangelical Christian right.⁸ They believe that the media within this community took old arguments against other minorities and reformulated them to attack Muslims for political reasons. However, older forms of media actually did talk about Muslims in the same way they do now and the stereotypes they carry are quite different from those of other discriminated minorities. It is more likely that this evangelical community has long fostered anti-Muslim sentiments along with xenophobia towards other non-European groups.

The problem with these theories is that they explain how Orientalism has been reshaped into modern Islamophobia by certain academic and political forces, but they don't recognize just how far back Orientalism goes. Some historians have traced anti-Muslim rhetoric back well into the early history of the United States and even earlier in Europe. In his book *Islam through Western Eyes*, historian Johnathan Lyons argues that orientalist tendencies towards Muslims started as far back as the crusades of the 11th century. Lyon's explains how there has always been a one-sided conversation on the part of West which has othered Muslims and allowed certain stereotypes of them to be passed down.⁹ A similar view is held by Islamic studies professor Sophia Rose Arjana, who argues in her book *Muslims in the Western Imagination* that Westerners have always portrayed Muslims in their art and media as sorts of mysterious

monsters.¹⁰ Both Lyons and Arjana believe in a Western construction of Islam that has long been part of the Euro-American tradition.

Furthermore, Islamophobia has had its own unique history in the United States itself. In her book *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921*, historian Karine Walther describes America's longstanding tradition of Orientalism, which has repeatedly singled out and exploited Muslim majority nations and communities in U.S. foreign policy.¹¹ Walther describes how Islam was frequently criticized on all levels of society and put up as the rival of Christianity. Walther reveals that Islamophobia was present in the United States before the nation's founding and was already having serious political consequences. By analyzing the historical context of anti-Muslim sentiments and political rhetoric, it's clear that 21st century Islamophobia is part of a longer tradition of alienating Muslims from U.S. society.

The Xeno-Archetype Theory

The long tradition of anti-Muslim Orientalism in the United States that Lyons and Walther bring up reveals two significant issues with past explanations of Islamophobia. The first of these is that negative understandings of Islam go back long before the colonial era, in which Said and others claim it was formed for political purposes. The second problem is that Islamophobia is driven by its own unique stereotypes of Islam that are not simple equivalents to other forms of xenophobia. It is therefore necessary to form an alternate theory on the nature and origins of Islamophobia that explains it as a recurring negative archetype of Islam passed down in the Western tradition over centuries.

The anti-Muslim Western tradition originates from a "xeno-archetype" of Islam in the Western mind. The term xeno-archetype comes from the Greek "xeno," meaning other, "arche,"

meaning ancient, and “typos,” meaning model. Therefore, xeno-archetypes can be understood as “ancient models of the other” that are constructed understandings of foreign groups consisting of specific stereotypes and misconceptions. Muslims are just one of several groups that have been understood by Western-Europeans in terms of a xeno-archetype. These archetypes have come and gone over time, often coinciding with events of domestic or global crisis. Each individual xeno-archetype has certain myths about the group they are concerned with that become relevant again when that group is coupled with a perceived threat. Politicians can target traditional xeno-archetypes to gain support because of the pertinence of existing negative images and stereotypes in the public mind. These leaders have drawn upon their xeno-archetype of Muslims throughout the history of American politics and have made it relevant again in recent history because of the threat of foreign terrorism.

These recurring xeno-archetypes come from Americans’ ever-changing understanding of Self and Other. For much of United States history, American identity has largely depended on one’s perceived “whiteness,” a concept that itself has changed over time. Those groups traditionally defined as Other have at times been understood as being “white,” but have then been re-categorized as “non-white” in times of perceived crisis. When these groups switch from the Self to the Other, they are immediately re-associated with the xeno-archetype by which the West understands them. In this way, the American perception of Self has changed due to the exclusion of certain races or religions, which explains why Muslims have now been re-excluded from American identity. The othering of Muslims has been relabeled as “Islamophobia” in recent decades, but this hostility is coming from a much older negative Western archetype of Islam. This archetype has allowed Muslims to be singled out in the current political climate because

they have always been subject to a cultural racism that conflates their religion with a negative concept of Other.

The Western xeno-archetype of Islam puts Westerners in contention with Muslims by ascribing to them certain stereotypes that appear to be the antithesis of the West's understanding of its own society. Western peoples, including Americans, have an archetype of their own society that is classified by all the characteristics of a "civilized" society: free, reasonable, progressive, and altogether superior to the East. In direct contrast of this understanding of the Western Self, Westerners associate the religion of Islam with the characteristics of a barbaric or "uncivilized" society: despotic, violent, monolithic, and altogether inferior to the West. These specific components of the Muslim xeno-archetype are reflected in the arguments of past and present politicians, who are drawing on the same recurring source for their understanding of the Muslim world.

THE STORY OF THE MUSLIM XENO-ARCHETYPE

The Archetype's Pre-American Origins

The story of Islamophobia in America started long before the nation's founding. This xeno-archetype, among others, was brought to the United States by European settlers, who had their own long history of mistrust towards the Muslim world. The European anti-Muslim legacy can be traced back to the early days of the Crusades, during which Catholic Europe engaged their Muslim neighbors to the East in an all-out war of conquest. According to Jonathan Lyons, Europeans underwent a huge transformation in their dialogue towards Islam during the Crusades. Before the 11th century, Europeans usually referred to people from Muslim lands using historic ethnic names, such as "Arabs" or "Saracens," making little reference to their Muslim faith.¹²

Furthermore, some early chronicles from this period even describe friendly relationships and alliances between Christian and Muslim kingdoms.¹³ Now this does not mean that tensions didn't exist between Europe and its neighbors to the East, in fact there is a long history of framing the West and East as being in contention with one another that goes well back to the ancient Greeks. These early chronicles, however, are significant because they suggest that Christians and Muslims were not always pitted against one another on religious terms. While there may have been some recognized difference between Western and Eastern peoples, the contention between Christian and Muslim civilization that would come to dominate the next millennium had yet to fully arise.

A major change in the tone of rhetoric towards Islam took place somewhere around the start of the Crusades. In 1095, Pope Urban II gave a speech at the Council of Clermont in which he called Christian Europe to embark on a crusade to the Holy Land. There is no original account of the Pope's speech, but the contemporary medieval chronicler Fulcher of Chartres wrote that the Pope called for a war against "The Turks... a race so despicable, degenerate, and enslaved by demons."¹⁴ Here Fulcher suggests that Turks, who weren't even the people they were actually going to fight, as a race are naturally linked to the devil through their Muslim religion. This inaccurately conflates an ethnic term with a religion in a way that makes them both seem naturally evil. A later chronicler, Robert the Monk, claims, in his speech at Clermont, that the Pope described the various ways these "people rejected by God" had violently tortured Christians and therefore called fellow Christians to seek their revenge.¹⁵ This chronicle holds some of the earliest images of Muslims as a barbaric and violent people, which seems to have a direct connection to their "rejected" faith. These condemning stories about Islam were brought about as a justification for Christians embarking on a religious war to a place with which they

were hardly familiar. This grand event on the part of Christian Europe brought about stereotypes associated with Muslims which formed into a xeno-archetype that has frequently reappeared over the last millennium.

