

**T.C.  
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**HOLLYWOOD FILMS REFLECTING MIDDLE EAST  
POLICY BETWEEN 1993 AND 2008**

**M.A. THESIS**

**Derya DEGER**

**Institute Main Field of Study: International Relations  
Institute Field of Study : International Relations**

**Supervisor: Professor Dr. Alaeddin YALÇINKAYA**

**JANUARY-2011**

T.C.  
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**HOLLYWOOD FILMS REFLECTING MIDDLE EAST  
POLICY BETWEEN 1993 AND 2008**

**M.A. THESIS**

**Derya DEGER**

**Institute Main Field of Study: International Relations**  
**Institute Field of Study : International Relations**

This dissertation has been accepted by the below jury by unanimity on 12.12.2011.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Yalçınkaya Prof. Dr. Emine Göky Prof. Dr. Mehmet Akperfer

**Head of Jury**

- Admission  
 Rejection  
 Amendment

**Juror**

- Admission  
 Rejection  
 Amendment

**Juror**

- Admission  
 Rejection  
 Amendment

*EMINE GÖKY*

*M. Akperfer*

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that in writing this thesis the rules of academic ethics were followed, in the case of benefiting works of other authors the referenced parts were used according to academic norms and none of the referenced parts were distorted or misrepresented. Finally, I declare that none of the parts of this thesis were presented as a thesis study in this or another university.

**Derya DEGER**

**10 January 2011**

## **PREFACE**

The Middle East which is a region has attracted the attention of many nations throughout the history. The U.S. has turned its attention to this region as well. Nevertheless through Hollywood, the U.S. has tried to find a legal basis for its actions and policies against this region. Also as a component of the culture cinema is related to the interest area of woman according to the thought of low policy. Yet it can be said that they don't have right to speak much on this component either. This study aims to present the relations between Hollywood and the U.S. Middle Eastern policy and the place of women in Hollywood films between 1993 and 2008.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my committee chair, Professor Dr. Alaeddin YALÇINKAYA, as well as to my committee members Associate Professor Dr. Emin GÜRSES from the department of International Relations at Sakarya University and Professor Dr. Mehmet ALPARGU from the department of History at Sakarya University for their guidance in the preparation of the study. Also, I wish to thank specially to my advisor, Professor Dr. Alaeddin YALÇINKAYA, whose support and encouragement have always been extremely helpful for me. In addition, special thanks are due to my friends Yağmur C. KORKUT and Ceren D. BAYKOTAN who shared with me their opinion and helped me to find the sources on the approaches given place in my study and I thank to my other friends and my students for believing in me to finish my thesis on time. Finally, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to my parents, my sister and my brother in law for their moral and material supports throughout the years of my study.

**Derya DEGER**

**10 January 2011**

## CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF PICTURES</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: POSTMODERNIST AND FEMINIST APPROACHES TOWARDS THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (IR)</b> .....	<b>8</b>
1.1. Foreign Policy from the Aspect of Postmodernism .....	8
1.2. Gender Matters from the Aspect of Feminism .....	13
<b>CHAPTER 2: POLICIES OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTS BETWEEN..... 1993 AND 2008</b> .....	<b>20</b>
2.1. The Presidential Term of William ‘Bill’ Jefferson Clinton (1993-2001) .....	20
2.2. The Presidential Term of George W. Bush (2001-2009) .....	36
<b>CHAPTER 3: HOLLYWOOD FILMS ON MIDDLE EAST POLICY</b> .....	<b>48</b>
3.1. Introduction to Hollywood Films on Middle East .....	49
3.2. Hollywood Films during the Presidency of William ‘Bill’ Jefferson Clinton.....	59
3.2.1. The Siege .....	61
3.2.1.1. The Plot of the Film .....	61
3.2.1.2. The Analysis of the Film .....	62
3.2.2. Rules of Engagement .....	65
3.2.2.1. The Plot of the Film .....	65
3.2.2.2. The Analysis of the Film .....	66
3.3. Hollywood Films during the Presidency of George W. Bush.....	70
3.3.1. Lions for Lambs .....	74
3.3.1.1. The Plot of the Film .....	74
3.3.1.2. The Analysis of the Film .....	75
3.3.2. The Kingdom .....	77
3.3.2.1. The Plot of the Film .....	77
3.3.2.2. The Analysis of the Film .....	77

<b>CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THE THESIS.....</b>	<b>97</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ABM</b>	: The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
<b>BMENA</b>	: Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative
<b>D.C.</b>	: District of Columbia
<b>EU</b>	: European Union
<b>FDR</b>	: Franklin Delano Roosevelt
<b>IAEA</b>	: International Atomic Energy Agency
<b>IGOs</b>	: Intergovernmental Organizations
<b>IR</b>	: International Relations
<b>NATO</b>	: North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
<b>NGOs</b>	: Non-Governmental Organizations
<b>NSA</b>	: National Security Advisor
<b>NYC</b>	: New York City
<b>PLO</b>	: Palestine Liberation Organization
<b>RAND</b>	: Corporation for Research and Development
<b>UN</b>	: United Nations
<b>UNSCOM</b>	: United Nations Special Commission
<b>US</b>	: United States
<b>USA</b>	: United States of America
<b>WMD</b>	: Weapons of Mass Destruction
<b>WTO</b>	: World Trade Organisation

## LIST OF PICTURES

<b>Picture 1:</b> Scene from the Middle East.....	67
<b>Picture 2:</b> Woman carrying her baby in her arms.....	68
<b>Picture 3:</b> Wounded women and children.....	68
<b>Picture 4:</b> A shoot at a target of American flag.....	70
<b>Picture 5:</b> The President George W. Bush with the Senator.....	76
<b>Picture 6:</b> Middle Easterner women.....	79



<b>Title of the Thesis:</b> Hollywood Films Reflecting Middle East Policy between 1993 and 2008	
<b>Author:</b> Derya DEGER	<b>Supervisor:</b> Prof. Dr. Alaeddin YALÇINKAYA
<b>Date:</b> 10 January 2011	<b>Nu. of pages:</b> vi (pre text) + 97 (main body)
<b>Department:</b> International Relations	<b>Subfield:</b> International Relations
<p>The States appeal to the media to make their foreign policy decisions and their acts gained legitimacy. They should be very careful while choosing the right image to make their message reached the public in the correct way. The U.S. can be claimed to be the only country using this method frequently. As one of the important tools of the media, the cinema is an effectual means. Also as being the production of popular culture, the place of cinema in postmodernism is very significant as it becomes the reflection of the zeitgeist and the mindset of the era in which the film is shot. Hollywood is the cinema industry of the US.</p> <p>There is a reciprocal relation between Hollywood and the US government. In consequence the policy goals of the U.S. are transferred to all people as they are right in their each of actions. It resembles reality instead of the real reality. It means they create an image and people begin to believe this image in the long run as it is the real reality, however it is not. Film themes of Hollywood change according to the policy of the era. While in the 1950s the theme was Nazis, in the 1980s it was about communists. And today it is about Middle Easterners and the terrorists. Hence it can be said that Hollywood reflects the policy of the president of the USA as to the each presidential terms. As formerly known women are kept in the background. Although cinema being a product of culture is one of the issues dealing with the low policy which is seen as womanish area, the male dominancy easily can be observed in cinema as well.</p> <p>Deriving from the above facts, the aim of the study is to show whether there is a mutual relation between Hollywood and the U.S. government or not and how in those films the description of woman, especially Middle Easterner woman, is formed in those two presidential terms of Clinton and Bush from the perspective of feminism. To reach a conclusion, qualitative research method shall be used and many written and visual documents shall be analyzed.</p> <p>The research problem of this study requires determining what variants of postmodernism and feminism will be used as they have a wide range of use in International Relations field. In this study, as a product of postmodernism, Hollywood films on Middle East named <i>The Siege</i> (1998), <i>Rules for Engagement</i> (2000), <i>Lions for Lambs</i> (2007) and <i>The Kingdom</i> (2007) shall be analyzed during the presidential terms of Clinton and Bush and under postmodernism aspect in IR, how the U.S. appeals to films and needs Other to create an identity and find a legitimate base for its actions. Under the feminist perspective, women, particularly Middle Easterner women shall be observed and it shall be tried to find out how they are depicted in the films, what their places are and how their depiction affects the audience.</p> <p>Hereby, it can be suggested that as formerly known there is both a close and a mutual relation between Hollywood and the policies of the President of the era. Although Clinton had a milder policy in the Middle East, the events experienced within the nation during his presidency made the citizens of America feel the threat of terrorism at their home. The successor Bush had a more severe policy towards the Middle East, and 9/11 attacks gave a legal basis to implement his actions. Thus the images depicting the Middle Easterner are always what they, the Americans, are not. Via this the U.S. creates its identity by oppressing the Other and the U.S. strengthens its power once more time. The conditions of women in Middle East are also depicted as being worthless in Hollywood films. Thus it glorifies the American women; however they are not being behaved equal with the American men.</p>	
<b>Keywords:</b> Hollywood, Middle East, Feminism, Postmodernism, Terrorism	

<b>Tezin Başlığı:</b> 1993 ve 2008 yılları arasında Orta Doğu Politikasını Yansıtan Hollywood Filmleri	
<b>Tezin Yazarı:</b> Derya DEGER	<b>Danışman:</b> Prof. Dr. Alaeddin YALÇINKAYA
<b>Kabul Tarihi:</b> 10 Ocak 2011	<b>Sayfa Sayısı:</b> vi (ön kısım) + 97 (tez)
<b>Anabilimdalı:</b> Uluslararası İlişkiler	<b>Bilimdalı:</b> Uluslararası İlişkiler
<p>Devletler dış politika kararlarını ve müdahalelerini yasal temele dayandırabilmek için medyaya başvururlar. Fakat vermek istedikleri mesajın halka doğru iletilebilmesi için doğru imgeleri seçmek zorundadırlar. Bu yöntemi sıklıkla kullanan tek ülkenin Birleşik Devletler olduğu söylenebilir. Medyanın önemli araçlarından bir tanesi de etkili bir araç olan sinemadır. Popüler kültür ürünü de olan sinemanın çağın ruhunu ve dönemin zihniyetini yansıtmaya nedeniyle postmodernizm içerisinde önemli bir yeri vardır. Hollywood'da Birleşik Devletlerin sinema endüstrisidir.</p> <p>Hollywood ve Birleşik Devletler hükümeti arasında karşılıklı bir ilişki mevcuttur. Sonuç olarak yaptıkları tüm müdahalelerde haklıymışçasına Birleşik Devletlerin politik hedefleri insanlara aktarılır. Bu durum gerçek hakikatin kendisi olmasa da bu gerçek, hakikate benzer. Yani bir imge yaratarak, bu imge gerçek hakikat olmasa da onun öyle olduğuna insanlar zamanla inanmaya başlar. Hollywood'un film konuları da dönemin politikasına göre değişiklik gösterir. 1950'lerde film konusu Nazi iken, 1980'lerde komünistler olmuştur. Ve bugün ise konusu Orta Doğular ve teröristler olmuştur. Buna göre, Hollywood'un tüm Amerikan başkanlarının başkanlık dönemini yansıttığı iddia edilebilir. Önceden de bilindiği gibi kadınlar ise hep geri planda kalmıştır. Bir kültür ürünü olan sinema, bir kadın alanı olarak görülen düşük politikanın ilgi alanlarından bir tanesi olmasına karşın, sinemada da erkek egemenliği kolaylıkla farkına varılmaktadır.</p> <p>Bu gerçeklerden hareket ederek, çalışmanın amacı, feminizm bakışı altında Clinton ve Bush'un başkanlık dönemlerinde Hollywood ve Birleşik Devletlerin arasında karşılıklı bir ilişkinin olup olmadığı ve bu filmlerde kadın tanımlamasının, özellikle Orta Doğulu kadın tanımlamasının, nasıl yapıldığını göstermektir. Sonuca ulaşmak için ise nitel analiz yöntemi kullanılacak olup, bir çok yazılı ve görsel belge incelenecektir.</p> <p>Çalışmanın araştırma sorunu, Uluslararası İlişkiler alanında kullanım çeşitliliği fazla olduğu için çalışmada postmodernizm ve feminizmin hangi dalının kullanılacağına belirlenmesini gerektirir. Çalışmada, postmodernizmin bir ürünü olarak, Clinton ve Bush'un başkanlık dönemlerindeki Orta Doğu konulu <i>Kuşatma</i> (1998), <i>Vur Emri</i> (2000), <i>Arslanı Kuzuları</i> (2007) ve <i>Krallık</i> (2007) Hollywood filmlerinin ve Uluslararası İlişkilerde feminist bakışı altında bunların nasıl şekillendiği, Birleşik Devletlerin kimlik oluşturmak ve müdahalelerine yasal dayanak oluşturmak için nasıl filmlere başvurduğu ve Ötekilere nasıl ihtiyaç duyduğu araştırılacaktır. Ayrıca feminist bakışı altında filmlerde, kadınlar, özellikle Orta Doğulu kadınlar, incelenecek ve filmlerde nasıl tanımlandırıldıkları, yerlerinin ne olduğu ve tanımlarının izleyiciyi nasıl etkilediği ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışılacaktır.</p> <p>Sonuç olarak, önceden de belirtildiği gibi Hollywood ve dönemin Amerikan Başkanlarının politikaları arasında sıkı ve karşılıklı bir ilişki vardır. Clinton'ın Orta Doğu politikası daha ılımlı olmasına karşın, başkanlık döneminde ülke içerisinde yaşanan olaylar Amerikan halkını evlerinde terör tehlikesini hissetmesine neden olmuştur. Halefi olan Bush ise Orta Doğu'ya karşı daha sert bir tutum izlemiştir ve 9/11 saldırıları müdahaleleri için yasal bir dayanak oluşturmuştur. Bu nedenle, Orta Doğulu tanımlayan imgeleri her zaman Amerikanlıların tanımlarının tersi olmuştur. Bu sayede Birleşik Devletler Ötekilere baskı kurarak bir kez daha kimliklerini oluşturmakta ve Birleşik Devletlerin gücünü güçlendirmektedir. Amerikan erkekleri ile eşit davranılmasa da, bu sayede yine de Amerikan kadınına yüceltmektedir.</p>	
<b>Anahtar kelimeler:</b> Hollywood, Orta Doğu, Feminizm, Postmodernizm, Terörizm	

## INTRODUCTION

The President of the USA, who is at the centre of decision making process for American foreign policy, is the determiner and executive of foreign policy in spite of some constraints of the Congress. Taking this power from the Constitution, the President determines how foreign policy will be shaped according to the president's personality, experiences and world opinion. This is an important factor for deciding the foreign policy team and the priorities in foreign policy. Another factor determining the role of the President in this process is the president's relationship with the foreign policy team. Again it is the President who will determine what a kind of relationship will be between him/her and the chosen team and with whom he/she will work from this team. Thus the President decides whether an active foreign policy will be followed or not and whether he/she will be in an active role for implementing this policy or not.

Consequently the 42<sup>nd</sup> President of the USA Bill Clinton, because of his past experiences and world view, did not see foreign policy geo-strategically important in his first years in presidency. This has been reflected on the selection of his foreign policy team and his priorities in foreign policy. But because of his experiences gained in his first term and his changing world view, Clinton changed his foreign policy team radically and played an active role in foreign policy in his second term. Bush who became the President after Clinton and the 43<sup>rd</sup> President of the USA had a different personality and world view from Clinton. For this reason he worked with a more different foreign team and this became the reason for changing in his priorities in foreign policy.

Clinton and his foreign policy team shared the opinion that international order in new period would be gained via the countries which depended on human rights and cooperate economically. For this reason during his presidency Clinton signed many agreements on the field of economy with other countries and for international problems he developed policies when human rights and democracy got into a threat. Also economical restrictions were imposed in order to improve economy and this reflected on foreign policy. For instance the number of military bases of America in other countries was decreased gradually, foreign aids were arranged and radical changes were made in this policy. He did not play an active role in foreign policy, but he and his team were criticized seriously to focus on resolving the disputes between Israel and Palestinians (Levy, 2002) and he tried to make peace in the Middle East. Nevertheless his country felt the threat of terrorism within their soil through the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center bombed by the Arab terrorist in 1993 and the "Federal

Building in Oklahoma City was destroyed in 1995” and this was resulted in killing 168 innocents (Lader, 2009: 246). In sum, unlike his successor, President Clinton did not give much importance to the foreign policy, did not play an active role in the foreign policy of the country.

Republican George W. Bush who won the election of 2000 had no foreign policy experience like Clinton, on the contrary as a president Bush with his foreign policy team gave the signals that differing from the foreign policy of Clinton they would give importance to foreign policy and play an active role in foreign policy. Consequently September 11 attacks gave a chance for this. After these events the target of Bush and his foreign policy team who followed policies of “war on terrorism” were against the Muslims who are especially in the Middle East.

Thus both presidents, Clinton and Bush turned their attention to the Middle East under their foreign policy. Yet their methods were different. The former followed a milder policy towards the Middle East, the latter’s foreign policy towards the Middle East can be claimed to be contrary to what Clinton did.

Whether taking an active role or not in the foreign policy, the Middle East region has been an important region for the USA. The Middle East has two geographical description as a narrow and broaden one; in narrow description Middle East includes only 12 Arabian countries (Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Palestine and Egypt) and Israel; on the other hand in broaden description Middle East begins from the line of Turkey, Syria, Lebanon to the border of the Far East by covering North African countries and includes Arabian peninsula. Middle East with China and India is one of the oldest culture and civilization centers of the world. Middle East which was at the center of the old world and at the transition point of tribes had a natural structure for civilization. Accordingly because of its richness, Middle East has become the target of many civilizations throughout history. For these reasons, in the region of Middle East administrations and administrators, religions and believers, societies and cultures have been in a continuous change and transformation. Thus the region has various ethnical, religious and cultural structures. As seen in today, this situation has continued throughout the history (Ural, 2009).

The region can be said as large as the United States, spreading to an extensive area. The area was a cradle to three major religions, a language and an alphabet. Today 70

% of the population of the most countries in the region has a young generation, in a word, population under the age of 30. "Most share a common language, cultural heritage, history and religion (Islam). Though the vast most majority of them are Muslims, about 15 million of them are Christians, reside there as well" (Shaheen, 2001: 3).

Middle East having been the home of many civilizations all through the history has turned into a permanent rivalry area of the big powers for its oil and other energy reserves which are an inseparable raw material of the industrialization and mass production process together with its many other by-products (Bozkurt, 2006).