When the first Europeans arrived on the shores of the New World nearly 500 years later, they carried with them this same antagonism towards Islam. Christopher Columbus himself held very strong views towards Islam and considered his expedition to the Indies part of the European effort to combat Muslim expansion. Columbus wrote a letter in 1493 to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain thanking them for being, “devoted to the Holy Christian Faith and dedicated to its expansion and to combatting the religion of Mahomet and all idolatries and heresies.”¹⁶ Columbus believed that by sailing and spreading Christianity westward, he was helping fight in the global religious war against Islam, which he refers to as “the religion of Mahomet.” Columbus’ eagerness to fight Islam comes from the same ideology that drove the Spanish Reconquista, which sought to force the Moors out of the Iberian Peninsula and “reclaim” it as a Christian land. With this warring mentality fresh in mind, Columbus saw his expedition to the Americas as another step in the holy war between Western and Eastern civilization.

This same notion of a global struggle between Christian and Muslim civilization was brought to the Americas by British colonists as well. The leader of the Jamestown expedition, Captain John Smith, had his own unique experience with Muslims. In his earlier years, Smith, who was an English aristocrat, joined the Holy Roman Empire’s expedition to go fight the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans. After participating in several sieges, being captured as a Turkish slave, and escaping back to England, Smith was lauded with glory for his efforts in combating the Muslim enemy. In his memoir entitled *The True Travels, Adventures, and Observations of Captain John Smith*, Smith explains how he was awarded for his exploits with, “three Turks’

heads in a shield for his arms,” which became his official coat of arms.¹⁷ As a result, the first map of Virginia bears Smith’s coat of arms, which has the severed heads of three turban wearing Muslim Ottomans on its seal.¹⁸ This violent symbol, which was worn proudly by the founder of the first colony in the future United States, shows that there was a tone of conquest over the forces of Islam even in the nation’s pre-history. Leaders like John Smith and his fellow colonists brought the Muslim xeno-archetype with them to the Americas, planting the ideals of a Western civilization in contention with the barbaric Muslim East in the early American conscience.

The Archetype in the Early Republic

The U.S. underwent a political separation from Europe during the American Revolution, but the culture and ideals it inherited from Europe remained well in place. As the early republic began to interact with the world around it, one of its first international conflicts was against the Muslim Barbary States of North Africa. The Barbary pirates conducted raids on American and European ships across the Mediterranean Sea and enslaved their sailors, which prompted the newly independent American colonies to send John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and John Jay as ambassadors to address this problem. In a letter to Jay on March 28, 1786, Jefferson and Adams discussed their meeting with the ambassador of Tripoli, which was one of the Barbary States. In the letter, Jefferson and Adam’s claim that the ambassador told them that their violence against Westerners was, “founded on the laws of their Prophet... that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found,” and that the ambassador “verily believed the Devil assisted his countrymen.”¹⁹ This letter suggests that the Barbary pirates were attacking Americans because their Muslim faith instructed them to, which Jefferson and Adams took as a pretext for war. It seems questionable that the Barbary ambassador would say that the “Devil” was assisting his own people, so it is quite possible that Jefferson and Adams wrote this in

themselves in order to further villainize the pirates. Whether these were the actual words of the ambassador or not, Jefferson and Adams used this to explain that there was something inherently violent about Islam that made these Muslims attack and enslave Christian Americans. Public outcry against the Barbary States continued until 1801, when Jefferson declared war on them and sent American marines to fight them in the Mediterranean. Even in its earliest conflicts, American leaders used the faith of Muslims as an explanation for why they were attacking America and a justification to attack them back.

The interesting part about Jefferson's interactions with the Barbary States is that he was actually quite knowledgeable of Islam for an American at his time. According to historian Kevin Hayes, Jefferson had his own copy of the Qur'an, which he read during his legal studies on natural law, and even taught himself Arabic in order to learn more about the religion.²⁰ While Jefferson never engages in a full on discussion about Islam in his writings, his notes suggest that he was studying Islam as a point of comparison for understanding different interpretations of law. Jefferson references Islam in his autobiography when he recalls a debate in the Virginia legislature over a religious freedoms bill. In reference to this bill, Jefferson explains that the freedoms this bill established were "meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian and the Mahometan, the Hindoo, and infidel of every denomination"²¹ Jefferson supports the idea of religious equality enough to include Islam within his legal understanding of religious freedom, but he makes note of this as a unique exception precisely because Muslims would not have normally had this right extended to them. In this way, Jefferson's inclusion of Islam was an exception to normal treatment of Islam at his time that proves it was not accepted as an equal religion by most. By making this unique claim for

including Islam, Jefferson is recognizing that the West's archetype of Islam would normally exclude the religion from the Western liberal principle of equal rights.

The 19th Century Muslim Xeno-Archetype

After a couple decades of relatively quiet relations with the Muslim world, the American public once again shifted its attention to a conflict involving Muslims. During the Greek Revolution of 1821-1823, many Americans pushed for direct U.S. support for the movement of Greek independence from the Muslim Ottoman Empire. These Americans, popularly known as "philhellenes" at the time, made the argument that Greece was the cradle of Western civilization and democracy, so it was only right that the U.S. help them in their struggle against the oppressive Muslim Ottomans.²² Philhellenes across the country called for direct U.S. action against the Ottomans, but, following the isolationist policies of then Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, the government was wary of engaging itself in foreign conflicts. James Monroe, the president at the time, addressed this issue in his annual speech to Congress on December 3, 1822. In this speech, Monroe explains that the United States is unable to help Greece, but still regrets that Greece, "has been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism."²³ Despite his lack of action, Monroe still believed that democratic Greece was valiantly struggling against a repressive Muslim Ottoman regime, which he calls "despotic." This language places "free" and "democratic" Western civilization in direct conflict with the supposedly "despotic" societies of the Muslim world. From this perspective, the democracy that Greece is seeking cannot exist under its current rulers because their Muslim faith makes them inherently opposed to freedom. To Americans who strongly believed in the ideals of democracy and liberty, this sort of "despotic" Islam would have seemed like a direct threat to their American values.

Despite the federal government's continued pledge to not get involved in foreign conflicts, support for Greece continued to grow in the American public and politics. Several U.S. citizens, including the prominent philhellene Edward Everett, pressured congress and appealed to their representatives to address the issue of Greece in Congress. In 1824 a series of debates were held in Congress over a resolution proposed by Massachusetts representative Daniel Webster which would send a U.S. agent to Greece as an official sign of support.²⁴ In a speech delivered to Congress on January 19, 1824, Webster argued that it was Americans' Christian duty to aid their fellow Christian Greeks in fighting the uniquely barbaric "Turkish domination." Webster proceeded to claim that the Ottomans are naturally despotic because, "the religious and civil code of [their] state [is] both fixed in the Koran, and equally the object of an ignorant and furious faith," making it, "incapable of change."²⁵ Here, Webster, an elected member of Congress, declared that the ignorant and violent nature of Islam makes it unable to change, which in return makes it inherently despotic. Webster used this anti-Muslim argument on the behalf of the philhellenic public to try and garner Congressional support to "free" Christian Greece from the grasp of the horrible religious dictatorship that he claims was the Ottoman Empire. By calling out Islam for its violent nature, Webster contributed to the existing xeno-archetype, further solidifying the definition of the United States as a Christian nation fundamentally opposed to the oppressive doctrines of Islam.

Greece officially declared its independence in 1832 after European intervention on the behalf of Britain and France, but only received aid from the U.S. in the form of some private donations. This lack of U.S. federal support had largely been due to the objections of then Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, who feared getting involved in foreign entanglements. However, after serving as president himself from 1825-1829, Adams revealed in an 1831 essay

that he had been ideologically supportive of Greek independence despite his political stance.²⁶ In this essay, which was entitled “Russia” and was a long history of that nation, Adams begins with a chapter entitled “Christianity Contrasted with Islamism” in which he describes the differing histories of Christianity and Islam. Adams gives a brief account of the teachings of Jesus and then declares, in all capital letters, “THE ESSENCE OF THIS DOCTRINE IS, TO EXALT THE SPIRITUAL OVER THE BRUTAL PART OF HIS NATURE.”²⁷ After declaring that Christianity is fundamentally concerned with the good side of human nature, Adams proceeds to explain how Islam is exactly the opposite of this. He claims that the “fanatic” and “fraudulent” Prophet Muhammad stole the principles of Christianity and adapted them to achieve the “gratification of sexual passion” and to declare “undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind.” After arguing that these evil ideals were central to Muhammad, Adams declares, “THE ESSENCE OF HIS DOCTRINE WAS VIOLENCE AND LUST: TO EXALT THE BRUTAL OVER THE SPIRITUAL PART OF HUMAN NATURE.”²⁸ By describing Christianity and Islam in directly opposite terms, Adams is clearly stating that Christianity represents all that is good in humanity while Islam brings out the evil side of human nature. This charged accusation from a former American president is clearly influenced by the same recurring xeno-archetype that portrays Islam as the exact opposite of Western Christian civilization.

After pointing out Christianity’s superiority, Adams proceeds to argue that the two religions are destined to always be in contention with one another until Christians find a way to rid the world of the problem that is Islam. Adams argues:

Between these two religions, thus contrasted in their characters, a war of twelve hundred years has already raged. That war is yet flagrant; nor can it cease but by the extinction of

that imposture, which has been permitted by Providence to prolong the degeneracy of man. While the merciless and dissolute dogmas of the false prophet shall furnish motives to human action, there can never be peace upon earth, and good will towards men... and the destiny of that doctrine which for its truth appeals only to the sword, must eventually be, by the sword itself to perish.²⁹

The severity of Adam's words here speak for themselves, as he is essentially arguing that world peace cannot be achieved while Islam exists on earth. The most threatening part of Adam's claim is that since Muslim's themselves are naturally violent, Christians have a duty to exterminate them by their own violent means. This religious justification for killing Muslims gave the Christian United States permission to declare war on Muslim peoples without any weight on their moral conscience and even a sense of justice. The fact that a former U.S. president was able to openly propose a concept as radical as the justified killing of someone based on their religion shows that the Muslim xeno-archetype was alive and well in 19th century American politics.

Anti-Muslim discourse receded from mainstream politics for a short time after the Greek Revolution, but was still maintained by select Christian communities of philhellenes. However, when the Greeks and Ottomans started fighting again in 1866, this time over control of Crete, the philhellenes were easily able to bring this issue back to forefront of American politics. By 1869, the issue of intervening against the Ottomans on behalf of Greece was being debated again in Congress. Representative John Shanks of Indiana argued that the Muslim Ottomans were worthy of being U.S. enemies by comparing them to other minorities against whom Americans traditionally discriminated. Shanks remarked that these Turkish Muslims were an "Asiatic Mormon dynasty" that was able to "rule despotically over Christian nations who are as much its superior as the American is superior to the aboriginal Indian."³⁰ Shanks chose to compare Islam

to these familiar groups because they were also othered based on their race and beliefs and understood as being outside America's perception of its own identity. Now this does not mean the racial archetypes of Islam and other groups were interchangeable, as Muslims also maintained a xeno-archetype independent of these groups, but it does show that these archetypes were able to be used as politically convenient tools in an argument of comparison.

After another period of limited interaction with the Muslim world, the political use of anti-Muslim discrimination became very relevant again in 1898 when the United States annexed the Philippine Islands. This previously Spanish colony had a population of over 6.5 million people, 300,000 of which were practicing Muslims, making this the first time that the United States had knowingly ruled over Muslims.³¹ While many of the African slaves brought over during the 17th and 18th century slave trade were also Muslim, their religious identity was not well known and never recognized on a significant level.³² So, when Americans interacted with their new Muslim subjects, they did so with their xeno-archetype well in mind.

For many Americans, the chance for the U.S. to rule over "uncivilized" Muslims and other non-Christians was the golden opportunity for the nation to spread its ideals of Christianity and progress. Despite the fact that over 90% of the Filipino population was already Roman Catholic, Americans considered Christian conversion a top priority in the new colony. In a speech delivered in 1899, President William McKinley declared that America's goal in the Philippines was to "take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them."³³ From McKinley and other Americans' perspective, the U.S. was in the Philippines on a mission from God to spread Western civilization. In this context, even the relatively small Muslim population of the Philippines was an alarmingly anti-Western feature that required immediate care and attention. Senator Albert J. Beveridge also voiced his support

of America's noble mission in a speech to Congress, stating, "Were it not for such a force as this (America), the world would relapse into barbarism and night."³⁴ Again, America is upheld as the shining example of goodness on the earth that is responsible for keeping the forces of "barbarism" at bay and given the task of showing them the "light." This reoccurring dichotomy between West and East was once again defining the U.S.'s relationship to the "backward" Eastern world, but this time was to have profound effects on an actual Muslim population.