In fact it can be said that the interest of the USA towards the Middle East began in the 1920s. After oil had been discovered in the Middle East in the 1920s, USA oil companies began to get interested in this region in order to have a share from this oil. But the real interest of the USA both militarily and politically towards this region had begun after the World War II. In 1990, after the collapse of USSR, Iraq and Iran were realized as a new threat. Generally, during the Cold War, Middle East had become a region where power struggles were made by both polars according to the bipolar world order policy (Ural, 2009).

September 11 attacks have given the signals that a period in international relations came to an end and "once the USA became the only super power, a unipolar period began. There are discussions on what kind of world order will be and how the administration will be shaped in this new period" (Bacık, 2006: 37). In view of that, "11 September 2001 attacks have become a milestone and a source of legitimization for the USA while performing its policy over other nations" (Yalçınkaya, 2006: 344).

All the same international system gained a new dimension at end of the collapse of USSR. One of the most important points of this new era has been globalization. Globalization has opened the way to live the affects of all problems and their solutions at individual level together. Any security problem or social, political and economic problem in any region of the world does not affect only the relevant region or nation but also all people in a particular degree anymore, nevertheless it affects in somehow. Herewith globalization has brought concepts such as open society, democracy, human rights, liberalism in to universal values. Threat perception has been also changed in this new era. New threats have begun to be perceived as terrorism, spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug traffic, ethnical and religious hatred, attacks

of rogue countries and environmental corruption. Also the possibility for having chemical and biological weapons not just by the states but also by the terrorists groups easily has become the reason for redefinition of the concepts such as threat and deterrence (Ural, 2009).

After the end of Cold War, the United States has become the only super nation which has the capacity to interfere in each region of the world (Kissenger, 2006). In other words after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, USA has become the only universal power dominating the world policy. America perceived this era as “New World Order” which contained the USA’s militarily, political, diplomatic, judicial, technological, economical and commercial supremacy over the world. In order to preserve this new world, the USA would interfere in any attacks aimed to demolish this order. For this reasons the USA began to define its new policy in order to remove these new threats. Concepts such as liberal democracy, universal peace, and respect to human rights have become the concepts to be used in the New World Order by the USA. Thus as to Yalçinkaya (2006: 344) emphasized “the collapse of the Soviet system has become the negative aspect of leaving the USA as only super power, whereas, September 11 attacks have become the positive reason of this.”

Along with these in order to legalize the action carried by the President in the public eye, the governments usually appeal to the media as well. Among the other states, the USA is the most successful state using this via the media, especially cinema. Having Hollywood, the most effecter institution, the USA governments have been trying to legalize their action since the first emergence of the film.

Cinema which is a significant element of postmodernism is very effectual to create an image in the minds of the people. It doesn’t play a neutral role in the production of information or its transmission or reflecting the outer reality. The states make the danger and threats from out felt by its people. Nevertheless it can be said that cinema presents scenes, illusions, archives scenes and simulations resembling the reality instead of the real reality. In order to create their identity, the state needs the media, especially cinema. For these reasons there is a close relationship between the USA government and Hollywood.

As a result of postmodernity, we can see a new and awkwardly productive association between technology and culture. As Rosi Braidotti emphasizes “approaching the issue of technology consequently requires a shift of perspective” (Braidotti, 1996:1). It is

accepted that because of the death of the God a domino effect can be observed in the distinction between mind and body, the family, masculine authority, the femininity and compulsory heterosexuality. "These metaphysically founded certainties have floundered and made no room for something more complex, more playful and infinitely more disturbing" (Braidotti, 1996:3). Thus if God is dead, anything goes. In this sense it can be affirmed that because of the recognition of the dissymmetrical relationship between sexes, in this postmodern world, feminists rejected the universalistic inclination on masculine and feminine viewpoint. "Postmodernism is a concept for understanding social change" (McRobbie, 1994: 521). As the product of postmodernism, popular culture can be said as the reflection of values and beliefs of the most part of the community. It is like a "Funhouse Mirror" which both reflects our image back to us and also alters our image in the process of practicing it. So mindset is a vital concept for understanding "Funhouse Mirror". That is to say, mindset is the actions determined by culture and thus the values attached to the new phenomenon. In other words, mindsets are formed by our individual experiences and our cultures.

In this respect the emergence of American postmodernism can be seen in "New Times politics in the late 1980s and early 1990s with its interest in consumerism, identity, ethnicity and with the critique of essentialism, be relation to gender, class, or ethnicity" (McRobbie, 1994: 521). And feminists have been influenced by postmodern thought and poststructuralist which emphasize on language and also are central to Hall's account of fractured identity. It has been argued that sex and gender are social and cultural constructions which are not to be explained in terms of biology or to be reduced to the functions of capitalism. This includes poststructuralist psychoanalysis, which has been drawn upon to connect the inside with the outside of gender construction (Barker, 2000: 227). As one of the most important poststructuralist feminists Helene Cixous and Luce Irigaray go on to emphasize that women, historically limited to being sexual objects for men have been prevented from expressing their sexuality in itself or for themselves. For them if women are to discover and express who they are, to bring to the surface what masculine history has repressed in them, they must begin with their sexuality.

Under these facts, it can be said that one of the elements of popular culture "cinema" is the reflection in this way to expose and highlights our cultural beliefs and values. So from post- Cold War Era untill 2009, Clinton and Bush were in the chair in the USA. During their presidencies, we see different kind of perspectives and mindset of the era.

In this study by analyzing four Hollywood films on Middle East named *The Siege* (1998), *Rules for Engagement* (2000), *Lions for Lambs* (2007) and *The Kingdom* (2007), it is tried to be presented whether there is any difference regarding the mindset of the period of their presidency to reflect and alter the mind of people and the zeitgeist or not. As a means of demonstration, it is tried to be illustrated how Hollywood reflects the mindset against Middle Easterner women, and how their roles, status are shown during two different presidential terms and how the audience perceive these.

### **Scope of the Study**

The scope of the study is to illustrate how Hollywood reflects the mindset against Middle East women, and how their roles and status are described during the presidential terms of Clinton and Bush. In the study, Hollywood films on the theme of Middle East have been scrutinized critically to perceive the two presidents' foreign policy oriented towards the Middle East and the status of Middle Eastern women in this policy. In order to gain idea about these, in the first chapter postmodernism and feminism are explained. After the explanations, the Presidential terms of Clinton and Bush are mentioned briefly. Here their foreign policies, especially towards the Middle East, and their domestic policies are pointed out in a few words. In the following chapter it is stated how Hollywood is important in order to shape the minds of people and create the identity of a nation and how Middle Eastern women are given place in those films and how the audience regard these.

### **Importance of the Study**

Middle East, being an important region for all nations throughout the history, became the interest area of the USA particularly after the discovery of oil in that region. In the aftermath of Post Cold War era, the USA realized the Middle East region as a threat. Particularly when they felt the terrorist attacks made by the Middle Easterners within their soils, they directed their attention and began to implement their policies towards this region. The USA governments began to use various methods; one of them is cinema, to legitimize their actions in the region in the eyes of the public. The importance of this study lies in presenting the relations between Hollywood and the USA government between 1993 and 2008 and exemplifying the status of Middle Easterner women in those films.



### **Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study is to demonstrate that there is a close relationship between Hollywood and the USA governments and Middle Easterners women are described as being oppressed by their male partners. In fact two sides are being nourished from each other. Considering these facts the research questions that “how the Middle East image is in the eye of Americans” and “how this image has been reflected in Hollywood films during Clinton’s and Bush’s presidential periods between 1993 and 2008” and “how the Middle Easterner women are being described in Hollywood films”. As a result the questions will be tried to be answered.

### **Method**

In this study qualitative research method is used. The written and visual materials about the subject of the study- books, journals, articles, official documents, films and internet resources- are scrutinized critically and used as references in building up the base of the thesis.

# **CHAPTER 1: POSTMODERNIST AND FEMINIST APPROACHES TOWARDS THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (IR)**

## **1.1. Foreign Policy from the Aspect of Postmodernism**

There is not a consensus among theorists on what postmodernism really means as there is a dispute on the meaning of postmodernism in IR. Many thinkers such as David Campbell see postmodernism not as a work of a particular group of thinkers but as an important base of foreign policy and the concept of postmodernism “functions as a way of directing our attention and establishing a negative disposition toward a set of characteristics with which we would all be concerned were they to be unproblematically advocated by anyone” (Campbell, 1998:212). According to some theorists, postmodernism doesn't refer to an absence of seriousness and a kind of political immorality or irresponsibility, but it resembles a critique because it forces precisely this kind “of response, either urgently to redefine and defend the political and intellectual formation of modernity, or else, having subjected to scrutiny the great pillars of thinking which have supported the project of modernity, to stand back and ask ‘What’s going on?’” (McRobbie,1994:62). Or for others postmodernism is contended with that there can be no “commensurability in theory, knowledge or purpose. These dissipate amid a montage of differing interests, opposing views, contrasting perceptions and dissimilar cultural enclaves, makes theory a latent tool of those who wield it” (Jarvis,2000: 4). Thus as it is seen postmodernism has a great deal of contribution to the IR.

Steve Smith (1997) summarizes these contributions under four points in his “Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory”. According to him, postmodernism's first offer to IR is that international relations can say a lot of views about the nature of identity. Then postmodernism can make a connection between international relations theory with the other works of social sciences and political and social theory by problematizing the simple assumptions about how knowledge is created and anchored. Thirdly, postmodernism is also concerned with which is usually leaved out from international relations, such as ethics, gender, race, economics and sexuality. And finally, postmodernism has a massive contribution to the relationship between knowledge and power (Smith, 1997). Unlike from these, Stanley Aronowitz (1989) has tried to show the relations between postmodernism and politics in his “Postmodernism and Politics” as remarking that a great deal of changes have taken place since World War II which was a period when big powers such as “the USA, the

United Kingdom and the Soviet Union closed the war period in Yalta and Postdam conferences in case of not having occurred an important dispute” (Yalçinkaya, 1997:121) and this has been resulted in a major change in the political and cultural problematic.

It is even asserted that postmodernism includes four different descriptions within itself at the same time. First of all it is a historical period from World War II to the present. This period includes Vietnam War, global economic recessions in the 1970s and the 1980s, the increase of conservative political regimes in Europe and America, the fail of the Left and the increase of the racism in the world. Secondly, there is a referent to a new logic, new types of communication and multiculturalism of the late capitalism. Thirdly, movements in social theories, which are against the cliché of classic realist and modernist formations in visual arts, architecture, cinema and popular music, are emphasized. Lastly writings and theorizations on pre-positivism interpretative and critical society are implied (Karadoğan, 2005).

Moreover postmodernism is perceived as the latest *bête noire* of IR by many critics; however, here its several contributions to the IR will be tried to be presented (Devetak, 2001). Textuality which stems mainly from Derrida is a common postmodern term. By using text in fact Derrida means the world is like a text, that is, real world is formed like text, so no one can attribute to this real world without an interpretive experience. For this reason, postmodernism gives importance to interpretation to constitute the social world (Devetak, 2001). Derrida uses the statement of Montaigne to make clear it by saying people need to interpret interpretations more than to interpret things (Derrida, 1978). All the same texts are compared with other similar texts. For this reason definition of the concept of representing of reality becomes difficult as it is not definite and clear what, if any, reality is objective (Klimenkova, 1992). Thus in order to scrutinize textual analysis, deconstruction and double reading are two significant methods in postmodernism.

Deconstruction’s main focus is to show the “effects and costs produced by the settled concepts and oppositions, to disclose the parasitical relationship between opposed terms, and to attempt a displacement of them” (Devetak, 2001:187). According to this view, there is an inevitable hierarchical relation between two opposed terms, as a result one side becomes the privileged side, whereas, the other becomes the subordinated term. What’s more, Derrida tried to describe the relations between stability-effects and destabilizations by passing through double reading in any analysis. The first reading is

about demonstrating how a text, discourse or institutions complete the stability-effect. In other words, it demonstrates how the identity of a text, discourse or institution is formed and constituted. In addition to this the second reading displays the internal tension and how they are covered over or dismissed. "The text , discourse or institution is never completely at one with itself, but always carries within its elements of tension and crisis which render the whole thing less than stable" (Devetak, 2001:188).

One of the outstanding authors of postmodernism Michel Foucault affirmed a provoking idea that discourses and words form objects which began to be used in IR in the 1980's and has led to the thought analyses of international relations and to theoretical and epistemological discussions of IR theories. And at the base of this thought the relationship between words and reality has laid (LaBranche, 2002). Foucault who wrote in *Archaeology of Knowledge* remarked that discourses and words were not just a symbol but practices shaping the objects which they meant. Thus he among many others helped us to understand that the language and discourses shape and create our reality. For many thinkers of postmodernism in IR, postmodernism consists of the efforts to combine the shift in the object of knowledge from society to language with the identification of new political agents (Aronowitz, 1989).

As to Foucault power and knowledge mean directly one another, that is, they are mutually supportive. In fact he thought that those practices and power clearly defined themselves differently according to the different paradigms. Thinkers like Richard Ashley have tried to find out the relation between paradigms of sovereignty with modern political life. The overall theory and practice of IR are stated by the constitutive principle of sovereignty. State sovereignty gains different concept via different configurations of power and knowledge which are presented by various episodes. So state sovereignty does not have a fixed meaning and does not depend on the presence of a foundational political community; on the contrary it depends on the practices of power and knowledge (Devetak, 2001).

Moreover power in postmodernism is rooted in uncertainty and ambiguity, not in material capabilities, institutional assets or expressions of violent governmental force. Their roles are very important for power in postmodernism. According to Foucault there is a mutual relationship between knowledge and power so that "knowledge is indissociable from regimes of power. Knowledge is formed within the practices of power and is constitutive of the development, refinement and proliferation of new techniques of power (Barker, 2000: 80).

Except for the notion of power and knowledge genealogy is also an important notion for many postmodern views in IR. In fact genealogy is a historical thought style exposing and registering the significance of power and knowledge relations. Roland Bleiker (2000:25) describes genealogy as “the focus on the process by which we have constructed origins and given meaning to particular representations of the past, representation that continuously guide our daily lives and set clear limits to political and social options” and history from genealogy perspective is full of endlessly repeated domination plays but in knowledge and power. So there is not a single history but “many interwoven histories varied in their rhythm, tempo and power-knowledge effect” (Devetak, 2001: 183-4) and also according to this view there is no single truth but only competing perspectives.

As known, international relations has been interested in the issue of states, sovereignty and violence for a long time. These can also be regarded as the milestones of the IR thinking. Moreover these are the focal points in postmodern approaches for the study of IR. Unlike from traditional approaches, postmodern approach renews them in the concepts from genealogy to deconstruction. And so postmodernism makes searches on the interpretation and explanations of the sovereign state of which historical constitution has been one of the main points of world politics. In addition, postmodernism seeks to find out the relations between the state and its effects on the experience of daily life. This can be called as a phenomenological or “quasi-phenomenology” of which explanation consists of four main points as violence, boundaries, identity and statecraft. By this way, we can have an idea on the sovereign state’s (re)construction as the normal issue in IR.

In modern politics, the reason is seen as the measure of legitimacy. But many thinkers have a thought that the relations between politics and violence in modernity are indefinite. On the one hand violence is perceived as the shelter of the sovereign community, on the other hand it is something from which the citizens should be protected. So there is a dilemma in this relationship in the modern states. For traditional view, violence is a natural occurrence in the IR. It only changes the territorial configuration or is seen as an instrument for the relations between power and politics and distribution of hierarchy. Unlike from this view, postmodernism reveals the violence constitutive role in modern policy. Accordingly it is both introductory and augmentative (Devetak, 2001).

Additionally, postmodern approach is concerned with the discourses and practices substituting threat and danger for difference to form the political identity. So discourse, being a social construction of reality, is one of the most important main themes of postmodernism. All things are to write a narration about another narration. "This quasi-biblical importance attached to the Word is both the approach's strongest weapon and its Achilles' heel" (LaBranche, 2002: 67). Devetak explains this by stating "Geopolitical discourse constructs worlds in terms of Self and Others, in terms of cartographically specifiable sections of political space, and in terms of military threats. The geopolitical creation of the external other is integral to the constitution of a political identity (self) which is to be made secure" (Devetak, 2001: 195). For David Campbell sovereign state depends on the discourse of danger and threat, and its constant articulation through the foreign policy of the state is not a threat to state's identity but "it is its condition of possibility" (Devetak, 2001: 195). Nonetheless, quietening the internal dispute is constantly required to establish a singular and consistent political identity. The reason is that there can be internal others that cause danger for the self; so they are to inevitably expelled or contained. Accordingly there is a strong relationship between the containment of domestic and foreign others to constitute a political identity.

As Joan Hoff emphasizes in his "American Diplomacy from a Postmodern Perspective", when a country suffers from a doubt on national identity or in other words, psychic crises, the country prefers war in order to prove national identity and a short term therapeutic relief from psychic crisis is gained (Hoff, 19??). In other way of explaining, the state where its people have an instable identity, in order to prevent the instability and disorder, bases always its foreign policy on the existence of "outer enemy nations" or "outer threats". They are essential for the inside to built a common "us" and "friendship". For this reason in order to create an identity a boundary between "inside" and "outside", "self" and "other", "we" and "they", and "domestic" and "foreign" are needed to be fixed. Roxanne Lynn Doty described in her *Imperial Encounters* the division between "we" and "they" by emphasizing;

"We" of the West are not inefficient, corrupt, or dependent on a benevolent international society for our existence. "We" are the unquestioned upholders of human rights. "We" attained positions of privilege and authority as a result of our capacities. "We" of the West are different from "them". "Their" fate could not befall "us". "They" can succeed only if "they" become more like "us" (Doty, 1996:162).

That is, "they" are the ones what "we" are not. Therefore as it is understood political identity requires prevailing discourse and practices of security and foreign policy. The relation to the other even can be seen as a relation loaded morally and politically. The

outcome of this is to put the other to an inferior moral space and the self to a superior one. Also through multiple strategies of otherness identities only existed in locations having been defined historically and spatially are given rise. By this way foreign policy is made possible (Campbell, 1998).

For Campbell, within the discipline of international relations there is a widely recognized if imperfectly understood “Hobbesian tradition a tradition in which Hobbes is regarded as having providing the pivotal images of anarchy, conflict, the state of nature, and the war that are taken to be the conditions of possibility for international relations and our conventional understanding of foreign policy” (Campbell, 1998: 53). Hence the inferences for international relations are claimed to be developed from the transference of Hobbes’ perceptive of individuals within the state to the realm of relations between states. As Jennifer Sterling Folker and Rosemary E. Shinko (2005) express the relation between power and modes of subjectivity in their article; power hence works to form subjects being free to generate themselves. In addition,

“Doubt gives those confronted with knowledge claims pause to rethink their presumptions, assumptions and conclusions. Such a pause opens the space to think things anew and it also provides a space for a multiplicity of views to emerge. Together, doubt and multiplicity operate as political resources to resist and transgress current modes of subjectivity. The postmodern conceptualization of power ultimately relies upon the ability of individual thought to ‘present it [power] to oneself as an object of thought and question it as to its meaning, its conditions, and its goals’. [...]Thus the expression of difference opens the space wherein the individual can confront the existing web of power relations with an expression of that which it (the existing set of power relations) has yet to know, yet to discipline within its established set of practices” (Folker and Shinko,2005: 655-56).

Moreover postmodernism seeks an answer to the question how the state has been made to appear as if it were an essence. The answer to this question by Devetak is “by performative enactment of various domestic and foreign policies, or what might more simply be called “statecraft”, with the emphasis on “craft”” (Devetak, 2001: 196-7). Statecraft traditionally means to various policies and practices undertaken by states to perform their goals in international area, whereas, statecraft from the perspective of postmodernism means to the ongoing political practices of the states. So for postmodernism there is statecraft, but no completed state.

## **1.2. Gender Matters from the Aspect of Feminism**

In the late twentieth century woman realized that they had a problem that had no name. Especially in the late 50s almost all women in the U.S. recognized they were facing a problem that they could not confess even to themselves. In fact their dreams were to

get married, have four children and live in a nice house in a nice suburb. But then they became aware that they wanted something more than husband, children and home (Friedan, 1963). Hence scholars began to study on this issue. Over the past two decades feminism has made refreshing, often radical contributions to the study of International Relations. The debates in the study of IR in the late 1980s formed a space for feminists; however a varied tradition of feminist thought goes back to at least the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Even the word of “feminism” took its place in Oxford English Dictionary in 1894 (Alatl, 2009). Thus briefly it can be said that feminism gained a place in IR theory in the 1980s, however it has a much longer history (Ackerly et al., 2006).

Since the late 1980s, feminist scholars have paved the way for serious engagement with gender and theory in a previously gender-blind and theoretically abstract IR field. Since the beginning of the 1990's, IR feminist scholars have examined the deconstruction of IR literature and found out that there is a linkage between gender dichotomies, stereotypes and practices and concurrently all these are wholly unaware of gender. As Stern claims that “deconstruction makes gender relations visible by overturning the oppositional logic that mystifies categories like woman/man, domestic/international and peace/war” (Ackerly et al., 2006: 110). Thus feminism is no longer a rare import but a well-established approach within IR and new contributions to the texts on IR from the view of feminism have begun to be seen (Ackerly et al., 2006).

Also it can be said that feminist theoretical approach has been indirectly influenced by international women's social movements. As it is well known, a social movement is a concerted effort among groups to gain political, social and economic change. In the United States these movements have been closely related to civil rights movement. What's more, the early suffrage movements in the U.S. and Europe were facilitated by several international organizations such as the International Council of Women founded in 1888, the International Women's Suffrage Alliance founded in 1904, and the International Women's League for Peace and Freedom founded in 1916. So it can be asserted that these have influenced the feminist approach. These movements have been facilitated by IGOs and NGOs leded women's status to improve globally. So it can be concluded that they are effective on feminist theoretical approach in two ways. Firstly, it made women venture outside of their traditional gender roles, become lawyers, professors and politicians. Secondly, these movements showed how powerful social constructions were in shaping our perception on social, political and economic world. Although legal barriers have been demolished, women are still not paid equally



and are still underrepresented in positions of economic and political power. Thus it can be said that relationship between male and feminine is one of dominance and subordination and of superiority and inferiority (Pease and Pease,2008 91-2). In recent years women have organized internationally to promote women's human rights. This rights discourse is ever more being adopted by NGOs all over the world. However some feminists' thinkers reject the idea of rights discourse as they think that this is highly individualistic and based on male experiences.

Although the question "where are women?" is an easy one, as to Enloe many secrets on local and international policy, economy and generally running of the world are behind this question (Enloe, 2003). For Friedan;

"The problem lay buried, unspoken, for many years in the minds of American women. It was strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night-she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question-Is this all?" (Friedan, 1963: 11)

When these are asked with a feminist concern this simple question leads us to surprising results. There are many definitions and descriptions of feminism, in other words it has many variant strands. Although feminist theories have different perspectives from each other, they have also joint concerns such as the demand for the equality between the sexes and equal rights for women. For this reason it is not surprising to assume that feminism in IR is always talking about women. Thus it can be said that feminism in IR does not just focus on equality and equal issues. For IR feminists, improving the conditions of women, stressing the harmful effects of gender hierarchy and carrying social justice are vital and essential discourses in feminists IR. IR scholars with feminist sympathies have worked on different aspects of issues in feminism. Hence they have begun to study on a wide range of issues in feminism; such as from critiques of IR theory, alternative visions of security and community to the significance of gendered identities and subjectivities in IR. While one is stressing on the exclusion of women from traditional activities and institutions the other emphasizes how feminine activities are seen as devalued, trivialized and low rewarded and status. According to Barker, feminism is a plural field of theory and politics which has competing perspectives and prescriptions for action and sex is a basic point for social

organization which suppresses women to men. As a result for feminism it can be said to discuss mainly on sex as an important vehicle for power relations. As to feminists subordination of women can be viewed in a wide range of social institutions and practices (Barker, 2000). As a movement, feminism is concerned to construct political strategies by which to intervene in social life in pursuit of the interests of women.

In fact, women and gender issues have been glossed over in the IR studies for a long time. Gender is a key aspect to get knowledge on world orders and for IR feminists. As Caprioli briefly mentions,

“gender is better seen as a system of culturally constructed relations of power, produced and reproduced in interaction between and among men and women. We know, for instance, that masculine and feminine values are not inherent to each biological sex but are adopted behaviors. Gender (masculine/feminine) and biological sex (men/women), however, are often used interchangeably” (Caprioli,2004: 260).

It was commonly considered that women, the positions of women and gender could not say many things on the realm of IR studies and the world, thus; this was not related to IR studies. For some feminist scholars, the world was already extremely shaped by gender and much discourses on IR had a masculine perspective (Steans and Pettiford, 2005). So it can be affirmed that gender is regarded as a political masculine domination over the feminine. This brings about a division between social relations as dominated and subordinated side. When we look over the world of international relations through liberal feminist lens, it is soon realized that it is generally shaped by man, the state-affairs are profoundly determined by men-politicians, or in other words, men-dominated politicians, and decision makers for foreign and defense policy are heavily men. Thus it can be easily seen that women have historically been kept out from making political decision and high-politics. Accordingly a division has been made between the two genders interest area as the low and high policy. The former policy is associated with women whose interest areas are education, health and culture; whereas, the latter policy is associated with man whose interest areas are strategy, military and security.

As seen throughout history, in the West only men had access the public of sphere of work, politics and civil society; on the contrary women were limited to the home and family sphere and they struggled to get numerous rights. Today as Mojab emphasized although “women have legal access to the public realm, they remain subordinate to men” and still they have not been guaranteed full participation in society (Mojab, 2001: 137-8).

In general, feminists have concentrated on women, because they believe that women "have been subjected to discrimination and unequal treatment. As Enloe (2003) claimed, women have to struggle more than they could in order to be as effective as men in such a world. Feminism is, then, a bottom-up view of the world, constructed from the point of view or experiences of a group who have historically experienced discrimination and marginalization" (Steans and Lloyd, 2005: 156). Yet according to many feminist scholars; this theory is no longer only focus on the lives of women but also on the analysis of gender. In spite of the diverse opinions, emphasizes, analyzes and descriptions, they commonly have an agreement on that gender can be understood in the light of power relations. On the ground that gender helps us to recognize the relationships between the sexes in society (Steans and Lloyd, 2005). In addition for many other feminists, this study area scrutinizes the roles, status and contributions of women in international organizations and how the policies and actions of these organizations affect women and what quantity women take part in decision making process. As it is known senior level bureaucrats in organizations such as the UN and WTO, decision makers and governments and head of states are masculine in a thumping majority and in this way they see and shape the decisions and the world from a masculine point of view. Therefore feminists point out the women's place in this decision making process which is covered by masculine majority and their traditional roles in the society (Pease and Pease, 2008). Women even have the chance of working outside their houses however they are working at the low positions and have little chance to work at high positions (Enloe, 2000). Nevertheless, women are allowed to some select access in national and international political arenas which are dominated by men, and these women either successfully play at being men or do not shake masculine assumptions (Enloe, 2003).

In addition scholars like Cynthia emphasizes that IR should be interpreted more than ever especially in the first decade of the new century and in this decade; various women's experiences should be taken into account acutely and being feminine and masculine should be not seen just as the result of culture but of policy. If these expressions are underestimated, we will get in a risk to see how political resources are important to shape international politics and according to many feminists this underestimation could be the feature of nonfeminist analysis (Enloe, 2000).

In fact so far feminist analysis on international politics has not been given attention. Commentators of foreign policy and decision makers who are substantially men seem

to disregard feminist opinions and women's experiences as they have been called as "human interest" subjects. Women's participation to produce and perform the international politics has been seen as if it is not laudable for scrutinizing. Heretofore women's role to affect the international politics of which place dominated by men has not been examined sturdily (Enloe, 2000). Thus it can be claimed that feminists scholars' main goal is to investigate the lives of women within states or international structures for changing them, while much studies in IR are concentrated on the description and explanation of the behavior of states (Ackerly et al., 2006).

So as it is seen, most IR feminist scholars have asked very different questions on where the place of women in the world is. While some of these are trying to understand, they are seeking the state behavior and asking why women remain disempowered on the issue of foreign and military policy. Although women could be more peaceful than men in the matter of foreign policy, they are trying to find out why so few women are taking place in the positions of power and foreign policy decision makers. The other feminists studying on war and peace have tried to see why wars have been mainly fought by men and how masculinity and femininity have legitimated war and militarism for both men and women and also have attempted to understand sturdily what the relation between women and peace are (Ackerly et al., 2006).

For feminists also there is a connection between state and violence in IR. Mostly women and children have been affected from violence. Moghadam states as well that there is a strong relation between economical difficulties, political inconsistency and violence, and women and children are the main victims of this violence (Moghadam, 2006).

As the foreign policy is shaped by men as a result it is shaped by violence. Of course women could be seen in this field but their number is so low but it is believed that these women like Margaret Thatcher, Indira Gandhi and Jeanne Kirkpatrick are not selected randomly. Because as mentioned before "when a woman is let in by the men who control the political élite it usually is precisely because that woman has learned the lessons of masculinized political behavior well enough not to threaten political privilege" (Enloe, 2000: 5-6).

Simply "the basic question that has most concerned IR feminists is why, in just about all societies, women are disadvantaged, politically, socially and economically relative to

men, and to what extent this is due to international politics and the global economy” (Ackerly et al., 2006: 24).

Feminism in IR has adopted a range of analysis and strategies of action “which have been broadly categorized such as liberal feminism, Marxist feminism, difference feminism, socialist feminism, poststructuralist feminism, black feminism and postcolonial feminism” (Barker, 2000: 225). For example; second wave feminism involves the collaboration between the state and liberal feminism which began approximately with Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963 and the founding of the National Organization for Women in 1966 (Rogers, 1998). For liberal feminists, women like men have the ability for intellectual developments; so the key for the advancement of women’s status is their participation to the public life. From Marxist feminist perspectives, women’s emancipation would not be led by equal rights and capitalism formed new forms of social subordination. Thus even if women work out of home, they again deal with the works related to caregivers, nursing, and education. Especially in the late fifties it was seen that a third of American women worked but most were either no longer young or very few were pursuing careers (Friedan, 1963).

Among many other varieties of feminism for example neofeminism valorizes feminine qualities and these feminists known as even as essentialist feminists see the biological differences between men and women as accounting for many gender qualities. According to liberal neofeminists participation of women to the political environment will deeply change and affect this environment and for postmodern feminists gender-laden language and gendered terms are used to define IR (Pease and Pease, 2008).

Nevertheless when we look into the feminist analysis it is usually seen that this study area is mostly about women; women but white, middle class and European women. So feminists have begun to pay attention to the necessity to bethink of the experience of past eras; that’s to say that various women’s experience from women in West to the East and white to so-called colored. This can be said as a painful problem for feminist since it is seen in the 1970s feminism in large extent was an issue of white, middle class, European women (Klimenkova, 1992). This means when the talk is begun to start on feminism it is seen that feminism is much more related to the Western women rather than the women of different classes and cultural background (Nicholson, 1992).

## **CHAPTER 2: POLICIES OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTS BETWEEN 1993 AND 2008**

### **2.1. The Presidential Term of William ‘Bill’ Jefferson Clinton (1993-2001)**

The President, excluding the authority given by the Constitution, is seen as “the symbol of supremacy and persistence” by Americans. American presidents are at the center of foreign policy process; however, they get guidance from politicians and official institutions. The president's personality, experiences and world views affect to determine both the foreign policy team and the political orientation. These options can be different during the terms of office of different presidents or even during the mandate of the same president, as proven by the foreign policy of President Clinton's two terms.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and Cold War, America becomes the only super power in terms of military and policy. The foreign policy of the USA comes into view as an important international relations' determiner. As being at the heart of the foreign policy process, who the president is, is very important. According to the American Constitution, the president has many commitments as well as with or without Congress. Therefore, during the foreign policy process, the effect of public opinion, media, lobbies/interest groups and Congress cannot be denied; still, the determiner of foreign policy is the personality, experience and world philosophy of the president. Keeping American general foreign policy firm, with these features the president defines the priorities of foreign policy and determines the foreign policy of the country according to these (Önal, 2006).

William ‘Bill’ Jefferson Clinton was the president of the United States between January 1993 and January 20, 2001 so the foreign policy of the U.S. was shaped under the administration of him during this period. He became president shortly after the end of the Cold War in other words he became the first president after the fall of Cold War. But for Clinton it is generally claimed that he focused much more on foreign policy in his second term than in his first term. Thus it is asserted that during the administration of Clinton, the U.S. enjoyed more peace and economic well being than at any time in its history (The White House, 19??).

Even he was the first Democrat to serve “two full terms as president since FDR” and was also “the first president since Andrew Johnson to be impeached by the House of Representatives and to be tried by the Senate” (Metz, 2002: 17).

As Richard H. Haas indicated in his article “Fatal Distraction: Bill Clinton’s Foreign Policy” President Bill Clinton’s foreign policy is hardly to define because it lacks a general framework, however his approach includes the element of his predecessor's policy as well as selective preoccupations with American exports, human rights, and nation-building (Haas, 1997).

Stated in other words, in the years of Cold War, the focus point of the relations of America and the West with the Third World Countries has become “stability”. The interest of the USA, in a way of the West, which gained a “transnational” feature gradually, has followed a two dimensional political praxis of which one side is economic and the other side is security. America foresaw to gain the European countries and Japan in wealth as well as the Third World Countries after the Second World War (İsen, 2004).

That is to say, Bill Clinton is the first President after the period of Cold War. In his first term he is lack of foreign policy experience and does not give much attention to the issues of foreign policy; in fact he is mostly interested in domestic issues. Accordingly, his speeches during the electoral campaign support this. Clinton, throughout this campaign, only emphasizes on two important issues; one is economical problems in the country, the other is democracy and human rights issues (Önal, 2006).

Bill Clinton was always casting about for historical models too. In his first term he sought to emulate Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whom he quoted in his first inaugural address to the effect that in 1993, America needed “bold, persistent experimentation.” He tried;

“a New Deal– sounding doctrine, the “New Covenant,” visited Hyde Park, and placed an iconic FDR bust in the Oval Office. In fact there was little need for bold, persistent experimentation: Rather than a depression, Clinton was handed an economy that, it turned out, needed only a little deficit cutting and was already soaring on its own in the great tech boom of the '90s. Health care reform, Clinton’s most New Deal–like plan, flopped” (Hirsh, 2003:13).

As a matter of fact America does not encounter serious problems when Clinton becomes the President. Clinton also is not under a domestic pressure for not being in an active role in foreign policy. Hence it becomes easy for him to incline towards domestic policy. For Clinton budget, if it is extremely so limited, should be spent for

domestic issues. A reform is necessary for the economy called by him with the slogan "it's the economy, stupid" which is the most important issue within the country. Candidates for the President focus on domestic issues. This is an expected situation because this is a period in which the problems in economy and society have been at the highest level since 1993. For this reason when Bill Clinton becomes the President he and his team try to find solution in order to solve this urgently.

He could able to make his economic programme passed by working hard with Republicans in Congress. As a result in later years the programme reduced the national deficit and made surplus for the federal treasury. Also he got the North American Free Trade Agreement passed in his first year (Metz, 2002).

As a consequence the country's economy has been declined rapidly because of the reasons of economical recession, fiscal deficit and unemployment which gradually increase in the term of office of George H.W. Bush beginning especially in the term of office of Ronald Reagan. If it continues in this way, the country will not be in an important place in international issues. Therefore Clinton begins to carry out an economic programme approved by the Congress for this aim in 1993. Clinton perceives the global economy out of the country as a vehicle for the augmentation of welfare of America and for this reason he signed many Free Trade Agreements during his term of office. In his terms being seen as an economic age, the policies which cost less are begun to be pursued and the budget allocated to the foreign issues is declined to \$ 17 billion in 1996 from \$ 32 billion in 1993. During this period issues determined the foreign policy are more economic than strategic (Önal, 2006).

In short, the Clinton administration was a successful one especially in terms of domestic policy. The rate of unemployment was dropped to a fifty year low, and inflation declined and the rate of crime was fallen. Also many changes in domestic policy occurred. He and his administration, working with Republican Congress for six years, achieved in over hauling the welfare system and keeping the solvency of the Social Security system (Mertz, 2002).

In fact now that the Cold War is over, Americans need a foreign policy that recognizes the new world before them. The path that America has followed since the fall of the Berlin Wall is understandable, but it is no longer constructive. A policy that tries to hang on to old privileges while pressing for greater economic advantage will inevitably give



way to an approach that is increasingly nationalistic and narrow. Now a change is required in the policy of the country. Stated in other words;

“That will not be the design, but it will be the result. A policy that offers both more responsibility to others and more cooperation with others in the quest for lower political exposure and greater economic growth is consistent with Clinton's original campaign vision. It is also a policy that would help guide the American people through the difficult years ahead” ( Maynes, 1993-1994: 20).