As the United States began to implement its colonial plans in the Philippines, it found it difficult to include Muslim Filipino's, known as Moros, in their plans to create a united Filipino nation-state. A Syrian-born Christian immigrant to the U.S. named Najeeb Saleeby, who was considered an expert on interacting with Muslims abroad, referred to the difficulty of integrating the Moros into Western civilization as the "Moro Problem."³⁵ Many Americans viewed the presence of Muslims in the Philippines as a challenge to U.S. rule there because they didn't think it was actually possible for "them" to live like "us." Some Americans were even opposed to the very idea of non-Christians living on U.S. controlled territory, including popular playwright H. Grattan Donnelly. Donnelly disapproved with the annexation of the Philippines, asking whether Americans could take in, "a semi-civilized horde of mixed blood-of negritos, bolo men and Mahometans (Muslims)... people who are either not willing or not able to appreciate the priceless boon for living under the American flag?"³⁶ According to Donnelly, Muslims and other "semi-whites" were simply incompatible with western civilization and unable to live the American way of life. Even though this argument was by a playwright and not a politician, it proves that there was a popular concept of "Americanness" that assumed a White Christian identity and excluded other groups based on their religion and race. The very idea of Muslims,

who supposedly couldn't be changed, living under American rule was a violation of this restrictive American identity.

With America's Christian identity in mind, the U.S. employed a policy of religious segregation in the Philippines in which they slowly granted some autonomous power to the Christian controlled areas of the islands while maintaining a military rule over the Muslim regions.³⁷ By implementing this segregationist policy, America distinguished Christians as people who could live under civilization, but marked Muslims as inherently barbaric and needing military threats to behave. In an interview in January 1902, then governor of the Philippines and future president William Howard Taft explained the division between Christians and Muslims on the islands. When asked how many of each lived in the new colony, Taft explained that it was hard to count the amount of non-Christians because "a great many of them live in the woods" and also insinuated that the Christians were the only ones who counted as actual "Filipinos."³⁸ For Taft, Christian Filipinos could be given a national identity because their religion made them relatively civilized, but the Moros living "in the woods" were somehow undefinable and not worth bothering with. On June 1, 1903, Taft passed an act that officially created a distinct Moro Province governed by its own separate military government.³⁹ This colony, which was still under martial law, was given a totally separate legal code than the Christian Philippines that took all power away from the local population. Through this policy, the U.S. government officially created a system of laws and governance that affected the legal rights of religious groups differently solely on the basis of their faith. In this way, the Muslim xeno-archetype actually manifested itself into official U.S. legislation.

The Domestic Xenotype: Excluding Muslims from U.S. Naturalization

While Americans were implementing discriminatory policies against Muslims in its overseas colonial holdings, similar religious segregation was occurring in the United States itself. The U.S. in the early 20th century was marked by a resurgence in widespread xenophobia towards all minorities in the nation. Due to anxieties towards increasing mass immigration, many Americans became concerned about the influx of minority groups, ranging from Catholics to Chinese, taking over their communities. This prompted Congress to pass the *Emergency Quota Act* in 1921 followed by the *Immigration Act of 1924*, which limited the number of immigrants to quotas by nationality. The act also created the “Asiatic Barred Zone,” which restricted anyone of Asian descent from immigrating to the U.S., including people from Arab nations.⁴⁰ Several Arab Americans, mostly Syrian Christians, had been immigrating to the U.S. since the end of the Civil War, but they still struggled to achieve citizen status. Arab’s and other minorities had consistently been denied citizenship under the *Naturalization Act of 1790*, which stated, “any alien, being a free white person, who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States... may be admitted to become a citizen thereof.”⁴¹ This act effectively restricted U.S. citizenship to only people of European descent, although it was amended in 1870 to include those of African descent as well. So, well into the 20th century, minorities such as Arabs, both Christian and Muslim, were not allowed to become U.S. citizens or be included in American identity.

However, as more Arabs petitioned for citizenship, the definition of “whiteness” began to change in respect to religion. According to legal historian Khaled A. Beydoun, the definitions of “whiteness” and “Christian” became conflated so that Arabs who could prove they were Christian were ruled “white by religion.”⁴² In a series of cases in the early 20th century, the courts

went from denying U.S. citizenship to all Arabs to just denying it to Muslim Arabs. In the 1909 case *In re Najour*, Christian Syrian Costa Najour was granted citizenship after he was declared to be “within the statutory bounds of whiteness.”⁴³ However, in the 1913 cases *Ex Parte Shadid*, Judge Smith ruled that the dark-skinned Syrian Christian Shadid was of “mixed-blood” and therefore denied him citizenship. In his ruling, Judge Smith explained that Shadid’s whiteness could not be determined because the region he was from had been tainted by the “Arabian Mahometan eruption.”⁴⁴ Shadid could not be considered white because, although he was a Christian, the judge thought he might have too much Muslim blood in him. This case shows that even the possibility of having “Muslim blood,” a phrase that makes Islam seem like a race rather than a religion, could be enough grounds for prohibiting citizenship.

The idea that religion could determine race continued to be used to deny Muslims U.S. citizenship for much of the 20th century. In 1942, when a Muslim Yemenese man named Ahmed Hassan appealed for citizenship to a Michigan court, the presiding Judge Tuttle still denied his request. Judge Tuttle argued that because “Arabia is not immediately contiguous to Europe,” despite the fact that Christian Arabs had been given citizenship, Hassan did not fall within the definition of whiteness. However, this definition did begin to change just 2 years later in the case *Ex parte Mohriez*, when the first Muslim was granted U.S. citizenship through a court appeal. In this case, the judge had reasoned that the Saudi man Mohammed Mohriez could be considered white because Arabs had lived in Europe for some time and carried down many European traditions.⁴⁵ This justification for changing naturalization policy towards Arabs is hardly satisfactory considering the long history of denying Muslims citizenship. One reason for this change may have been increased U.S. interests in the Middle East and Saudi Arabia in particular, which had just become a major supplier of oil to the U.S. during WWII.⁴⁶ If this was really the

case, then the only reason Muslims were removed from the “non-white” list was because of economic interests. By 1965, the old immigration quota system was changed, which allowed for the first major influx of Muslims to come to the country. These marked the first major changes in U.S. policy towards the Muslim world that began to go against the traditional xeno-archetype.