With the end of Cold War and the Clinton administration, America acquired a new opportunity to create a strategy other than a superpower confrontation. As Secretary of State Warren Christopher stated “Clinton administration would adapt the U.S’ foreign policy and institutions to the revolutionary changes that began with the destruction of the Berlin Wall” (Maynes, 1993-1994: 3).

Clinton also gives importance to the issues on democracy and human rights which are believed by him are important for the security and welfare of America excluding economy and he refers to these subjects constantly when foreign policy is carried out. In American foreign policy subjects such as self-determination of the nations, democracy and human rights are given significance even at least as statement. In a campaign speech of him on 01 October 1992 Clinton states the reason of this policy as a democracy out of their country provides advantages in terms of economy and security to the USA in a concrete way. Democratic countries do not involve in war against each other, do not support terrorism and do not be a threat for the other. They have respect for human rights and property right and rule of law within the border. Democracies supply the most important base for building international order (Önal, 2006).

Unfortunately it is soon realized that Clinton and his foreign policy team are not ready for foreign policy strategy after Cold War. Clinton has a relatively simple opinion on actors and the issue has occurred with the changeover in the structure of international system after the collapse of the Soviet Union and keeps his optimistic view on this change. According to him the change in international system should be a system that covers all nations in a democracy and market economy frame.

According to Charles William Maynes the new approach in the presidential term of the President Bill Clinton turns out to be much like the old one. Under the Clinton doctrine of enlargement, America's alliance commitments remain the same as they were under the Cold War doctrine of containment. American troops stay where they are. As the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has pointed out, even after

proposed draw downs the U.S. force structure will be at roughly 90 per cent of the figure that retired head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell developed before the Berlin Wall came down, the Warsaw Pact disbanded, and the Soviet Union fragmented (Maynes, 1993-1994).

Under the Clinton doctrine of enlargement, the United States would try to spread democracy and free markets. But that was the U.S. objective during the Cold War. Meanwhile, "the administration has retreated from its early, bold endorsement of U.N. peacekeeping. Now it states that Americans will only participate under conditions that very few U.N. operations, including those in the Middle East, could ever meet" (Maynes, 1993-1994:3-4).

However, "Enlargement Doctrine" to be hoped to achieve these targets was declared by the speeches of Clinton in the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, Warren M. Christopher Minister of Foreign Affairs in Colombia University, NSA Anthony Lake in John Hopkins and UN Ambassador Madeleine K. Albright in National Defense University. Enlargement, which will cover political areas such as spreading democracy and human rights especially to previous socialist countries and economical areas such as free market and investment convenience, will take place the understanding of "containment" of Cold War.

Clinton doctrine in fact does not mention about preemptive action but talks about maintaining "a robust triad of nuclear forces to deter potential adversaries who might seek access to, or use of, WMD and building a missile defense system to protect against rogues states with WMD" (Offner, 2007: 38).

Foreign Affairs Minister Warren M. Christopher claims that enlargement should be the guide for foreign policy and America could determine the world policy according to their interest only with this way. Because according to Christopher, as Clinton stated, America encounters with a struggle which is as old as the history. This struggle is between freedom and oppression and in order to overcome this, the guidance of America is essential. Although this strategy is introduced as a new one, many foreign policy experts consider that this is not so much different from the old one and it does not have a new vision. For them, the foreign policy implemented by Clinton administration is not quite different from the foreign policy of America during the Cold War. The aims are to protect mother country from the attacks, to create an environment to spread American democracy and keep this, to provide American welfare and

preserve this, to maintain the role of international system regulator of America without spending unnecessarily lots of money (Önal, 2006).

Clinton's foreign policy can be claimed to be a mixed bag. At that time there were conflicts and violence in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Haiti. For this reason he had to make a decision regarding the foreign policy of the U.S. and its role. He believed that the U.S. was the protector of human rights and the promoter of the political and economic stability of the remote countries. This is why the U.S. armed forces involved in conflicts in order to terminate the fighting and maintain peace. Although many American lives were lost during his presidency he spent efforts to give an end to the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and the Middle East (Freedman, 1999).

In other words, analysts as Greenstein, Wolfowitz and Scowcroft describe the approach and the world philosophy of Clinton on the foreign policy sometimes as discrepant and sometimes as indecisive. Because of this, the first term of Clinton's foreign policy is described as "mediocre" by many analysts. In this period Clinton indicates clearly that he does not want to make his country as a world police. According to this policy, a transatlantic intervention will be in case of these three conditions: firstly, the condition requiring intervention should be violent and invasion of common human rights, secondly, America should have a military capacity to support that intervention and thirdly, a change creating a difference should be gained after the intervention. As it is claimed, America would send its army only to perform a mission. And that mission is to remove this invasion to the human rights and spread democracy. During the election campaign Clinton gives priority to domestic policy, however he and his team know that electorates notice take into account of his behavior at the time of international crisis, if he will manage it or not and if he will direct to be a supreme command or not. Clinton cannot ignore this. For this reason, despite not putting the foreign policy at the centre of his campaign, without making much of an issue he brings it to the agenda. But it should be kept in mind that foreign policy will follow American president all the time and Clinton has not realized its importance much. As a matter of fact in this period events in the problematic part of the world- Somalia, Rwanda and Haiti- become the issues waiting for Clinton. But the intervention to those countries shows nothing but the ineffectiveness of the administration. A late intervention to Bosnia is another criticism to the administration (Önal, 2006).

In fact Clinton, aiming to limit the role of America on the issue of world security, prefers either disregarding international issues or being in a big cooperation with the U.N. with

“assertive multilateralism”. Regarding the U.N. as a vehicle for their security policy and a legal authority in the intervention to the domestic issues of the countries; Clinton points out that he supports a powerful U.N. Clinton ventures to involve the U.N. in American foreign policy even though the Congress criticizes that organization because of their concern of aid. Clinton points out that;

“As a president my first duty is to provide American society the welfare and to empower my country. Target is easy in World War I and II: to win the war, target is open in Cold War: to prevent nuclear war and restrain communism. But the target after Cold War is complicate. American security in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is open to be defined by effective powers within and out of our borders. We still believe that a strengthened UN operation is the best insurance against humanistic disasters” (Önal, 2006: 56).

In addition, Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine K. Albright states that the U.N. will take a central and positive role for peace and ensure the balance. Because of this, administration of Clinton accepts the role and importance of the U.N. in this new period and therewithal takes care of moving under the umbrella of the U.N. in order to spread democracy. American military forces have been used by the U.N. and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and in this context American soldiers take place in the operations of the U.N. After years Clinton explains his effort for this by stating that in spite of their differences he would like to live in a world that they will get on well with each other and they will not concern with ethnic cleansing in some other parts of the world. Obviously he states that for shaping such a kind of world he ventures to use power under the umbrella of the U.N. by America. Nevertheless most of the commitments of Clinton could not be eventuated for both giving much attention to the domestic issues, keeping away from foreign policy and Congress'-majority of it is Republican- intervention to the foreign policy. Indeed two out of three of Republicans do not have even a passport and this nationalistic Congress ignores international issues as well as cuts the budget allocated for these issues. That's why the foreign policy he has to struggle with a Congress is skeptic, cautious and partisan.

As a matter of fact, this “assertive multilateralism” strategy of Clinton has been changed on October 1993 as a result of death of 12 American soldiers in Somalia and a new strategy has been adapted. After this event in Somalia as a result of seeing the corpse of the soldiers on the screen, American public oppresses Congress and the President in order to withdraw the soldiers from Somalia and consequently Clinton has to state that the forces will be withdrawn at the end of March. Although all American soldiers are under the control of America Clinton blamed the U.N. and the mission of America for keeping the peace has been rapidly changed. All along Congress' reaction

is effectual because it is against the protecting security operations of the UN for various reasons- financial burden for America and possibility for American soldiers' death in this cause. Clinton brings a new limit to the multilateral peace operations of America by Presidential Decision Directive signed on 03 May 1994. According to this directive America will intervene by its own on the condition of a directly threat to the nation's interest, otherwise intervention will be only done by providing the support of the allied. Also the type and results of the intervention will be taken into consideration. In this period, Haiti, Bosnia and Rwanda are the place where Clinton wants to show his intention to use power in order to support regional order and to recreate democracy; however, left wing criticizes him because of being late for intervention. Indeed, in spite of assertive statements of administration of Clinton, it can be claimed that they were reluctant while intervening there.

Clinton spent so much effort for also to keep NATO together after the Cold War. Because keeping the organization as it was is very important for America. The organization should be adapted to changing security area and should intervene to the issues such as massive immigrants and ethnical conflicts. Moreover America supports the extension of NATO by new members and expects that it will be more powerful. As a result on January 1994 Partnership for peace was commenced officially. Its aim was to introduce NATO's daily and politic works to Middle and over European countries more closely and to accelerate their union membership process.

Clinton, during his four year office term, succeeded to limit his predecessor President George H.W. Bush's sharp policy by using either changing in economy or ambiguity in new world after Cold War as an excuse. But in 1996 election the condition is extremely different. Clinton's election campaign differed from the first one was based on foreign policy. During the campaign he emphasized in his speeches that he experienced on foreign policy and he gave the signals that he would give priority to foreign policy in this term. Consequently, when he was elected as a President, his foreign policy team was changed according to the policy to be followed in his second term. In fact this changing in his team did not bring a radical change in foreign policy, however it can be said that it brought a stylistic change. Because the objectives on foreign policy were not changed, nevertheless a more active policy was followed for these objectives. In other words, by approaching new election period in 1996, Clinton became a candidate for the second time. But this time it can be said that his foreign policy view was changed. In 1993 he perceives foreign policy as a one dimension- foreign policy controlled by

global economy, whereas in 1996 his foreign policy view became relatively multidimensional. Thus in a speech of Clinton on 23 January 1996 he focused more on global security than global economy and stated that threat elements for America have become various: terrorism, spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug traffic, ethnical and religious hatred, attacks of rogue countries and environmental corruption. If today they ignore these problems, tomorrow they will have to abide all of the results. Accordingly he affirmed that America should struggle against all of these threats in an international area (Önal, 2006).

It is claimed for Bill Clinton that he focused on foreign policy more in his second term than in his first term. As Michael Hirsh stated in his book *At War with Ourselves: Why America Is Squandering Its Chance to Build a Better World*;

“Clinton, who like Bush was little concerned at first with foreign affairs, filled in the blank with the promulgation of globalization and “soft” goals such as economic integration and the spread of democracy and open markets. Hamstrung by his draft-dodging past, scandal, and a conservative Congress that obstructed him for six of his eight years, Clinton shied away from projecting American muscle abroad. He was a military minimalist, resorting too often to a least-offensive approach that eroded American credibility, even in his one war, Kosovo. Overseas interventions that might have been successful had they been more robust and involved more troops in Somalia, in Haiti, in Kosovo in 1998 (when he refused to send in NATO peacekeepers before the war in 1999) mostly failed or became bogged down. Clinton got away with this halfhearted foreign policy because most Americans saw these issues as mere annoyances, small-scale wars in a time of peace” (Hirsh, 2003: 16).

New Term’s Minister of Foreign Affairs Albright classified American foreign policy to be followed in this period as: providing peace and strengthened international system. For providing peace, international relations would be tried to keep on, these relations would be assured and for the solution of regional problems they would move together with the partners. In this context, they would be in cooperation with Europe for the peace construction in Bosnia and strengthening NATO, and with China, Japan and North Korea in order to keep the peace in Korea peninsula. And for the continuance of international system they would try to spread democracy all over the world, would support weak nations, would repel all the elements that are a threat for law system and cooperation to be effective for all nations’ security, would form a monitor system that will prevent the spread of nuclear arms and poisonous gases. Also Foreign Affairs Minister Albright stated the priorities of foreign policy as; unification of the nations against terrorism, Security Council should be in a certain struggle against the threat and challenges of Saddam Hussein; being brave in North Korea battle, full completion of Dayton Agreement and a common effort in order to prevent international society

from having weapons of mass destruction and having added that in order to achieve these, Congress and public should move together.

Moreover in this period America tried to prove its leadership to both Europe and Japan and China by intervening Kosovo and joining in negotiation process for the North Ireland, Cyprus and Turkish-Greek problems, making effort to eliminate the disagreement between North-South and Taiwan-China. Clinton's changing foreign policy has been evaluated by many experts in some of the parts of the world as drawing attention to the out from inside of the country- because there are many problems within the country. The first foreign policy strategy of the second term was 1997dated national security strategy and here threat classifications oriented towards America have been made excluding repetition of the pre -plans and principles. According to this, there are threats such as nation-centered or region- centered threats, transnational threats- terrorism, drug traffic, arms traffic, international organized crimes, immigrants' transportation out of control, harms given to the environment- threats caused by weapons of mass destruction and a common work against these threats should be done with other nations. In a strategy dated 1998 it was expressed that another subject presenting a threat for America was "unsuccessful states" that spied, could not govern their people and for this reason caused regional crisis.

Clinton defines the 21<sup>st</sup> century's American strategy as strengthening allied for the intervention in issues that are a threat for the national security such as terror and the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and securing the army, strengthening global movement for peace and democracy and creating welfare inside the nation by providing an enlargement in Market economy out of the nation. Moreover Foreign Affairs Minister Albright mentions America as an "indispensable nation" and states that the first aim of America is to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and gives the message that for this America volunteers for using the nation's force and sources in case of need. Accordingly Clinton gave clues that he would give importance to human rights individually in this term by saying that force would be used for people who were subject to mass death for their race, ethnic past and religious and they had this force (Önal, 2006).

As the first post Cold War President Bill Clinton in his second term, focused most his foreign policy on NATO which was a child of the Cold War. According to the White House reports a National Security Strategy for a New Century, lists fostering a "peaceful, undivided, democratic Europe as the United States' first priority for

advancing core national security objectives. As the primary attempt NATO enlargement is singled out" (Haas, 1997:119).

American administration explains that they support the works on the enlargement of NATO. Clinton hopes that NATO will be effective in two ways: unification of new democracies and protection against occurring effective areas and powerful opponents in Europe. In this context NATO led by America for the first time made an intervention to Yugoslavia without a decision of the U.N. In this period also the role of the U.N. on the changing and varied dangers and threats was emphasized once more and the support on the new role of NATO and its enlargement has been continued.

In fact the election of Bill Clinton to the Presidency presented an important change in the U.S. administration's approach towards the Middle East peace process. He introduced himself as "a mediator and as an approachable President" (Beirman, 1997: 270). Clinton expressed in a speech given in Jordan Parliament in 1994 that he did not believe in civilization clash and they were respectful for Islam. The base of Middle East policy of America in this period as: control over the oil springs taken over in the period of Cold War and transmitting this to the world market continually, continuation the existence of Israel, decreasing the effects of Radical Islam, containment of Iraq and Iran and regional countries should not have weapons of mass destruction.

For Clinton, Middle East was a focus born less of choice than necessity. Up until recently, according to Richard N. Haas (1997), Clinton has garnered considerable credit for the Middle East even though he has done little more than host events. When peace talks between the Israelis and Palestinians broke down, the White House dragged its feet for five months before starting to use its voice. The United States should work harder to encourage the Israelis to be more generous in terms of the amount of land they return under Oslo, more forthcoming in economic policies affecting Palestinians, and more restrained in settlement-building. Similarly, the White House should continue to push the Palestinians to rewrite their covenant and rein in violence and terror. Failure by either party to meet any of these standards ought to provoke clear and consistent criticism from the Oval Office. There are times when allowing local protagonists to stew in their own juices makes sense; this is not one of them. Moreover, shifting the focus of the negotiations to the most difficult final status issues is unlikely to prove successful. Israeli-Palestinian relations are fraying badly and significant violence could well return to the region, in the process not only polarizing



local politics but also making it much more difficult for the United States to cooperate with local states against Iran and Iraq.

In other words, Clinton was interested in the Middle East to negotiate peace agreements between Arabs including the Palestinians and Israelis. After the secret negotiations between Clinton and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat, Oslo Accords was signed on September 13, 1993 at the White House. According to the agreement between Arafat and Rabin, there would be a limited Palestinian self rule in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. With the help of Clinton on July 1994, a historic compromise between Israel and Jordan was carried out to end their state of war.

It can be claimed that in spite of this efforts, these peace agreements did not end the conflict in the Middle East. For this reason, Clinton invited Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat to peace talks on the Wye River on October 1998. Another agreement known as the Wye River Memorandum was signed between these two leaders. According to this agreement Israel would transfer more territory in the West Bank to the Palestinians and in return, Palestinians would take step to stop terrorism and moreover they would make a time table to settle a final resolution of the Palestinian fight for an independent state. It can be said that these agreements just gave way to force Israel to transfer more territory in the West Bank to the Palestinians in exchange for an empty promise for the Palestinians to take steps to restrain terrorism. This gave Palestinians to access to ground to fire more missiles into Israel (The White House, 19??). Nevertheless, Netanyahu refused to give any more West Bank territory and had new demands on Palestine. This factor with other factors accelerated the downfall of the Netanyahu government in Israel and in May 1999 Ehud Barak replaced Netanyahu as prime minister. Nevermore, Clinton kept up his efforts to make negotiations between Israel and Palestinians. Unfortunately he failed because of Arafat's reluctance.

Clinton also faced with the problems in Iraq. Before Clinton became a president in 1991 the U.S. involved in the Persian Gulf War to make Kuwait liberated from Iraqi occupation. In 1991 a cease-fire agreement requiring Iraqi elimination of weapons of mass destruction was signed between Iraq and Kuwait. Also according to this agreement the United Nations Special Commission, UNSCOM, was allowed to make inspections and monitor the country's adherence to the agreement. But the team faced resistance from Iraq and Iraqi president Saddam Hussein attempted to cut the

UNSCOM inspections. Consequently, Clinton ordered four days of concentrated air attacks against military bases in Iraq in December 1998. After the bombing, Hussein blocked any further the U.N. inspections. The U.N. sanctions against Iraq that the Security Council imposed after the Gulf War remained in place during the Clinton administration (Freedman, 1999).

According to the national security strategy declared in 1996, Clinton stated that basic targets of America was to provide security with a powerful armed forces, to accelerate economic revival and challenge democracy out of the country. In this strategy it was stated that America's guidance in the world was necessary. But it was stated while doing this both the type of the intervention and the form of intervention would be carefully chosen. From this date, American's Iraq policy which was being criticized has been changed. Clinton bombarded Baghdad unilaterally in 1996 after Gulf War when Saddam Hussein sent soldiers to the safe zone formed by America and its allies. When Clinton was criticized because international support was not given before the bomb in 1996, he said "sometimes America has to move by its own. We cannot allow other nations veto our foreign policy" (Önal, 2006:61).

American's Iraq policy is based on "containment and isolation". For this aim economic sanctions have been implemented, Iraq's armament is tried to be controlled, forbidden zone for flights has been formed and sometimes by bombing some emplacements in Iraq, Saddam who is foreseen to have the weapons of mass destruction- being against the interest of America for the region- the security of American forces, the security of Israel and a threat for an important part of demand of world oil- is aimed to be threatened.

Clinton played a more active role in Iraq after the increased criticism and as a consequence America was so determined to solve Iraq problem. Then the office of the UN's armament controller who has controlled Iraq's armament since 5th of August and has been sent to Iraq after the efforts of America was terminated with the demand of Saddam on 31 October 1998 and so the voice of intervention to Iraq was raised by America. Thus America commenced Operation Desert Fox on December 1998 (Önal, 2006).

Concerning Iran, Clinton signed Executive Order 12957 on 6 May 1995. Accordingly, tight oil and trade sanctions on Iran were implemented and legally American corporations or their foreign subsidiaries would participate in any contract for the

financing of the development of petroleum resources located in Iran. By Executive Order 12959 on 6 May 1995, Clinton banned nearly all trade between U.S. businesses and the Iranian administration with the exception of informational materials. Meanwhile in 1994, President Clinton declared Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism and a rogue state. Hence he became the first president who called Iran in this way. In his second term, especially after Mohammed Khatami became president of Iran, Clinton softened his approach towards Iran. Although in 1995 U.S. citizens were warned against traveling in Iran due to that administration's rampant anti-Americanism, five years later in 2000 Secretary of State Albright declared that U.S. would begin to enable Americans to purchase and import carpets and food products such as dried fruits, nuts, and caviar from Iran. Nevertheless President Khatami and President Clinton failed to initiate an official diplomatic dialogue between the nations and the relations between those two countries were cool. Many critics claim that Clinton's approach towards Iran was weak and this strengthened Iran and set the stage for a potential confrontation with Iran a decade later in the George W. Bush administration (Freedman, 1999).

The events in Balkans attracted the attention of Clinton in his first term to this region. America has become one of the nations that recognized the new Republics after the dissolution of Yugoslavia. In course of time with the appearance of these Republics, the ethnical conflicts in the region were increased and the stability and the security of the region got into a threat. Especially the ethnical conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina have an important place in the world common opinion. The EU became unsuccessful in solving this problem; however, the U.S. became a part of it.

In fact, one of the rare discourses on foreign policy of Clinton in his first election campaign is Bosnia. In his speech Clinton affirmed that America was ready to use power in Bosnia under the framework of the U.N. with the collaboration of international society. But Clinton taken office in 1993 was soon appeared that he and his team were not ready how they would handle the problem in Bosnia. Accordingly it can be claimed that in Clinton's first two years Bosnia problem has become one of the issues of foreign policy that annoyed him.

Nonetheless they kept the problem in Bosnia on the agenda. As stated by National Security Advisor Anthony Lake frequently, there could be nothing in foreign policy unless Bosnia problem was solved and as long as foreign policy was in the question Clinton handled Bosnia before anything else and any kind of attempt was carried out in order to solve this promptly. However Clinton just used air forces in Bosnia and

supported Croats and Bosnians indirectly in order to convince Serbs to negotiate. He reduced the military existence in Bosnia more speedily than his allies.

Nevertheless it can be claimed that the share in the success in Bosnia was mostly owing to America especially when the failure of Europe was thought. Consequently the war in Bosnia came to end and Clinton guaranteed in Dayton Agreement negotiations that refugees would allow to turn back their homes, people in Bosnia could move freely and a commission would be set up for the protection of human rights and political forbidden would be brought to war criminals. Thus with the efforts of Richard Holbrooke Dayton Agreement was signed on December 1995. Some experts claimed that Clinton's this late intervention was to correct his image in Islam world. After the war Clinton also dealt with the reconstruction of Bosnia, formation of national democratic institutions and training the security forces (Önal, 2006).

Developments in Balkans keeping Clinton busy were seen in his period and the region continued to be America's area of interest. As a result America playing an active role in solving the problem in Bosnia-Herzegovina and in the reconstruction of the region began to play an active role in the region by Kosovo problem once more time.

Increased ethnical violence in Kosovo made Clinton believed for again an intervene need. But there was not a consensus on this matter within the administration. While especially Madeline K. Albright wanted to take action and to use air forces, Cohen and General Chief were against such a kind of intervention. Clinton and NSA Samuel Richard Berger were at the middle and came up against a decision that they did not want to give. Congress and Pentagon also declared that they were against such a kind of intervention insistently.

As a consequence this subject was talked once more time at American National Security Council Meeting on 15 January 1999. In spite of continuation of the hesitations Clinton and his team found themselves in an unwanted conflict in Balkans once more time. But America did not have an opinion about what their role would be both politically and militarily. Clinton obtained the support of NATO for an air attack to Serbia instead of a unilateral intervention. Nevertheless all the preparations for the intervention were began at the end of the winter when NATO members believed that negotiations would not stop the conflict and NATO forces leading by America began to bomb Yugoslavia from the date of 24 March. Above all, the decision of America on

intervention to Kosovo was interpreted as the aim of America to reshape its image in the world.

For Caucasus and Central Asia region, America which was one of the nations that recognized firstly the new nations after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, tried that nations to follow a democratic, laic and Western policy and to prevent Russia from being again a powerful nation in that region after the Cold War. Thus Clinton guaranteed any kind of support for the implementation of economic and political reforms in that region to be successful as a consequence. Also Clinton helped out some nations economically and militarily under the development aid. Unfortunately, America recognized that these new nations did not want a new brother after Russia.

Extracting oil and gas reserves in the basin of Caspian and transporting this to the world market was one of the foreign policies of Clinton and a unique effort was spent for this. In order to form and implement this policy especially a team led by Vice Foreign Affairs Minister Strobe Talbott was formed and this team was aimed to assist technically, commercially and diplomatically for shaping the policies among American companies dealing with Caspian oil and gas reserves. By this policy Clinton aimed to strengthen the sovereignty and independence and increase the economy of these new nations in the region; and to augment the commercial opportunity for American and other companies, to end the regional problems by reforming the economic relationship between those countries and to obtain the security for the energy. The pipe line policy of Clinton on transportation of oil and gas reserves in Caspian basin to the world market was to support various pipeline route without depending on one just line. For this aim construction of two pipe routes for "earlier oil" were decided. On November 1997 Russia Novorossisk and on April 1999 Georgia Supsa were thought as pipe routes in order to transport the oil to be extracted earlier in Azerbaijan. Clinton gave a great importance to the transmission of the existed oil and gas reserves in Caucasus and Central Asia to the world market (Önal, 2006).

Thus, as seen above unlike from many American Presidents, President Clinton differed by his foreign policy approach in his both presidential terms. He and his team didn't play a much active role in foreign policy and gave much importance to the domestic issues in his first term, whereas, he began to play a more active role in foreign policy in his second term. Nevertheless, in his presidential terms Clinton handled Middle East policy on the issues such as controlling over the oil springs in this region, and carrying

this to the world market, reducing the effects of Radical Islam and depriving the countries in the Middle East region from WMD.

## **2.2. The Presidential Term of George W. Bush (2001-2009)**

George W. Bush who was the second President of the USA after the end of Cold War became the 43<sup>rd</sup> President of the U.S. between January 2001 and January 20, 2009. During his presidency it can be said that like many other presidents he tried to extend freedom, opportunity and security at home and abroad. The most terrific event during his presidency can be asserted as September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks which were experienced at the homeland of the U.S. About 3.000 people were killed on the land of America. His response to this was given immediately to protect American people. He had led the most dramatic reorganization of the federal government since the beginning of the Cold War. He built global coalitions to remove violent regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq that threatened America. So he developed strategies towards especially Middle East in the aftermath of 9/11 (The White House, 20??).

Before the end of the first year of Bush's presidency, on September 11, 2001, nineteen individuals hijacked and commandeered four U.S. aircrafts, turned them into directed missiles and crashed them into the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington D.C., killing more than 3.000 people. These terrific attacks against innocent people were soon widely condemned all around the world. The world leaders hastened to do so with the fear to shun the measures taken against terrorists and the states which supported them. Three weeks later from the attacks, the United States and the United Kingdom united in a major campaign in Afghanistan. In the meantime, the U.S. administration prepared for a war in Iraq.

Stated in other words, George W. Bush faced with terrorist attacks on the lands of America before the end of his first year as a president. Attacks were made by terrorists on 11 September 2001. "From that attack sprang the global war on terror, a campaign to battle terrorists around the world and to bring peace and security to the United States" (Marquez, 2007: 8).

Initially the Bush administration gave little attention to terrorism, and but divulged its highly nationalist and unilateralist ideology "by proposing to negate the 1972 ABM treaty and build a national ballistic missile defense system and by rejecting and the Kyoto Treaty on Global Warming, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the International Criminal Court, and the Treaty on Land Mines" (Offner, 2007: 37).

Before the 9/11 attacks, the foreign policy had never tended to dominate American public discourse nor determined the outcome of a presidential poll. Nevertheless the attacks changed this tradition as well. The Middle East became the top topic of the agenda of the foreign policy of America as a result of 9/11 attacks, the “war on terrorism” and American invasion to Iraq. Iraq and Iran were not just Bush’s target sights in the Middle East but;

“pressure grew to look afresh at the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Lebanon, Syria, regional security and arms defense issues, Egypt, the absence of democracy in pro-western regimes such as Jordan, as well as economic factors such as oil and global capital development” (Edward, 2006: 254).

Hence September 11 attacks gave rise the USA, being the only super power, to redefine its security problems. Thus terrorism was placed to the first rank among the new threats and it was declared that the nations which were supporting the terrorists all along the world would be perceived as enemy and be struggled without remorse (Ural, 2009). President Bush always saw himself as a “war president.” After 9/11, especially, he seemed to view the world as a Hobbesian jungle in which force is mainly what matters. Thus it can be claimed as Hirsh stated some of America’s goals may be achieved here in the end. The world has seen a demonstration of American will and power, a willingness to absorb casualties that has undercut the “paper-tiger” image promulgated by Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. New generations around the world now understand what can happen when America gets angry, just as earlier generations did after Pearl Harbor (Hirsh, 2003).

As a result 9/11 terrorist attacks made the president’s priorities and rhetoric changed. In the aftermath of the attacks the president declared the U.S. was in a global war and he was a war president that got him to gain the right to expand his power. In addition he stressed that they were in a conflict between good and evil and also stated that he wanted Osama bin Laden whether he was dead or alive. On January 2002 he declared that “war against terrorism” had begun and announced the war “would include dealing with regimes that threatened the U.S. or its allies directly with WMD or by passing WMD to terrorists” (Offner, 2007: 37).

In most of the 1990s the USA was a “reluctant sheriff” according to the statement of Richard Hass. The USA was the super power of the world, even though it was reluctant to perform this responsibility and cover the uncertain expenses. Nevertheless after the September 11 attacks, having felt a threat directly towards itself, the USA was in an

attempt to impose its power through war against the terrorism and for this it mobilized all its national resources (Cottey, 2006).

Until September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, the United States' mainland had had a degree of inviolability that underwrote its imperial indifference to the socio-cultural details of its various adversaries, or the long-term consequences of its foreign policies. The sheer scale and spectacularly mediated nature of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon have brought home to the United States that its Olympian detachment from the entailments of its global involvements is no longer sustainable (Krishna, 2006).

As the USA's security was seriously damaged by September 11 terror attacks, preventive concepts such as "preemptive attack" for solving the problems by deterrence and preemptive diplomacy and "preventive war" have been occurred (Bozkurt, 2006). Even preemptive strategy is called with Bush; in fact it has been applied often by America from its start date. Bush only turned this strategy into a doctrine after September 11. The only thing which is not changed in the practice of this strategy is the discourse that legalizes the action "freedom". As a result Bush introduces the fact and fight as themes such as democratic values, freedom and human rights not as American national interest. In "Bush Doctrine" which was latterly published and defined the new national security strategy of America, it is notified that America should be ready to stop rogue countries and their terrorist friends before they become ready to treat "us" (Americans) and "our" (Americans') allies with mass destruction weapons and America is given right to hit the target which is perceived as a threat even there is not a direct attack to them. With this doctrine Bush also defines that in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the struggle between totalitarianism and freedom was won by freedom, however the struggle in the 21<sup>st</sup> century has been to preserve this freedom.

The Bush doctrine "clearly draws on American traditions of exceptionalism and mission, and Cold War containment and deterrence" and also its "emphasis on maintaining military superiority over every nation or adversary suggests U.S. intent to be not just the world's policeman but its permanently predominant power, a policy likely to inspire resentment from allies and less friendly states" (Offner, 2007: 38).

In fact the bases of the new security and foreign policy doctrine of Bush's administration went back to the 1970s, however the practice of the doctrine could be implemented in the atmosphere formed by September 11 attacks in the USA and



generally in the world. In other words, September 11 attacks have given chance to a group of strategists in the USA waiting for a long time for an opportunity to implement their plans (Bozkurt, 2006).

Accordingly September 11 proved what an important concept terror was and what terrorist groups could do. Thus according to “preventive warfare” concept published in September 2002 after the attacks by National Security Strategy, the USA was given authority to take into action in case of an actual threat or its possibility. Thus under the context of war on terrorism, with a substantial rate of international consensus an intervention was made against Afghanistan. Without international consensus, also the USA intervened Iraq under the preemptive strike doctrine in order to change the regime in Iraq and to change the structure into a controllable one (Ural, 2009). That’s, after the attacks on 11 September 2001, Bush “announced a ‘crusade’ in Afghanistan to kill or capture Osama bin Laden, and soon denounced the so-called ‘axis of evil’ of Iran, Iraq, and North Korea, although these countries had nothing to do with the attacks” (Offner, 2007: 41).

Nevertheless, until the summer of 2001 the policy of Bush has been described as “unilateralism” and “isolationism” or “semisphere isolationism” because he focused on Latin America and Asia-Pacific region. But this condition changed after the date of 11 September 2001 (Önal, 2006).

For Hirsh when George W. Bush came into office, he filled in the post–Cold War blank slate by reasserting America’s “hard” or military power. Bush tried at first to set his priorities narrowly and grab a very new world in the old clothes of Cold War–style alliances and raw, Hobbesian might. This was partly in reaction to the perceived weaknesses of Clinton’s approach. If Clinton had depended too much on the international system, Bush would have slighted it. Especially after 9/11, the tools of that system institutions like the U.N. and the World Trade Organization, and treaties curbing weapons of mass destruction needed to be used and strongly supported. His philosophy of world leadership was simple: “America has, and intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge, thereby making the destabilizing arms races of other eras pointless, and limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace.” (Hirsh, 2003: 17)

Briefly in order to shape the world Clinton’s administration consulted to military methods only in case of need; but however, they preferred to use benign policies and globalization. On the contrary, with the Bush’s administration, the approach shaping the

world with benign policy not with military power began to lose its priority. In fact it can be said that for Bush's administration, September 11 attacks gave a chance for them to take an active foreign policy. Because the attackers contributed to form a common threat phenomenon which showed that they aimed at political and economic liberal values represented by the West.

September 11 attacks are important to show the point where terrorists have reached. Although the USA had a very developed defense technology, USA was not able to defend the national security against the terrors. The attacks created such a great panic among American people that they began to suspect from everything. And along with this, nationalistic feelings were woken up. Americans thought that they were in a great insecurity. Because of this fear, public reaction against the foreign occurred.

Especially Americans' opinions towards Muslims had greatly changed. Foreigner, particularly Muslim immigrants began to be chosen as target. Also as a result of September 11 attacks it can be said to be a reason for American administration to change their opinions on terrorism and terrorist groups (Ural, 2009). So then Muslim ideograph "has become a newly added concept to the insecurity related to its ethnical identity" (Alatlı, 2009: 26).

It is claimed that 11 September created a difference within the practice of the foreign policy of Bush's administration, however in fact it can be said that world view of the Presidents was not changed. Because these attacks prepared a proper basis for performing the foreign policy vision of the Republican Eagles at the same time, and also the attacks supported the view of the President and his foreign policy team that America could be preserved from the threat of the world by believing in its own power- especially militarily power- and for this any kind of initiatives and militarily intervention are necessary. Besides, Bush in his speeches on foreign policy stated that America was unique and a power that was responsible for spreading the freedom in new world and defined the new threats that were an obstacle to perform this responsibility as the following; rogue countries, terrorist groups and spreading weapons of massive destruction.

After the 11 September attacks, Bush's message to the world, first delivered in a speech to the nation on September 20, 2001, was this: "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. Either you stand with civilization and good (us), or you stand with barbarism and evil (them). We will not make separation between the terrorist relating

with these attacks and the ones who gave a shelter to them” (Hirsh, 2003: 57). Thus it can be claimed that this became the signal of his forthcoming foreign policy. In his speech he also stated that they would chase the nations who provided a secured shelter to terrorists and helped them. Thus every nations had to give a decision whether they favored terrorist or Americans. It means that either they are with Americans, or they are with the terrorists, from this day on any nation that supports and help terrorism will be perceived as an enemy regime by America. Thus it can be affirmed that with this message he had already given his foreign policy in the aftermath of 9/11.

So it means that he had experienced disputes and tough decisions including a controversial election terrorism and war in his term. After the September 11 attacks he sent troops to invade Afghanistan and then Iraq and eventually overthrowing Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein. While many Americans criticized him because of his misuse of power, the rest supported him because they thought that defeating Saddam referred to a safer world. Also he is criticized by many that he doesn't give much importance to the domestic issues such as the Hurricane and Katrina hit the Gulf Coast in 2005, or devastating New Orleans, Louisiana, Biloxi, Mississippi and many other coastal cities. Because of the funding cuts for many educational, health care and social programs, American citizens concerned about the domestic policies of the President Bush (Marquez, 2007). Simply, contrary to his predecessor the President Clinton, Bush took an active foreign policy.