Despite this change in policy towards Muslim immigrants, the anti-Muslim archetype that had dictated past discrimination did not totally go away. While immigration policy was changing and the U.S. was engaging in friendlier relations with Muslim majority countries, the xeno-archetype continued in the popular American imagination. This continuing archetype can be seen in 20th century media such as films, in which Sophia Rose Arjana explains “Muslim characters are depicted as villains harassing, kidnapping, raping, terrorizing, and killing innocents, often Americans or Europeans.”⁴⁷ Similar negative images of Muslims appeared in political cartoons about U.S. foreign policy in the Muslim world, as several cartoons about the 1973-1974 oil crisis and 1979 Iranian revolution depict Muslim leaders as irrational, ancient, and barbaric.⁴⁸ While the official U.S. policies surrounding these events and the rhetoric of U.S. leaders did not necessarily reflect these negative characterizations, the very fact that they existed in the popular media suggests that the Muslim xeno-archetype continued at some level in the late 20th century. This period displayed a downward trend in anti-Muslim political rhetoric, but this hate was soon to return to the national stage.

The Muslim Xeno-Archetype in the 21st Century

The United States’ longstanding hate towards Islam and its recurring Muslim xeno-archetype explain why, after the attacks on September 11, 2001, Muslims were again quickly thrown under the light of scrutiny. These attacks were carried out by the political terrorist group Al-Qaeda, which attempted to shroud their violent acts in an extreme religious ideology. As

Richard Bonney observes, the ideological leader of Al-Qaeda, Ayman al Zawahiri, argued that they had attacked in order to wage a war on the West for the sake of promoting Islam.⁴⁹ Despite the potency of Zawahiri's message, it is hardly supported even by the most devout Muslims. With less than 1000 members at the largest estimates, Al-Qaeda's numbers are inconsequential when compared to the over 1.5 billion practicing Muslims in the world. However, the miniscule acceptance of this violent viewpoint among the world's second largest religion has not stopped U.S. policy makers from emphasizing the "Islamic nature" of terror attacks.

From 2001 on, it has been almost impossible for media outlets and politicians alike to talk about the Global War on Terror without referencing the religion of terrorists. Because terror attacks appear to be attacks on Western society itself and the American way of life, it has been easy to revert back to the xeno-archetype that dominated political discourse throughout the nation's early history. In a speech given on September 16, 2001, just 5 days after the 9/11 attacks, George W. Bush assured Americans that they would hunt down those responsible in what he referred to as a "crusade."⁵⁰ By referring to the mission to fight terrorism as a crusade, Bush brought back the medieval images of Western Christianity fighting Eastern Islam that had been brought over by early American settlers. While Bush may not have intended to put this in religious terms, this still evoked the sense that this was a war against the ancient enemy of Christianity. In fact, in another speech on October 6, 2005, Bush attempted to explain that the war on terrorism was not a war on Islam. Referring to terrorism, Bush explained, "Some call this evil Islamic radicalism... others Islamo-fascism... whatever it's called, this ideology is very different from the religion of Islam."⁵¹ While Bush was attempting to separate Islam and terrorism in this speech, he failed at doing so simply by using the word "Islamic" next to "radicalism" and "Islam" next to "fascism." Although he wasn't claiming these words as his

own terms, Bush continued to use the phrase “Islamic radicalism” to describe terrorists 5 more times in the same speech.⁵² In the past Muslims were referred to as fanatics and despots, which is the same theme seen in these terms. Bush may not have believed that Islam was authoritarian in nature, but his rhetoric still reflected an understanding that it is inherently flawed. These current misrepresentations of Islam cannot be separated from their old American origins, making them last in the public discourse.

Since the start of the War on Terror, this anti-Muslim discourse has yet to go away and has even intensified over the last elections cycles, starting with the 2008 presidential campaign. This intensifying rhetoric reflects the views of American voters, as a Pew Research poll conducted right around the beginning of the 2008 presidential primary race found that 45% of Americans would be less likely to vote for a Muslim candidate.⁵³ This fear was manifested on the national stage, with the “Muslim question” becoming an important subject of political debate. In November 2007, when former governor and presidential candidate Mitt Romney was asked if he would ever appoint a Muslim to his presidential cabinet, he responded that he “cannot see that a cabinet position would be justified” because of the small number of Muslims in the country. By stating that he doesn’t think a Muslim would represent the American populace, Romney was implying that a Muslim’s religion is their main qualifying characteristic. While the candidates in 2008 generally strayed away from making outright attacks on Islam, a tone of caution towards the religion certainly loomed over the campaign atmosphere.

The candidates’ subtle attacks on Islam did not prevent many American voters from voicing their Islamophobic suspicions. A recurring theme in the 2008 election was the accusation that Obama was actually a Muslim and was therefore disqualified to be president. Despite repeatedly expressing his Christian faith in public, then Senator Obama was repeatedly accused

by far-right voters and media outlets of being an undercover Muslim. Another Pew poll from this election found that as many as 12% of American voters believe Obama is Muslim and 51% didn't believe he was Christian.⁵⁴ These Americans seemed to believe that Obama is somehow Muslim by blood, which is likely a reflection of his African heritage, and this in turn makes him anti-American. This conflation of race and religion is directly related to past understandings of whiteness, which excluded Muslims from becoming American based solely on their race and religion. Those who challenge Obama's religion are drawing upon this old American view that being religiously Other makes one's commitment to American values suspect. In this way, many American perceptions of what it means to be Muslim in the 21st century are directly connected to the same views in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The 2008 election was the first in recent memory to challenge Islam directly, but it was really only the beginning. Anti-Muslim sentiments continued to resurface across the country more and more each year, especially in the lead up to the 2012 presidential election. The early phase of the election began with controversy over the proposed building of the Park 51 mosque near Ground Zero in New York City, which many American's viewed as offensive to the victims of 9/11. Presidential primary candidates, most notably former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, openly opposed the building of the mosque.⁵⁵ In addition, Gingrich and others raised concern over the implementation of Islamic Sharia law in the U.S.. In a July 29, 2010 speech to the American Enterprise Institute, Gingrich warned that sharia law is "a mortal threat to the survival of freedom in the United States and in the world as we know it."⁵⁶ This opposition to Sharia law on the grounds of its anti-American nature resounded well with other republicans, as they included a provision to oppose foreign laws, meaning Sharia, in their official party platform at the Republican National Convention.⁵⁷ This open opposition to Islamic law, which was

virtually an imagined threat to U.S. laws, was a clear testament to the age-old belief that Islam is incompatible with Western American democracy. This resurgent belief that the world as we know it is threatened by Islam led potential U.S. presidents to label Islam as an enemy of the state.