As mentioned above until the summer of 2001, Bush's foreign policy has been seen as unilateral or isolationist as his focus was on Latin America and Asia-Pacific region. In addition, Bush administration disregarded Balkan region extremely which differed from the policy of his predecessor President Clinton who used power to solve the problems in that region. As a result during the election campaign Bush emphasized American soldiers would be drawn back from Balkans differed from previous problems in Balkans this problem was solved by political negotiation. Thus it can be claimed that Bush administration will not give priority to that region in American foreign policy. Nevertheless after the September 11 attacks Bush and his administration turned their attention towards the Middle East.

Before the attacks, the terrorist attacks were seen only as the problem of the relevant nations but now this perception has changed and it is begun to be seen as the problem of all nations. The President Bush's and his foreign policy team's prior target were to

follow a policy that increased the security of America. These targets can be claimed as; increasing the confidence to American soldiers, preserving American citizens from the threat and attacks of terrors and forming an army having the new latest technology that would encounter with the new threats of the new century. In spite of all of these efforts, on 11 September 2001 it could not stop America to face with the terror in its land. Twin Tower of the World Trade Center being the symbol of America's economic power and Pentagon (Defense Ministry) being the symbol of America's military power were crashed and destroyed by the planes of a terrorist groups. In the same day Bush called all of the citizens to be union against terrorism and from that day American foreign policy was developed within the centre of "war against terrorism" (Önal, 2006). Thus it can be said war against terrorism or in other words the war on terrorism, the associated struggle against the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the effort to establish the democratic political culture have become the central elements determining the dynamics of the U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East.

Thus the USA, after the attacks of September 11, 2001 being interpreted as an attack that cannot be bear to the power and the supremacy of America leded two great "oversea" military-politic operations within nearly one year. It can be asserted that September 11, 2001 became a watershed in the U.S. foreign policy on the Middle East. The U.S. was describing an "act of war" by a private, non-state actor (Al-Qaeda, the alleged planners). This initial framing by prominent figures and members of the policy-making elite greatly increased the probability of a large-scale military operation (Malik, 2006). Thus the USA terminated the regime of Taliban in Afghanistan which carried unendurable features for modern world and, in Iraq, ended Baas despotism of Saddam Hussein having been endured since 1968 actually (Hirsh, 2003). America invaded Iraq according to practice of its political theory which enabled the U.S. to be a world power since 18<sup>th</sup> century. Nevertheless invasion of Iraq turned into to be a military operation which was watched as a sport competition from its destruction to the loot via media (İsen, 2004).

So it can be said that after 9/11 terrorist attacks Bush and his administration gave attention towards Middle East and war on terror. For Bush, the war on terror was mainly about good states and rogue states, states that were "with us" versus those that were not. After the operation towards Al Qaeda under the name of "permanent freedom" in Afghanistan, a possible intervention to Iraq came into agenda. In fact Bush

always criticized Clinton administration for his failure for keeping Gulf War coalition that was brought together skillfully by his father to fight against Iraq and during his administration he put Iraq in to the centre of his foreign policy.

Thus Bush and his foreign policy team see “terrorism” as the centre of foreign policy in this period and claim that international terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda are the biggest danger for American security. In fact this danger had been mentioned in the administration of Clinton frequently. Although Clinton administration formed a counter terrorist team for fight with this organization, it was not turned in to action. With the 9/11 attack a real attempt towards this organization has been carried out by the national security team- especially leaded by National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice and CIA President George Tenet and a strategy which will diminish this organization and continue for years has been developed. This strategy being the base of Bush Doctrine riposte to individual attacks with sanctions. Also the President and Congress cooperate on the issue by destroying the legal and bureaucratic wall that prevents intelligence and judicial units from knowing and sharing vital information on terror threat.

According to this strategy, struggle will be transport to the place where enemy lives and intervention for it will be commenced with elimination of the possibility of peace by thinking that adversary who has mass destruction weapons create a threat against America or its allies. Thus the responsible for September 11 attacks is defined as Al Qaeda and Afghanistan and so the intervention became inevitable. Then the primary goal of America is to compose a willful coalition for the intervention to Afghanistan. With this aim multilateral support declaration was published soon and relations were begun to be improved with the countries such as Russia and China. A joint operation towards Afghanistan was carried out however America became the only commander of this operation.

In consequence it became the signal that America would be the leader in the struggle against terrorism which replaced the threat of communism. Nevertheless the strategy of Bush and his team were begun to be criticized within America as well as out of the country and American public opinion that supported the operation of Bush in Afghanistan declined gradually. But in spite of the criticisms Bush and his team wanted to finish the operation that they began. As a consequence in the speech given on January 2002 by Bush, other targets were defined. In other words he claimed that other regimes such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea supported these terrorist groups. Again in a speech delivered on March 2002 by Bush, he declared that they won the struggle

towards Al Qaeda and Taliban and they commenced the second stage of the war and America would do everything to secure the nation. In speech delivered on January 2003, it was argued that some countries continued to develop mass destruction weapons and these were a threat for America. And Iraq kept producing mass destruction weapons and its nuclear programme and also cooperated with the international terror organizations. So America started necessary attempts to intervene Iraq.

As America's only aim in intervention to Iraq was not fight for terrorism, there were many criticism against the aims such as Israel's security, oil and making American military and political power dominating in the region and also U.N. weapons inspectors could not present a report on which Iraq had mass destruction weapons as America claimed. Nevertheless although U.N. Security Council Members such as France, Russia and China and international public opinion objected, "Freedom Operation" to Iraq has been commenced on 20 March 2003 (Önal, 2006).

In other words, in a speech given by Bush to public on October 2002, he expressed that Iraq was a threat to the country, this country was required to diminish massive destruction weapons, to stop the developments regarding this weapons and to stop supporting terrorist groups but Iraq regime neglected these. These opinions were supported by both parties in the Congress and all members of National Security Council and it was strongly emphasized that dictator of Iraq would not be allowed to be a threat to America. Soon after this speech on October 11 American Congress gave President Bush the right to declare war without waiting the support of the UN and after 12 October Bush administration began to send message to its allies by stating their expectation in a possible Iraq operation.

As a consequence Bush declared to the world and American public in a speech given to the nation on 29 January 2003 that Iraq was a serious threat to the nation and if it was necessary they were determined to use power to diminish this threat. Soon after this on 17 March 2003 they gave Iraq State President Saddam Hussein and his close acquaintances a 48 hour time to leave the country and when this time was ended on 20 March 2003 the operation was given a start. On 13 December 2003 Saddam Hussein was caught near Tikrit.

During this period America also claimed that there was a relation between Iran and Al Qaeda. Moreover America pointed out that Iran performed a secret nuclear weapon

programme like Iraq and this country should be enforced to cooperate with IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency). Upon this by visiting Iran authorities of IAEA have commenced to study on this issue since the month February 2003. Report on the nuclear programme of Iran prepared by IAEA General Director El Baradei was published on 24 February 2004 and here it was pointed out that Iran had this nuclear technology just for peace. But these explanations were not seen satisfactory by America (Önal, 2006).

After September 11 attacks, the USA would like to interfere in the Middle East with many projects. One of them is "Greater Middle East Project". It can be said that this project has two aims; one is controlling the energy sources and the transition way and the other is controlling the countries in the Middle East region by bringing them democracy, judicial understanding, free market economy and freedom. In this way the USA would like to prevent the threat from itself, Israel and the free world. But in order to actualize this Bush tried to implement a using power strategy under the affect of September 11 (Bozkurt, 2006).

Thus after the September 11 attacks USA adopted a "universal security" perception against international terror and began to initiatives with its all institutions to restructure the Middle East. For this aim Greater Middle East Project or with its official name Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative (BMENA) was given a start. But however the official border of the Project is not certain. Nevertheless, 27 countries were evaluated at the first plan under the context of the Project. These countries are; Afghanistan, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Algeria, Djibouti, Morocco, Palestine, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Qatar, Kuwait, Comoros, Lebanon, Libya, Egypt, Mauritania, Pakistan, Somali, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunis, Turkey, Oman, Jordan and Yemen. Thus it can be claimed that the project covers a geographical region and accordingly has a political and strategic aim, and especially has aim on Islam geography, nevertheless it doesn't cover all Islam geography (Ural, 2009). Afterwards, Turkey was removed from the list of target countries.

Two Arab Human Development Reports prepared by a group of Arab scientist in 2002 and 2003 under the UN Development Programme had an important place for forming the basic thought of the Greater Middle East Project to be declared to the international public opinion by the USA. Data and suggestions taken place in these two reports could be claimed to be an inspiration source for shaping the Project. In two reports economic and social aspects of the region were put into forefront (Dağcı, 2006).

According to this project USA aimed to dominate in this region in order to bring democracy and develop it with various methods containing even military power. Greater Middle East Project based on the thought that people in the region were extremely living in bad conditions and this condition was the most important fact for occurrence of the actual problems. According to the project it was thought to actualize the aims such as broadening political freedom, improving the regimes, strengthening civil society, fighting with corruption, augmenting the literacy by education reform, broadening women rights and supporting enterprise and free trade. Also under the struggle with terrorism it was aimed to replace radical Islam and anti American regimes with administration which could be defined as moderate Islam, to augment the welfare level of the society and to bring democracy. Also it can be claimed that another reasons for USA with this project could be its private relation with Israel, its wish for being a hegemonic power, building new nations, controlling energy gate and oil and its wish on preventing in and external actors of the region from gaining power in this region. Nevertheless USA used much more power while performing these.

As national security advisor of USA President Bush, Condoleezza Rice stated in her "Transforming the Middle East" in Washington Post in August 7th 2003 that they would restructure the country. Also she defined that the transformation began in the Middle East would take time and Iraq would be a key nation during the process, and this would cover 22 countries in Africa-Middle East- Caucasus and Asia axis beginning from Morocco to Persian Gulf. Thus it can be said detail information on the scope of the project has been given.

As stated above the project based on the assumption that people in Middle East region were living in terrible conditions and this was the basic reason for occurrence of the actual problems. As defined in the draft, if economical and social conditions in Middle East were improved and democracy was brought there, then people in Middle East region who had the chance to involve the administration and had a high welfare level would gain a consistent structure, thus they would go away from the threats for the West (Ural, 2009). In generally the aim of the project can be summarized as the following;

- "To control the mass destruction weapons,
- To democratize totalitarian regimes,
- To expand economical opportunities and free market economy
- To prevent terror in the region



- To make reforms in education and to augment the level of literacy” (Ural, 2009: 51-60).

Although it is not officially declared, according to the reports published by RAND and edited by Zalmay Khalilzad and Ian O. Lesser under the name of “Sources of Conflicts in the Greater Middle East” and also by Bradley A. Thayer under the name of “The Pax Americana and the Middle East” and many other deductions, the real aims of USA for the Middle East Projects can be claimed as;

- “To become a hegemonic power
- To control energy basin and sources and to provide its security
- To integrate the region with the West economically
- To control the regional based terror and to secure Israel
- To build new nations and to constitute the states according to the international system” (Ural, 2009: 82).

Although it can be said that there are many proofs for perceiving Greater Middle East Project as a product of the USA’s long term interest in the Middle East, it is still not definite what really the Greater Middle East Project is, what a kind of content it includes and more important, whether the USA still would like to implement it or not. Also it can be claimed that there is not a general consensus and opinion on what the content of the project is. Moreover there are many various views on the origin of the project. Nevertheless Greater Middle East Project of which theoretical and technical basic facilities and details was prepared and completed in the pre-years of Republican Bush administration was put into effect on February 2003 (Çakmak, 2006).

In briefly, the augmented interest of Bush administration towards the Middle East especially after 11 September gave rise to the new development under the name of reconstruction in the region. By moving with the thought on the extreme side thus terrorism was being increased for deprivation of political and economical rights in the region, Greater Middle East Project or with its official name Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative (BMENA) aimed to create an extensive transformation including political, legal, information/education, economical, social and security sides in the region from Mediterranean to Afghanistan even to Pakistan. At eight paper draft it was aimed from leaders of the region to bring democracy to their countries and it was underlined that America would support these changes. At this democratization period particularly in the countries in that region independent election and vote right for woman were recognized, and it was aimed to provide possibility to found civil organizations that informed the persons about civil, criminal or Islamic law and to make

media independent. Besides, augmenting the rate of the literate and education period in Arabian countries and promulgating the name of women were among the prior targets. For financially aid, establishing finance organizations and increasing trade with the region countries were among the efforts for this target.

For performing this project Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs Marc Grossman made a tour covering the countries in the region and the Project was transmitted officially to the respondents by "Future Forum". While at this meeting Powell stated "in order to defeat terrorism in that geography political and economic reforms are required", the countries in the region claimed unless the problem in Palestine was solved, reforms would be useless (Önal, 2006).

In consequence, unlike from his predecessor President Bill Clinton, President George W. Bush followed an active foreign policy; however, he was usually criticized not for taking much consideration towards domestic policy of his country. Although initially he ignored Middle East region for his foreign policy, September 11, 2001 attacks gave him a chance to strengthen the identity of the country which was in a blank especially after the end of Cold War. Thus he and his team turned their attention towards the Middle East region. With the terrorists attacks dated 11 September 2001, the USA tried to make its actions and foreign policies towards the Middle East region legitimized by showing Afghanistan as the responsible country for those attacks and claiming that the WMD possessed by Iraqis could be used for further and new terrorist attacks and also carrying out Greater Middle East Project in the name of bringing democracy to the countries in the Middle East region (Yalçınkaya, 2006).

## **CHAPTER 3: HOLLYWOOD FILMS ON MIDDLE EAST POLICY**

### **3.1. Introduction to Hollywood Films on Middle East**

The states take the advantages of promotion process in order to make their foreign policy decisions and acts gained legitimacy. For this reason they often appeal to the media. However the states should be very careful while they are choosing the right image to deliver their messages to the public correctly. Among the other states, the United States is the most successful state to use this method by linking its foreign policy with the media, especially, via cinema. After the end of Cold War, as a unique power, the United States used the media effectively to shape and form the system according to its policy, to preserve its power and to gain legitimacy in front of the eyes of the public while doing these. Thus Hollywood is one of the most useful tools for the U.S. to transfer the mindset to the public. Because through its visuality and the capacity of access to all over the world, the intended message of the U.S. can reach a great deal of people throughout the world. Thus we can say that cinema is one of the politic tools within the power system for today.

It is believed by many people that there is a close relationship between the United States government and Hollywood directors to choose the dialogues in the scenario, actors and actresses, the places, the created enemy to be taken place in the films. As a result Hollywood turns into a tool by which the life style and policy goals of the U.S are transmitted to all people. Especially through "action genre" young people are introduced with new idols and the messages are being accepted by the young generation in other countries. Briefly, Hollywood is an industry more than a sector. Through its box office, Hollywood reaches the masses. Thus it is a powerful and politic institution to shape the minds of people.

According to some critics, reality in those films is depicted via hyper reality which brings cinema into another dimension. Thus especially scenes and music in action films are one of the factors that increase the degree for effecting people. Also cinema as an effectual tool, that's, Hollywood is seen in every important turning points of foreign policy of the U.S. For instance, during Cold War; Soviet Union, Vietnam War; Asians, pre-Cold War era Middle Eastern terrorists have become important functions which are needed by the United States to identify itself.

The U.S. was a powerful state even before the World War I; however it had an isolationist policy. Besides, Hollywood was in a crawling period till the World War II. During this period the themes of Hollywood were mostly about love or American Civil War. Nevertheless a turning point came with the World War II for both Hollywood and the U.S history. The U.S. took upon the role of central actor of the new world and its affectivity was raised.

After the end of Cold War, the United States became the unique power and all of its foreign policy was shaped according to this. After September 11, occupations towards Afghanistan and Iraq, constraints towards North Korea and Iran have the same aims. Directly Hollywood had been affected and especially after the 1990s films on the new role of the U.S. came up. In Cold War years through the character of Rambo the supremacy, honesty and peacefulness of the USA over the Soviet Union was tried to be emphasized, however, a result of the new threat or in other words enemy, Hollywood began to fight against international terrorism and dictator regime's nuclear arms traffic in the years of 1990. That's to say, American hero who was fighting with the Russian spies in the East Europe, was in a struggle with the Arab terrorist in Middle East desert anymore. As it is seen America needs an Other (enemy) to define its identity and its policy throughout its history. After the discovery of America the enemy was Indians, in the 1950s was Nazis, from the 1970s till the 1980s was communists and from the 1990s till today was radical Islamists (Ejder, 2007).

Thus in Hollywood films it has drawn attention that "some Israelis and Latinos are militant zealots, some Irishmen and Arabs are terrorists, some Italians and Indonesians are gangsters and some Asians and African are rapists and all of them are committing heinous acts" (Shaheen, 2001: 11). These enemies are seen on the scenes of the cinema according to the period of the history of the country. In fact, the perception in the films on Arabs who were seen as if they were terrorists appeared on the silver screen long years ago as seen in *Sirocco* (1951), *Wanted Dead or Alive* (1986) and *True Lies* (1994). Because the Middle Easterners were always become an easy target. Nevertheless after September 11, Middle Eastern terrorist- theme films have been reflected to the scene immediately and Hollywood gave intensity to this subject. Hollywood emphasized how Middle Eastern terrorists became a threat to world peace, freedom and human rights. When these films gained box office, the USA made preparations for Iraq War and occupied Afghanistan. By this way, the USA searched for a base for the legitimization for its acts towards the Middle East region (Ejder, 2007).

For Today, The Middle East, which has been regarded globally as a place of conflict as the result of the events September 11, 2001, the war on Iraq and shifting American interests in the on-going Palestinian–Israeli conflict, is at the core of the political debate. The media turns into an important tool in order to grant the Middle East a pivotal position. And among the products of the media, cinema can be claimed as the most effecting one to present the Middle East and the Middle Eastern policy of the United States. The American cinema, Hollywood has been productive in producing films around the theme of the Middle East (Khatib, 2006).

Hollywood cinema is the most powerful film industry in the world, for this reason it is vital to analyze its representation of the Middle East. Because with its representations of the politics of the Middle East, even if just a bit part of people's imagination regarding this region is shaped. That is, with its set of representations, Hollywood can be said to have the responsibility to emerge the other nations' identities.

The films which are produced as a result by history are made by the film industry as texts. So they can be interpreted as a document for the reality. Thus the films can be analyzed as a form of knowledge, ideology and power relations. Khatib emphasizes in *Filming the Modern Middle East* that in fact power and knowledge relationships characterize the films, the film industry and political events all form part of a reality. Therefore it can be concluded that the narrative is the location where struggles take place and people stress their identity and the existence of their history (Khatib, 2006).