THE PERSISTING XENO-ARCHETYPE: THE 2016 ELECTION

This re-emerging Muslim xeno-archetype in politics didn't end after the 2012 election but continued to grow as world events brought the perceived threat of Islam to new levels in the American conscience. In the summer of 2014, the American media began reporting on the rapidly expanding organization Daesh⁵⁸, better known in the U.S. as the Islamic State or ISIS, and its takeover of Syria and Iraq. Soon after, in 2015, Daesh claimed responsibility for a series of attacks, including the Charlie Hebdo shooting in January, the Paris attacks in November, the San Bernadino shooting in December, and most recently Brussels in March 2016. This apparent rise in the terror threat was also accelerated by the massive inflow of Syrian refugees into Europe and even some into the U.S.. These new threats, which have happened to coincide with the 2016 presidential primary season, offered the perfect opportunity for anti-Muslim discourse to rise to its highest level in roughly 100 years. The current atmosphere of perceived international and domestic crisis, just like foreign policy issues in the past, has brought back the xeno-archetype to the forefront of American politics.

Since the beginning of the presidential race in early 2015, the "Muslim question" has been a major part of campaigns on both sides. The Democrats have spent a large amount of time condemning threats to Islam, but anti-Muslim rhetoric has been prevalent in the Republican side of the race. The Republican candidates have focused much of their campaigns on the issues surrounding admitting Syrian refugees, the rise of Daesh, and Daesh linked terror attacks. In

light of these national security issues, the Republican candidates have offered solutions that target the perceived Muslim nature of these threats. While much media attention has focused on Donald Trump's fiery rhetoric in particular, most of the GOP candidates are guilty of framing foreign policy discussions in terms of the Muslim xeno-archetype.

Concerning Daesh and Islamism

One of the most frequent topics throughout the entire primary race has been the question of how each candidate will address the global threat posed by Daesh. When discussing military strategies for fighting Daesh, they almost always bring up the group's Islamist ideology. While Daesh has certainly put its misinterpreted version of Islam at the front of its public image, especially by insisting on being called the "Islamic State" in the West, it is dangerous to refer to it as an Islamist organization. Islamism is a political movement across the Muslim world that supports giving Islam a place in political decisions. On the other hand, Daesh is an insurgent terror group that does not even have representation in any recognized government. Considering this difference, it does not make sense to associate a violent group like Daesh with other civil political movements in Muslim majority countries.

Despite this misunderstanding of Islamism, the GOP candidates and media outlets alike have adopted the term "radical Islamic terrorism" to describe the actions of Daesh. Senator Ted Cruz of Texas has repeatedly used this phrase in his campaign speeches and has even called out President Obama for avoiding using this term. On his congressional website, Cruz reposted a Politico article in which he called Obama "an apologist for radical Islamic terrorism" and claimed we need to recognize that ISIS has "declared war... Jihad on the United States."⁵⁹ Cruz is arguing that our president needs to highlight the Islamic nature of terrorism because the current wave of terrorism is inherently a case of religious violence. Despite the fact that the large

majority of Muslims have condemned the actions of Daesh, Cruz insists that terrorism is inseparable from Islam. This same association was made by politicians in the 1820s when discussing the Ottoman Empire, making sure to note that it was ruled by Muslims. In his previously mentioned 1822 speech, President James Monroe made sure to indicate that the Ottomans were spreading an Islamic form of despotism. It wasn't enough to condemn the Ottoman Empire, which was a long established and well recognized state, for its undemocratic actions. Instead, Monroe had to bring religion into it. The archetype of Islam that both Monroe and Cruz appeal to functions by associating all actions taken by Muslims, no matter what they are, with their religion.

In addition to highlighting the Islamic ideologies of Daesh, several candidates have focused particularly on the fact that Daesh has been targeting Christians. It is true that, in its violent takeover of Syria and Iraq, Daesh has highlighted its persecution of Christians through videos and other social media. The acts they are committing against Christians are horrific, but these acts are only a small part of the much larger violent cleansing that Daesh is conducting across the region, which has led mostly to the deaths of other Muslims. Despite Daesh's violence affecting people of all backgrounds, the GOP candidates seem to be most alarmed by attacks on Christians. In the same article cited on his congressional website, Cruz proceeds to explain that the attacks of "radical Islamic terrorists" are deliberately "targeted at Christians" and calls out Obama for not acknowledging that those killed were Christians.⁶⁰ The problem with Cruz's condemnation of Daesh's actions, which are indeed horrific, is that he insists on pointing out that this violence is Muslims killing Christians. The apparent war between Christianity and Islam that Cruz is implying was also pointed by President John Quincy Adams when he condemned the actions of the Ottoman Turks. Adams insisted on comparing the nature of Christianity and Islam

and claimed that the two religions had been at war over world domination for a thousand years.⁶¹ Both Cruz and Adams see Islam and the actions of Muslims as a direct affront to Christianity and a danger to civilization. Because of this belief, Americans are quick to bring up the urgency and religious nature of attacks anytime that they involve Muslims harming Christians, even if these atrocities harm other religious groups as well.

The issue of Daesh's attacks on Christians has gone beyond a mere framing of the global conflict between religions and has moved to suggestions that Christians fleeing violence be treated differently than Muslims doing so. In light of the Syrian refugee crisis, which has partly been caused by Daesh's persecutions, some candidates have suggested that the U.S. should admit only those refugees who are Christian. In an interview with ABC, former Governor of Florida and presidential candidate Jeb Bush suggested that the U.S. should only let in those refugees who can "prove that they are Christian." Bush further explained that Christians "aren't going to be terrorists" and if they can't prove they are Christian, then they should be "on the side of caution."⁶² According to Bush, refugees' religious identity determines if they are a threat to the U.S. and it is reasonable to save only those that are Christian. Using this same logic, in May 2015 businessman and presidential candidate Donald Trump claimed that under Obama's policies "Christians can't come into this country but Muslims can."⁶³ Not only is this a false evaluation of Obama's immigration policy, it also implies that Christians should be entering the country over Muslims.

These modern cases of favoring Christians over Muslims echo the same logic used by the U.S. government to address the "Moro Problem" in the Philippines. The U.S. divided Christian Filipinos from Muslim ones, allowing the Christians to live in a semi-democratic society while imposing martial law over their Muslim subjects.⁶⁴ The logic here was that Christian Filipinos

were more civilized and therefore more American than their Muslim counterparts, so the Christians could be better trusted to live freely in the U.S. colony. Americans were comfortable letting Christians be a part of their already Christian nation, just as they are now more willingly to let Christians take refuge in the U.S. than Muslims coming from the same war-torn region. Both then and now, Christians have been part of the American understanding of Self while Muslims have been judged through a xeno-archetype that makes them distinctly Other.