The world witnessed a variety of events related to the Middle East from the late 1980s to the early 2000s; the eruption of the Gulf War in 1989, bomb in the World Trade Center by Islamic fundamentalist in 1993, the events of September 11, 2001, and the lasting conflict between Arab and Israel. These all events affected the United States' policy towards the Middle East. So each event resulted in shifting the policy of the U.S. towards the Middle East. As Shaheen defined briefly;

“The image began to intensify in the late 1940s when the state of Israel was founded on Palestinian land. From that preemptive point on- through the Arab-Israeli wars of 1948, 1967 and 1973, the hijacking of planes, the disruptive 1973 Arab oil embargo, along with the rise of Libya's Muammar Qaddafi and Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini-shot after shot delivered the relentless drum beat that all Arabs were and are Public Enemy. [...] It got worse in the 1990s. Two major events, the Iraqi invasion o Kuwait that led to the Gulf War and the bombing of NYC's World Trade Center [...]” (Shaheen, 2001: 28-29).

Thus Hollywood has been affected from these events since films cannot be thought without the political issues of their time. The outstanding political issues of the time can

be observed in those films easily. As known in postmodernism in IR, for Foucault, any discourse is the product of its place and time. So the relationship between films and history is subjective. As a result Hollywood produces films from the eyes of its country.

In Hollywood films it is easily seen that there is an absolute and systematic differences between the Orient, in other words, the East that is shown as irrational, underdeveloped and inferior, and the West that is shown as rational, developed and superior. The West is the opposite of the Orient which is something to be feared and controlled (Khatib, 2006). In this way it creates a misleading among people, especially American to believe that all Middle Easterners or “Arabs are terrorists and that they do not value human life as much as we do” (Shaheen, 2001: 29).

It is also claimed the East is characterized by how the West writes about the East. In other words, it is shaped around the discourses of the West on the East. That is to say, the West writes, whereas the East is written about. As Shaheen quoted the worlds of Platon from the book of *Republic* of him “Those who tell stories also rule the society” (Shaheen, 2001: 5). In this way, the thoughts in our minds and our beliefs are shaped according to the sovereign power. Thus as Khatib remarks the East becomes “a silent Other, an object that is incapable of defining or representing itself, and that is therefore in need of Western subjectivity” (Khatib, 2006: 6). Campbell outlines the view of the Americans towards the other as the following;

“At one time or another, European and American discourse has inscribed women, the working class, Eastern Europeans, Jews, blacks, criminals, coloreds, mulattos, Africans, drug addicts, Arabs, the insane, Asians, the Orient, the Third World, terrorists, and other others through tropes that have written their identity as inferior, often in terms of their being a mob or horde (sometimes passive and sometimes threatening) that is without culture, devoid of morals, infected with disease, lacking in industry, incapable of achievement, prone to be unruly, inspired by emotion, given to passion, indebted to tradition, or [...] whatever “we” are not”. (Campbell, 1998: 89)

Hence as it is seen representation is very important to shape the images of the country in one’s mindset. That’s why the representation of Arabs in Hollywood films can be associated with preserving the status quo of the United States as a world policeman controlling, among others, Arabs and Arab countries (Khatib, 2006). It is thought that since the emergence of film the portrayal of Hollywood on Arabs has not been good and has been dehumanizing Arabs. That’s to say;

“Seen through Hollywood’s distorted lenses, Arabs look different and threatening. Projected along racial and religious lines, the stereotypes are deeply ingrained in American cinema. From 1896 until today, filmmakers have collectively indicted all Arabs as Public Enemy, brutal, heartless, uncivilized religious fanatics and money-

mad cultural "others" bent on terrorizing civilized Westerners, especially Christians and Jews. [...] What is an Arab? In countless films, Hollywood alleges the answer: Arabs are brute murderers, sleazy rapists, religious fanatics, oil-rich dimwits, and abusers of women" (Shaheen, 2001: 2).

Space is an important representation in cinema. This can be taken into account for the exercise of power. For Hollywood space is the stage upon which political conflicts are fought. For instance, the Middle Eastern other spaces are political and ideological in Hollywood (Khatib, 2006). The most used image of Arabia is the desert which is a good example to demonstrate the contradiction between nature and science, that is, wilderness and civilization. "Sometimes this distinction is depicted literally, with juxtaposing images of progressive, (sub)urban space and desolate wilderness" (Khatib, 2006: 22). Or in the American films it can be viewed the displacement of the condition of wilderness from actual natural settings to urban ones. That is, the city of the East is described as a negative space like a modern wilderness or a concrete jungle. The city of the Other is cramped. This representation can be regarded a sense of claustrophobia and chaos that can be estimated upon the Arab political scene (Khatib, 2006).

Mapping and surveillance are two examples of America's different acts in the other landscape. Thus Americans can be viewed to physically penetrate the other space. Through this action America as a masculine side can be regarded to rape the feminized and weak side, the Other landscape. Nevertheless this space needs to be crossed and overcome as it is full of barriers, that is, it is required to be re-territorialized by Americans. This can involve three messages as Khatib defines first,

"border/barrier crossing involves a physical penetration of land and its impregnation with another culture. Second, this territorialization by Self over Other can be seen as enlightenment, as the start of civilization and the end of primitivism. Finally, colonization begins and perpetuates itself through acts of violence, and calls forth an answering violence from the colonized" (Khatib, 2006: 26-7).

Above all, the threat of the Other is not constricted to foreign lands but can happen at home, the homeland of America, as well. The border should not be regarded just geographically limited areas, but also can exist within the nation. As seen in Khatib's *Filming the Modern Middle East*,

"Foucault contends that the apparently "natural" spatial oppositions such as inside (familiar)/outside (strange) are invested with ideology and hence are "till nurtured by the hidden presence of the sacred. This way, the sacredness of a space implies the existence of boundaries that deny that space to Others. Hence, the Other's presence in a homeland (physically or culturally) is deemed profane. [...] that members of society produce imaginary geographies that locate them at the core,

representing those outside as different and threatening. [...] this “geography of exclusion” (inhabited by “imagined communities” (Khatib, 2006: 29).

It can be viewed there is a serious emphasize on space, power and knowledge in Hollywood films on the Middle East and a relation between the U.S. policy and Hollywood. Khatib summarizes this situation briefly by saying;

“Space is sometimes mapped and measured, often imagined. We have to understand here that, even as a victim of Other terrorist attacks, the United States remains the stronger side. It is not marginalized; it marginalizes others. Thus, the imagined geographies of Other spaces are a result of the processes of control exercised by the imagined community of the United States over the Other imagined communities. First Space exists to the extent that the material form of social spatiality exists, as seen in representations of New York for example. However, what envelops this perceived space is the conceived one, the imagined space of Self and Others. The imagined space of Others is homogenized, but most importantly devoid of history, in the sense that it is a fruit of the ideological representation of the American political view. It is not idealized, but essentialized to serve the American political agenda, which is to establish the dominance of the United States in Middle Eastern (world) politics. Hence, space is reduced to a tool, a stage. The Other space does not allow the Other subaltern to speak; indeed the space itself does not speak. It is a passive space, a subaltern itself” (Khatib, 2006:32).

The American films generally take place outdoors this means these films mostly pertain to action genre, that is, masculinity. In those films American space is described as masculine, virile and powerful, whereas, the Other's is described as feminized via mapping, invasion and exploration. Thus these lands are showed up to imagined space or passive space; on the other hand America is glorified. The gender description is thus important for nations to define themselves. As to critical feminist through the description of gender one side becomes the dominant side it means male side the other side becomes the female one which means the oppressed side. Especially in cinema, the way of description which nation is feminine and masculine can carry political statements within itself. As it is well known gender in IR feminism is about being male and female. Thus Hollywood by attributing the USA the role of masculine refers that the USA is the protector and suppresses all his fears hence defends the weak, on the contrary, by attributing the East the role of female Hollywood means that the East is the weak side who needs the protection and care of the USA. Thus this situation can give us clues about the policy of the United States towards the Middle East.

That is to say, Hollywood creates the American nation as a male gender through its films. But this situation has changed from a virile figure to the new man in over time. Stated in other words:



“There has been a historical/political shift in the way this male has been imagined, moving from the image of the virile, statuesque male in the 1980s that constructs the American nation as the world policeman, to the image of the “new man” in the 1990s and beyond, where the United States is placed as a tough yet caring global force” (Khatib, 2006: 12).

Briefly, almost all Hollywood films on the Middle Eastern politics are action drama which is a genre being and prototypically male fantasies of mastery, often with military-political undertones.

During the Cold War era American man was described as virile thus showing the America's hard foreign policy. Nonetheless the description changed with the Gulf War and having kept its role as a world policeman the U.S. added the role of rescuer and liberator of oppressed peoples. This is called as a “new men” in the representation of the cinema. Yet, the American male under a hard body or a new man, is regarded as a universal hero and savior, on the contrary the Arab male is characterized as a threat to the peace and integrity of the United States and the world at large. At the films of Hollywood the sexual vulnerability of the Arab is emphasized by contrasting the physical victory of the American male. The prowess of the U.S. is found place in the depiction of the male protagonist as a spectacular body. The hero, that is, the U.S. is a savior of the entire world from terrorism. This is depicted with the focus of the “camera's vision, and is often exaggerated by close-ups, larger-than-life framing, and lingering camera shots. The body's strength can mean that it is offered as a form of protection within this discourse, the body itself functions as a sort of armour against the world” (Khatib, 2006: 65-67). These can be well observed in the films such as *Iron Eagle* (1986), *Hostage* (1987), *Killing Streets* (1991) and *True Lies* (1994). However the model of extreme masculinity shifted towards mental prowess from physical prowess in the 1990s and beyond.

While the American man is described in this way, the Arab man is described on the opposite direction; undeveloped, backward, savage, and materialist Others. It means that they are depicted what the American man is not. By suggesting “that “they” in the East are technologically less sophisticated and ecologically more dangerous than “we” in the West”(Campbell, 1998: 171). They are seemed to be used as token enemies to show the strength of the American hero, in other way of saying, the American nation. Accordingly,

“This masculinity manifests itself in the representation of the Arab terrorist who is on a mission to attack the United States. This terrorist can be a plane hijacker terrorizing the elderly and religious figures, women or children; a maniac kidnapping an American family; or a street militant set on attacking American

troops or his own people. The terrorists in the films are characterized by extremism, ignorance, and lack of sympathy” (Khatib, 2006: 74).

Thus it can be said that the Arab’s representation in Hollywood is to display the position of the U.S. in the world and Middle Eastern politics. As Campbell defines “the role of difference danger and otherness play in constituting the identity of the United States as a major actor in world politics” (Campbell, 1998: 191).

The Middle Easterners or Arabs are depicted in those films as they wear black beard, headdress, and dark sunglasses and when they appear on the scene, in the background it is usually seen “limousine, harem maidens, oil wells, camels”, nuclear weapons and mosques” (Shaheen, 2001: 2). Meanwhile, the American hero was white however in the 1990s this case somehow changed. Black heroes have begun to take stage to sign the American democracy. However, black man’s character does not transgress the rules irrevocably.

Middle Easterners or male Arabs in general are described as mentioned above, at the same time the Middle Easterners women and children are depicted really as the mentioned description of the Arab men as well. They are humiliated, demonized and eroticized. Shaheen briefed the image of the Middle Easterner women in five points as;

1. “They appear as bosomy bellydancers leering out from diaphanous veils or as disposable “knick-knacks”, scantily-clad harem maidens with bare midriffs, closeted in the palace’s women quarters.
2. Background shots show them as Beasts of Burden, carrying jugs on their heads. Some are “so fat, no one would touch them.”
3. In the films such as *The Sheltering Sky* (1990) they appear as shapeless Bundles of Black, a homogeneous sea of covered women trekking silently behind their unshaven mates.
4. Beginning in 1917 with Fox’s silent *Cleopatra*, starring Theda Bara, studios labeled Arab women “serpents” and vampires” [...].
5. In *The Leopard Woman* (1920) and *Nighthawks* (1981) they are Bombers intent on killing Westerners” (Shaheen, 2001: 22-23).

We can see these 5 points in nearly all Hollywood films themed on Middle East; however the fifth point has been frequently used in the films especially after 9/11 attacks. Also they are covered in black and made kept silent and unlike their international sisters, the costume and the silence of them show that they are in oppression. Moreover they never work in a place like the women in the USA or Europe did. In fact they had gained many rights even before many European women gained. Nevertheless they are depicted as a demonized, an eroticized or a dangerous woman (Shaheen, 2001).

Also one important issue in the films is the confliction between Israelis and Arabs. For long years the conflict between the Arabs and Israelis has been going on and has extended beyond the Arab world with increasing American intervention.

“The position of the United States has shifted from relative direct support for Israel (such as American aid in the 1967 and 1973 wars), to acting as a go-between, attempting to arrive at an agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians which would (in theory) satisfy the interests of all three parties” (Khatib, 2006:77).

As a result Hollywood has been affected from this as well and in the films the U.S. is depicted as the negotiator to fight with terrorism and arrive at peace. However it is difficult to say that the United States’ position for this conflict is neutral. The U.S. is mostly seen as the supporter of Israel. Thus it is argued that the American media is often used Zionist discourse during the presentation of this conflict. Even Hollywood has a milder approach towards Israel; nevertheless the United States is depicted as stated above as a negotiator or a godfather trying to find a solution to terminate this conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Thus it can be claimed that this representation meditates to both exhibit sympathy towards American Jews and affirm the position of the United States as a world policeman.

In fact Hollywood has three major themes to represent the Arab-Israeli conflict. This can be sorted as;

- the ethnic conflict between Israelis and Palestinians,
- the construction of physical and ideological borders between Israelis and Palestinians,
- the representation of the United States as a negotiator whose role to find a balance between Israel and Palestine (Khatib, 2006).

Khatib depicts the policy of the United States for this conflict as;

“The position the United States has taken within the Arab–Israeli conflict historically has fluctuated between predominantly regarding Israel as a diplomatic liability under Eisenhower and Carter and regarding it as a strategic asset under Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Reagan, or regarding it as a combination of both under Bush, Clinton, and George W. Bush. Yet throughout the twentieth century and beyond, Israel has maintained a special relationship with the United States, nourished not only by influential pro-Israeli Jewish lobbying in Washington, but also by the American view of Israel, with its geographical location and military prowess, as a strategic ally in the Middle East” (Khatib, 2006: 118).

In fact, the United States as a superpower has kept this position to both Israel and Arab countries throughout history. Also the main role of the U.S. is not that of fighting back in

the films but is to gain a moderator role between Israelis and Palestinians thus gaining the role of godfather to find peace in the Middle East and the worldwide as well.

“Throughout history, however, the United States, as a superpower, has maintained a superior position to both Israel and Arab countries. While the films present anti-American terrorist attacks by Arabs within the context of the conflict with Israel which the United States is shown to successfully overcome [...] the main role the United States plays in the films is not that of fighting back. The United States in the films is ascribed a position seemingly higher than that of the conflicting parties, thereby constructing it as a godfather mediating between Israelis and Palestinians in order to arrive at peace not only in the Middle East but also worldwide” (Khatib, 2006:119).

Thus in the films the United States is always as the initiator for peace talks in the Middle East. Hence the America is being put in a superior position, whereas, Israel and Palestinians are being put in an inferior position thus the America is almost infantilizing both Israel and Palestinians such as in the films *The Ambassador* (1984) and *Programmed to Kill* (1987).

Also the notion “Arab” has become a synonym for Islamic fundamentalism in contemporary Western culture. The 9/11 September events, the war on Iraq and the conflict in Palestine made Islamic fundamentalism linked with terrorism thus become an anti Western enemy. It is perceived and represented with many West and East oppositions. In general, Islamic fundamentalism is associated with Islam and the Middle East. As Khatib (2006) emphasizes, Muslims and Arabs have a stereotype as being sensual, hedonistic, militant and passive. Arabs in Hollywood films especially for the last two decades and a half have been presented as ruthless, faceless Islamic fundamentalist killers and also they are reduced to terrorists and that is why they are shown as dehumanized. For example, “when mosques are displayed on the screen, the camera inevitably cuts to Arabs praying, and then gunning down civilians” (Shaheen, 2001: 9). In those films there is not any distinction between the notions of Arabs, Muslim and Islamic fundamentalists. “Hollywood tends to blur not only Arab countries, but also Islamic fundamentalism and Islam as a religion with those countries and others in the Middle East region” (Khatib, 2006: 175). They are all seen as the Other, that is, enemy. As Campbell claims, “for the United States, the current period in world politics can be understood as being characterized by the representation of novel challenges in terms of traditional analytics, the varied attempts to replace one enemy with (an) other” (Campbell, 1998: 8). “In contrast to the degeneracy of the Arab/Muslim/fundamentalist Other, the United States in Hollywood stands superior, morally right, and unbeatable” (Khatib, 2006: 167). All terrorist is associated with

speaking the language of Arabic and, Islamic prayers are associated with preparation for terrorist acts in Hollywood films. They are depicted as the one who kills, kidnaps and tortures. The films seem to depend on historical facts to depict these acts.

Thus these descriptions such as terrorists, dehumanized, enemy refer to the Other which is significant for any state's self-definition. As Khatib remarks, "Hollywood's portrayal of Islamic fundamentalism is part of a national project that idealizes the American nation while essentializing the Other" (Khatib, 2006: 174). Thus cinema is important to reflect both the nation's history and its difference from other nations. These fundamentalist terrorists then become a threat to "us". In fact these representations on terrorists in Hollywood mean a reconfiguration of political space. By attributing negative connotations to all Arabs such as the epithets "aliens, animals, bearded Arab, boring oil billionaires, brown devils, camel-driver, desert bandits, devil, dirty dog, jackal, terrorists and wild tribes" directed at the films (Shaheen, 2001: 552-4), Hollywood has been using the images as a tool for cultural defense and has become a space for political metaphor. In here American foreign policy is a dominant discourse.

Ponder the consequences. As seen in films of Hollywood on Middle East, it is recognized that women always becomes the affected side, whether they are of "women of them" or "us". In Middle East, a place of militarism, foreign policy issues, war threat and insecurity, the lives of women and children are always affected. They suffer from these issues and unquestionably they are the weakest of the society that affect from these conditions at most degree (Talhami, 2006). And the negative images of the Middle Easterners are all as the reflection of the president's policies of the era to recreate an identity and show the strength of America to the all world.

### **3.2. Hollywood Films during the Presidency of William 'Bill' Jefferson Clinton**

The terrorism well known by the American citizens, however, it was for the first time to really hit the American citizen's consciousness when Iranian hostage crisis occurred in 1979. In the hostage crisis Iranian students took over the American Embassy in Tehran and took several embassy employees as hostage and in *the Delta Force* (1986) we can see the clues on this event.