Concerning "Islamic" Terrorism

The most condemning campaign comments towards Muslims and their perceived nature have been said soon after large scale terror attacks conducted in Western nations by Daesh and their affiliates. These threatening attacks, which are meant by Daesh as affronts to Western civilization itself, have created a massive terror anxiety that has led many Americans to define these attacks based on the attackers' Muslim-ness rather than hold them individually accountable for their own violent decisions. Repeated associations in the media and politics between terrorists and their Muslim ideologies have led many Americans to believe there is something inherently violent contained in the message of Islam. When he was asked in an interview with CNN on March 10, 2016 if Islam was at war with the West, Donald Trump stated that he thinks "Islam hates us" and suggested that "it's very hard to separate" terrorists from regular Muslims.⁶⁵ Trump believes that Islam as a religion is ideologically opposed to the Western world and it is therefore difficult to distinguish all Muslims from Muslim terrorist groups. Backing up Trump after this interview, one his campaign spokeswomen, Katrina Pierson, argued, "We've allowed this propaganda to spread all through the country that this (Islam) is a religion of peace."⁶⁶ These comments support the view that Islam is a violent religion and is categorically opposed to

Western civilization. Not only is Islam unlike the West, it is also violently opposed to everything for which America stands as a nation.

This idea that Islam is inherently violent and barbaric is one of the most common tropes in the centuries old Muslim xeno-archetype. As far back as the Crusades, medieval chroniclers were describing unthinkable atrocities committed by Muslims and claiming that Islam was inherently evil.⁶⁷ This same idea was reiterated nearly 700 years later by Thomas Jefferson during the Barbary Wars when he claimed in a diplomatic letter that the “Devil assisted” Muslims in fighting American sailors.⁶⁸ Westerners have long argued that Muslims are aggressive because their faith is evil and commands them to commit violence against non-Muslims. Trump is not unique in claiming that Islam hates the West, but is instead functioning off an understanding of Islam has been handed down to him by the Western tradition.

Current politicians are also bringing back the same solutions proposed in the past to deal with the “Muslim Problem.” In his writings, John Quincy Adams had condemned the “brutish” nature of Islam and proposed that the only solution to world peace would be the annihilation of all Muslims. While Adams’s proposal of fighting violence with more violence is certainly extreme, it is not too far off from some recent suggestions. In her endorsement speech of Trump, former Alaskan governor Sarah Palin promised that Trump would “Kick Isis’ ass” after Trump himself confirmed he would send as many troops as necessary to Syria.⁶⁹ Clearly for Trump and Adams alike, the only answer to end violence committed by Muslims is to respond with equal violence.

Concerning the Syrian Refugee Crisis

While violent Muslims abroad are a major fear for many Americans, nothing scares them more than the prospect of Muslims coming to the United States. The influx of millions of Syrian refugees into Europe has made some Americans welcome them with open arms, but has scared others into locking them out. In a speech in Knoxville, Tennessee on November 16, 2015, shortly after the Paris attacks, Donald Trump told a crowd that he will not allow any Syrian migrants to enter the country.⁷⁰ The next day, when an ABC reporter asked him why he supports a ban on migrants, Trump responded that the screening process for refugees is flawed and “the problem is, we don’t know if they’re Christian or not... we have no idea who the people are.”⁷¹ By suggesting a ban on all Syrians on the basis that we would not be able to tell which one’s are Christians, Trump implied that his ban would be targeted at Muslim refugees. In fact Trump said this directly on December 8, 2015 in a speech soon after the mass shooting in San Bernardino, calling for “a total and complete shut down on Muslims entering the United States.”⁷² Trump views the desperate refugees fleeing Syria and all Muslims worldwide as a potential national security threat to the United States because of the violent acts of a handful of ideologically extreme Muslims. This proposed ban to discriminate immigration based on religion is the only logical way that Trump and his supporters see to stop the violent Muslim Other from destroying their American way of life.

Trump’s comments are extremely reminiscent of early 20th century naturalization cases, which also excluded immigrants based on their Muslim religion. The judges in these cases ruled Christians of Arab descent “white” by definition, which allowed them to become U.S. citizens, while excluding Muslims of the same ethnic background.⁷³ These Muslims were perceived as somehow un-American in these cases and Muslims now are again in threat of having their ability

to become American taken away from them. This combines all of the previous components of the Muslim xeno-archetype, from their violent nature to their inability to change, and marks Islam as a threat that Americans cannot afford to allow in their country. Trump and past Americans both operated on the assumption that Muslims are not like “us” and may even want to harm Westerners, so it only makes sense to keep “them” out of our rightful land. While there are now more Muslims living in the U.S. than ever before in U.S. history, Americans are still unfamiliar with Muslims and are scared of the prospect of them being their neighbors. For many Americans, the mysterious religion of Islam is still the opposite of Western civilization and any invitation of it into our country invites them to destroy America and its values.

CONCLUSION: THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE MUSLIM XENO-ARCHETYPE

The resurgence of anti-Muslim rhetoric in recent decades has shown that many Americans have long had a predisposition to oppose Islam, but this certainly isn't the case for all of the American public. A significant portion of Americans are not outwardly opposed to Islam, even if they do have some reserves towards the religion, and are open to Muslims becoming a part of American identity. Yet this more accepting portion of the American population does not take away from the serious influence that the Muslim xeno-archetype has had on much of the U.S. population since the founding of the nation.

When this misinformed archetype of Muslim identity recurred in America's past, it often led to actual violent and repressive action against Muslims both in the U.S. and other countries. This means that, especially in the current global climate, the xeno-archetype of Islamophobia poses a very real and serious threat to Muslims domestically and abroad, who have already received backlash and retribution in last couple decades. Other groups whom the West has constructed xeno-archetypes of have suffered to an extreme degree because of the perceived

threat they posed to Western identity. The most detrimental xeno-archetype in recent memory was that of anti-Semitism, which resulted in the infamous murder of millions of Jews in the Holocaust. While this is an extreme example of violent racism, it is not impossible that something like this could happen again. Since xeno-archetypes exist outside of time and have the potential to re-emerge in the face of crisis, it is frightening to imagine the degree to which the current hate of Islam could evolve.

In light of the recurring and potentially dangerous nature of the Muslim xeno-archetype, it is extremely important that the current anti-Muslim rhetoric be contained and combated. The best way to fight this rhetoric is to call it out for what it is; an outdated misunderstanding of the 2nd most common religion in the world. These same exact anti-Muslim arguments have been made since the formation of the Muslim xeno-archetype, making Trump and other's understanding of Islam no truer than Pope Urban II's was nearly 1000 years ago. Therefore, it is necessary, but unlikely, for America to leave behind its dangerous perception of Islam and try to understand Muslims on their own terms for a change.

¹ Walther, Karine V. *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921*. University of North Carolina Press, 2015, 43.

²Real Clear Politics. "Carson: Islam Incompatible with U.S. Law, We Shouldn't have a Muslim President." *Realclearpolitics.com*. Real Clear Politics, Sept. 20, 2015. Web.

³ Said 1.

⁴ Ibid, 7.

⁵ Bonney, Richard. *False Prophets: The 'Clash of Civilizations' and the Global War on Terror*. Peter Lang, 2008, x.

⁶ Bonney 2-4.

⁷ Stampnitzky, Lisa. *Disciplining Terror: How Experts Invented 'Terrorism'*. Cambridge University Press, 2013, 7.

⁸ Ansari, Humayun and Farid Hafez. *From the Far Right to the Mainstream: Islamophobia in Party Politics and the Media*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2012.

⁹ Lyons, Johnathan. *Islam through Western Eyes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012, Print 4.

¹⁰ Arjana, Sophia Rose. *Muslims in the Western Imagination*. New York, Oxford Press, 2015. Print, 1.

¹¹ Walther, Karine V. *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921*. University of North Carolina Press, 2015. Print.

¹² Lyons, 50.

¹³ Ibid, 53.

¹⁴ Ibid, 62.

¹⁵ Ibid, 63.

¹⁶ Walther, 10.

¹⁷ John Smith, *The True Travels, Adventures, and Observations of Captain John Smith*, 382.

¹⁸ Walther, 12.

¹⁹ Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. "American Commissioners to John Jay, 28 March 1786." Founders Online, National Archives. Source: *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 9, 1, November 1785-22 June 1786, ed. Julina P. Boyd. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954, pp. 357-359.

²⁰ Kevin J. Hayes. "How Thomas Jefferson Read the Qur'an." *Early American Literature*, Vol. 39, No. 2. University of North Carolina, 2004. 247-261.

²¹ Cited in Hayes, 259, Thomas Jefferson. *Writings*. Ed. Merrill D. Peterson. New York: Library of America 1984.

²² Walther, 36-41.

²³ Cited in Walther, 43, James Monroe December 3 1822 address.

²⁴ Walther 46.

²⁵ Daniel Webster, "The Revolution in Greece." *The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*.

²⁶ Walther, 52-53.

²⁷ Adams, "Russia," *The American Annual Registry for the Years 1827-8-9+*, 268.

²⁸ Ibid, 269. A small, yet important, detail in Adam's descriptions of these doctrines is that he uses the present tense "is" when talking about Christianity, but uses the past tense "was" when referring to Islam. This minute distinction implies that Muhammad's teachings are something of the past and are bound to fail in the future while Christ's teachings are bound to triumph and continue on for eternity.

²⁹ Ibid, 269-270.

³⁰ Cited in Walther, 64, Shanks, "Recognition of Crete," *Congressional Globe*, Session 40-3, 7 January 1869, 244.

³¹ Walther, 157.

³² Ibid, 158.

³³ Cited in Walther, 160. Rusling, "Interview with President McKinley." *Christian Advocate*, 22 January, 1903, 810.

³⁴ Cited in Walther, 160. U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record*, vol. 33, 56th Cong., 1st sess., 705, 711.

³⁵ Walther, 163.

³⁶ Cited in R. Volney Riser. "The Burdens of Being White: Empire and Disfranchisement." *Alabama Law Review*, Vol. 53.1, 254. H. Grattan Donnelly. *The Coming Empire: A Political Satire*, 6-7. 1900.

³⁷ Walther, 178.

³⁸ Cited in Walther, 179. U.S. Congress. *Affairs in the Philippine Islands*, part 1, 39.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 182.

⁴⁰ <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act>

⁴¹ <http://library.uwb.edu/static/USimmigration/1%20stat%20103.pdf>

⁴²⁴²Khaled A. Beydoun. *Between Muslim and White: The Legal Construction of Arab American Identity*, 29. Barry University, November 22, 2014. From *Social Science Research Network*. Web.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 53.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 55.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 65.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 71.

⁴⁷ Arjana, 141.

⁴⁸ Peter Gottschalk and Gabriel Greenberg. *Islamophobia: Making Muslims the Enemy*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2008, 121-125.

⁴⁹ Bonney, 2.

⁵⁰ <<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html>>

⁵¹ CNN. "Bush: Islamic Radicalism Doomed to Fail." *cnn.com*. CNN, Oct. 6, 2005.

⁵² *Ibid*.

⁵³ Religion and Public Life, *Public Expresses Mixed Views of Islam, Mormonism*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center, 2007.

⁵⁴ Cited in Austin Algernon. *America is not Post-Racial: Xenophobia, Islamophobia, and the 44th President*. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2015. Religion and Public Life Project, *Little Voter Discomfort with Romney's Mormon Religion*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center, 2012.

⁵⁵ David J. Rusin. "Islam Muslims, and the 2012 Election." *Middle East Quarterly*, vol. 20 No. 3. The Middle East Forum, summer 2013, 27.

⁵⁶ Newt Gingrich, "[America at Risk](#)," American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C., July 29, 2010

⁵⁷ Rusin, 28.

⁵⁸ I have chosen to use "Daesh," which is the Arabic acronym for the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, instead of the more common ISIS because the later emphasizes the Muslim nature of the organization. The name "Islamic State" has allowed Islam and to be conflated with this radical organization in the popular media, which is exactly the problem I am trying to address in my analysis.

⁵⁹ Cited on cruz.senate.gov, Nick Gass, "Cruz: Obama 'an Apologist for Radical Islamic Terrorists.'" *Politico.com*. Politico, Feb. 19, 2015. Web.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*.

⁶¹ Adams, 268.

⁶² Candace Smith. "Jeb Bush Says US Should Allow Syrian Refugees Who Can Prove They're Christian." abcnews.go.com. ABC, Nov. 17, 2015. Web.

⁶³ Bridge Initiative Team. "Islamophobia in the 2016 Elections." [Bridge.georgetown.edu](http://bridge.georgetown.edu). Washington D.C.: Al-Waleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding, Jan., 2016. Web.

⁶⁴ Walther, 182.

⁶⁵ David Sherfinski. "Donald Trump: 'I Think Islam Hates Us'." WashingtonTimes.com. The Washington Times, March, 10, 2016.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Lyons, 63.

⁶⁸ Jefferson and Adams, 358.

⁶⁹ Boyle, Matthew. "Sarah Palin's Fiery Iowa Endorsement of Donald Trump: Let's Stop 'Pussyfooting Around,' 'Kick ISIS's ASS,' Build Border Wall." *breitbart.com*. Breitbart, Jan. 19, 2016. Web.

⁷⁰ John Santucci and Enjoli Francis. "Trump Says He Would Ban Syrian Refugees from Entering U.S." *abcnews.go.com*. ABC News, Nov. 17, 2015. Web.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Jenna Johnson and David Weigel. "Donald Trump Calls for 'Total' Ban on Muslims entering United States." *washingtonpost.com*. The Washington Post, Dec. 8, 2015. Web.

⁷³ Beydoun, 26.