In the 1990s terrorist hit the United States on its own soil The World Trade Center was bombed by the Middle Eastern terrorist as a result six were killed. Two years later on April 19, 1995 the federal building in Oklahoma was bombed and consequently hundred sixty-eight Americans died. "Though no American of Arab descent was

involved, they were instantly targeted as suspects. Speculative reporting, combined with decades of harmful stereotyping, resulted in more than 300 hate crimes against them” (Shaheen, 2001: 7).

This became a turning point for the perception of threat. Now there is an enemy threatening the mainland of America as in *Under Siege 2: Dark Territory* (1995). After this event immediately the media focused on the new threat, Arabs, in other words, Middle Eastern terrorists as seen in *Delta Force One: The Lost Patrol* (1999). Thus the fear of terrorism has begun to be felt by American citizens that it was so close to their home. Until this time, from the end of Cold War to that time, the U.S. had not had a clear enemy so it was difficult to display their identity. Also it was difficult for Hollywood to depict a believable screen villain without a real threat. With the occurrence of the new threat perception both the U.S and Hollywood used fear of terrorism in their films and policies (Vanhala, 2005).

The year 1993 brought along one of the deadliest and most destructive years of terrorism. According to the State Department's 1993 report, the year's most important terrorist incidents were the World Trade Center bombing in February, the foiled Iraqi attempt to assassinate the former President Bush in Kuwait in April, and the Kurdistan Workers Party's several coordinated attacks in June and November against Turkish diplomatic and commercial facilities in Europe. “The year's "spectacular" attack, as the 1993 report calls it, was undoubtedly the bombing of the World Trade Center on February 26 in New York City” (Vanhala, 2005: 325). As a result the new threat was the Arabs or the Middle Easterners anymore.

Meanwhile, unlike from the era of the previous presidents, in the Clinton era Hollywood producers gave a response to the changed gender roles in America. Before Clinton era, the women had been excluded. Nevertheless in the 1990s Hollywood film industry began to display woman actress to attract female viewers. In those films the role of women was not just to be decor for her male companion or to be seductive sex pot. Thus women began to be appeared on the silver screen of Hollywood.

Above all according to the zeitgeist in the 1990s two films *The Siege* in 1998 and *Rules of Engagement* in 2000 hit box office and became two important films depicting the policy of the era.

### **3.2.1. The Siege**

**Running Time:** 116 min.    **Genre:** Action Thriller Drama

**Release date(s) :** November 6, 1998      **Director:** Edward Zwick

**Starring :** Denzel Washington, Annette Bening, Tony Shalhoub with David Proval and Bruce Willis

#### **3.2.1.1. The Plot of the Film**

The Siege is an action thriller drama released in 1998 by the director Edward Zwick and 20th Century Fox and Bedford Falls Productions. The film is mainly about the Islamic militants unleashing terrorism in New York City. The film was shot during the president Clinton, although the president was not named in the film, it can be easily understood that the film was colliding with the era of Clinton as he is seen on the TV in the film. The Siege shows us the threat of terrorist in the mainland of America, the danger was at home.

The first scene of the film begins with a bombing of a U.S. Army Barracks in Saudi Arabia. A group led by Sheikh Ahmed bin Talal is blamed for this bombing by the U.S. With the help of a huge paint bomb terrorist manage to escape. The FBI receives warnings to make Sheikh Ahmed bin Talal release. Again a bus is bombed by the terrorist. FBI Special Agent Anthony Hubbard (Denzel Washington) captures a man named Samir Nazhde with who CIA agent Elise Kraft (Annette Benning) is romantically involved. However Hubbard has in a conflict with agent Kraft who persists that Samir is not a terrorist and they need him to keep on the investigation.

Nevertheless the terrorist attacks do not stop, that's the number of the attacks is increasing day by day. The terrorist attacks were made firstly to a bus, then a theatre, a kinder garden and Federal Plaza. As a result the President announces the martial law and the Army's 101<sup>st</sup> Airborne Division under Major General Devereaux (Bruce Wills). He occupies and seals off Brooklyn to find the terrorist cells. That's why he rounds up and detains all young males of Arab descent in Yankee Stadium. This gains reaction by New Yorkers. All ethnic groups in NYC gather to make a peaceful march against the occupation of Brooklyn by their own army. Meanwhile Kraft and Hubbard coerce Samir to arrange a meeting with the final terrorist cell. At the meeting it is understand that Samir is a terrorist also who try to denote the bomb being strapped to his body. Kraft with her other name Bridger was shot by Samir and as a result Hubbard kills Samir.

This time Hubbard with other FBI agents places General Devereaux under arrest for torturing and murdering Tariq Hussein. Consequently, Devereaux is arrested and martial law ends and detainees are released (The Free Encyclopedia, 2010d).

### **3.2.1.2. The Analysis of the Film**

In the film it is always seen that through the dialogues we can easily get idea on American thought on the Middle East region. Although the exotic and mysterious side of the Middle East depicted with the dialogues such as “My first boyfriend was Palestinian,” “My father used to say Palestinians seduce you with their suffering,” “there's these incredibly warm, hospitable people, living in this horrible place,” and “I love Lebanese men,” and “growing up there [in Beirut] was like paradise, like an exotic Paris,”, the many other dialogues show us the dangerous side of this region. All above as Shaheen states that the film;

“is especially alarming. In it Arab immigrants methodically lay waste to Manhattan. Assisted by Arab-American auto mechanics, university students, and a college teacher, they blow up the city's FBI building, kill scores of government agents, blast theatergoers, and detonate a bomb in a crowded bus” (Shaheen, 2001: 17).

What's more in the film there is an emphasis on the word of “jihad”. It is understood by “(Arab terrorists) “pros” having “a warrant from god”, “from the age of 12, they've been dodging people like you, people better than you.” And thus the West labeled the word of jihad with fundamentalist Islam and terrorism. Hence jihad gains the meaning by the West that Muslim supposedly wages a war against infidels.

Moreover in the film it is taken consideration that the dialogues in Arabic language seem to be no worth of being translated in English. As a result it can be claimed that the dialogues of the Arab characters in the film were seen irrelevant.

Furthermore in the film, “the fight against terror” discourse covers the construction of terrorism as both an Arab and Muslim phenomenon. “I just got off the phone with the leaders of the Arab community. We have their complete support and cooperation. They want these criminals brought to justice as badly as we do”. With these words we can see this.

Above all, the politicians' views upon the attacks of the terrorist are important because what they say is important to see what the policy of the country is against the Middle Eastern. Although it is not clearly emphasized we can understand from scenes on the TV news that the president of the era is the Clinton. He says for the bombings “Let me



say again. America takes care of our own. Those who did it must not go unfinished.” Then following to say “the cowards who committed this murderous act must not go unpunished” and “the explosions appear to be the act of terrorists. I’m outraged by the terrorist act.” Also reporters state for the bus explosion “Beirut came to Brooklyn today when the worst terrorist bombing in the United States since Oklahoma City took the lives of more than people”. Via this way, in the minds of people both the thought on the threat at home is emphasized and the threat discourse against Muslim and Arab is shaped. In addition, throughout the film it is continually stressed that the terrorist attacks are towards the way of American way of life. Americans begin to live in suspect and fear. Americans have experienced such a great fear that they get scared from even the sound of exhaust. Putting the emphasis to the terrorist cells, it is shown that the threat is at home and “one cell controls all others. Cut off the head, the body will wither” is an old wisdom and not working anymore. The new wisdom is “each cell operates independent of the other. Cut off one head, another rises up in its place”. Thus these attacks will not have an end. By this way a hate and prejudice occur among American citizens towards the Arabs or the Middle Eastern so they regard every Muslim as a terrorist. Hence we can claim that in fact the West needs a threat and an enemy or an Other to identity itself and the explosions made by the Eastern are a good chance to use to make this (Oumlil, 2010).

Moreover it is important to take attention to the words of General Devereaux “Well, with all due affection for the man, the president doesn’t know about the Mideast or terrorism that I don’t write on his cue cards. He is an expert in covering his own interests”. Thus it is understand that President Clinton doesn’t know much things about the Middle East, however he is interested in the foreign policy on this region. Also it is seen that his advisor group is much more affective in shaping this policy rather than himself.

In the film, although the Middle Eastern terrorists are showed to create a threat in New York, in the second half of the film the character William Devereaux (Bruce Wills) in the form of the U.S. General is sent to the city of New York to secure it via dozens of tanks in the streets and confining a great deal number of Muslim and Arab Americans during the declaration of the martial law. Hence this film is something like a warning on the dangers of overzealous defense.

The film gives a wide place to the news on TV to make the events displayed objectively to the viewers. Terrorist attacks to the external representations of America were shown on the TV news. Also the new enemy of the U.S is global Islamic terrorists. They are

Muslims and generally negative stereotypes have been used to describe them. They are depicted as bearded, using prayer beads and skullcap, reading Koran and going to the Mosque. Whenever a Middle Eastern is on the scene, whether the azan is being recited and its sound is heard or this man is performing the namaz. Also under an armed conflagration, while no American is killed, all the terrorist are killed thus showing one more time the superiority and power of American army. Moreover by comparing the differences between the way of life of Americans and Islamic terrorists, the superiority of America is emphasized (Yilmaz, 2007).

It is also emphasized that Muslims are taking their order from Allah so they don't afraid of anything. In the film Islam is showed as a religion of terrorism, too. The enemy was the Muslims who are blinded and motivated by their hatred of the American betrayal. The film is good at creating the mood of fear of terrorism. The Siege does not show the moment of the attacks much made by the terrorist. Nevertheless the film is much more interested in the social consequences on the aftermath of the attacks. Although this film has been criticized by many critics to include many negative stereotypes against the Middle Eastern people, the director has not had the same opinion with them and insisted that more than negative stereotypes he just reflected the zeitgeist and how America was under a threat of the Middle Eastern terrorists. With those films it can be said the explosions experienced in real life are shown in the scenes as well thus creating a feeling among the American citizens that they are so close the threat and danger they are living among them. In an overall assessment of Hollywood's Middle Eastern images, New York Times religion columnist Laurie Goodstein complained that The Siege was simply the latest in a series of films that cast Arabs in the bad guy role recently reserved for Russians. "With Soviet pretensions shattered and aliens from outer space passes, the new cinematic enemy is the Muslim extremist" (Fries, 2005: 303). As a result it can be concluded although the scenario of Edward Zwick "may be fiction, but the terrorists' on screen killing take place in a real city-the Arabs are rounded up in Brooklyn, where many peace-loving Arab Americans reside" (Shaheen, 2001: 17). Valantin summarizes this film in his *Hollywood, The Pentagon and Washington: The Movies and National Security from World War II to the Present Day* as stating;

"The FBI ends up arresting the last terrorist and the Army general in charge of the operation for anti-constitutional practices. The FBI thus re-establishes the normality of daily life, becoming the incarnation of legitimate power against the excesses of the army, which through its actions, carries out the subversion desired by the terrorists. Terrorist violence, like military violence, are both part of the dislocation of

daily life, the 'social counter-project' of the terrorists, which seeks to transform a peaceful society into a terrified one in order to obtain a favorable response to their demands, meanwhile satisfying their hatred and lust for revenge" (Valantin,2005: 54).

Like many other films, the Siege didn't give much place to woman protagonist too. Kraft with her other name Sharon Bridger was posted in Iraq as part of the covert operations during the Gulfwar. She tried to gain information on Middle East region. However throughout the film it is put emphasis on Sharon's seductive side. When it is said "everybody in the Middle East is sleeping with everybody else". She said it is "only professionally". Also in order to take information from Samir she sleeps with him, however, she can't get the essential information. As a result at the end of the film it is seen that she has been convinced by Samir who is one of the leader of terrorist cells in Brooklyn and suicide bomber and killed by him. Also Middle Easterner women were not given much place in the film. However when they are displayed, they are not again given much importance to these scenes.

All above, though the Siege is more critical and analytical of the role of the U.S. government and the military in counterterrorism when the country is under a terrorist threat on its own soil, the film also supports the prevailing order. "The film's hero, a special FBI agent, not only beats the terrorist threat but also the threat of a military general who has run amok. His work and words throughout the film support the view of terrorism as a crime" (Vanhala, 2005: 356). Thus as a result the U.S. has tried to secure its own land and the whole world from these attacks and fears and at the same time punished the guilty, who was responsible from all of these fear. By doing so the U.S. keeps its protector role for peace of the world.

### **3.2.2. Rules of Engagement**

**Running time:** 128 min.                      **Genre:** Military, Political and Legal Drama  
**Release date(s):** March 31, 2000                      **Directed by:** William Friedkin  
**Starring:** Tommy Lee Jones, Samuel L. Jackson, Guy Pearce, Bruce Greenwood, Blair Underwood, Philip Baker Hall, with Anne Archer and Ben Kingsley

#### **3.2.2.1. The Plot of the Film**

Rules of Engagement being a military, political and legal drama was released in 2000 by the director William Friedkin. The film is mainly about a Marine Colonel named Colonel Terry Childers (Sameul L. Jackson) who is being charged of disobeying the

rules of engagement in a military incident at an American embassy in Sana'a in Yemen and causing the deaths of many civilians by Childers' men.

The film begins with a time in 1968, that's the time of Vietnam War. The incidents experienced by Lieutenant Childers and Lieutenant Hays Hodges (Tommy Lee Jones) in the jungle of Vietnam are displayed. The film jumps to 28 years later, in other words the year of 1996 in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Both of these Lieutenants have become Colonels; however Colonel Hodges is a veteran as well as the result of an injury picked up in Vietnam. While Colonel Hodges is waiting a retirement party, Colonel Childers with his platoon are called into action in Sana'a in Yemen where the residents of Yemen demonstrate outside the embassy of U.S. in Sana'a. The U.S. Ambassador named Mourain and his family needs to be evacuated. During the evacuation, the things have not gone as Colonel Childers planned. Soon 83 men, women and children were killed as a result of the order of him.

After this event, the National Security Advisor decides him to be court-martialed. He could be charged with three offenses; first one is for killing 83 non-combatants, the second is for Conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and the last is for a minor charge of Breach of the Peace. Childers asks Hodges to be the attorney of him, he accepts and goes to Yemen where he finds many audio tapes which calls for jihad against the USA. Although he perceives the reason of the shooting outside the embassy, he thinks that the case will be a hard one to win. At the court it is claimed by the prosecution that Childers' order lies only on the base of personal fear, racism and confusion. Hodges defends Childers well when Childers is being accused severely. At the end he is found guilty of the last offense; that's, minor charge of Breach of the Peace. However at the end of the film it is seen that he honorably retired from the Marines (The Free Encyclopedia, 2010c). In addition, after an investigation William Sokal was found guilty of destroying evidence. He resigned as National Security Advisor. Ambassador Mourain was removed from the Diplomatic Corps and charged with perjury.

#### **3.2.2.2. The Analysis of the Film**

The film is full of juxtaposing images on the space; that's, the jungles of Vietnam, leafy American suburbs and the desert of Yemeni. The use of desert is ironic as well because it serves to the American political agenda. It refers to a classic binary which is barbarism versus civilization. The former part is for the Arabs, the latter is for the West.

In other words it means the barbarism is invested with ideology and the West. The people who inhabit in desert are perceived as a native to the desert that means they are naturalized as the part of the landscape. Like the landscape they are barbaric and a reflection of what wilderness stands for. While American landscape is usually shown as green and urban, as seen in Picture 1, Yemen is shown as having condensed hustle and bustle of seemingly overlapping houses.

**Picture 1. Scene from the Middle East**



**Source:** *Rules of Engagement* (2000)

Middle Easterners are displayed as barbaric in the film and over and over again their image has been reflected as negative. Middle Easterner men are represented as full of hatred against the U.S. and as armed. The angry crowd is continuously firing against the U.S soldiers with stones or the molotov cocktail prepared by themselves, simply are setting the thames on fire. Although women and children are taking part in this action, more often men are on the scene and they are shooting the soldiers of the U.S. Women and children are usually waiting behind them, or women carrying their baby in their arms are just standing in a passive position as seen in Picture 2.

**Picture 2. Woman carrying her baby in her arms**



**Source:** *Rules of Engagement* (2000)

When Colonel Childers ordered his soldiers to open fire to the crowd in front of the embassy building instead of Middle Easterner sharpshooters at first, his soldiers objected to the order as there are women and children in the crowd. Nevertheless as some of them are displayed with armament or shouting slogans against the U.S, Childers repeats his order once more time and his soldiers has opened fire against the civilians and killed more than 80 and wounded many Middle Easterners. Among them the most affected side has become women and children and they are in the unhygienic hospitals waiting for treatment as seen in Picture 3.

**Picture 3. Wounded women and children**



**Source:** *Rules of Engagement* (2000)

U.S. National Security Advisor William Sokal sees the action carried out by the Middle Easterners just as a routine protest against the existence of the U.S. army in Gulf rather than a terrorist attack. Also he perceives the incident of killing 83 Middle Easterners as it has damaged the sensitive balance and confidence in the Middle East and emphasizes that as a result of this incident the U.S. has begun to lose the U.S. Embassies of Saudi, Jordan and Egypt and the U.S existence in the region. Moreover he states that Colonel Childers could behave in any other way rather than killing women and children and other many innocent civilians and the whole U.S. should not be blamed for just the actions of a man. Furthermore this incident was protested by Americans and American press and they just blamed Colonel Childers for killing innocents. In addition in the film it is stressed if a Yemeni killed 83 Americans, the court just lasted for one day contrary to the Colonel Childers.

During the investigation for the court the advocate of Childers, Hayes Hodges observes protest against Middle Easterners towards himself and sees a boy that is standing in front of him as if he is shooting at him, however he has no gun. In addition he finds audio tapes with a piece of Arabic language on it. These letters are translated by a Middle Easterner doctor at the court. They are related to calls for jihad against the USA and word of Allah for all Muslims. It is stated that killing all American, both civilians and soldiers, and plundering all the things of Americans are a duty for Muslims who wish Heaven.

As a result it can be said that all behaviors of the Middle Easterners creates a sense of threat to the West, in other words, to a non Arabic speaking audience. The film in fact has been banned by most Arab countries. Arab women and children in the crowd are shown as armed. Childers is charged for breaking the rule of engagement, at the end Childers as the protector of the nation is redeemed.

Also the flag scene is very important in the film. While American flag is being shot by a Yemeni in Yemen as seen in Picture 4, Colonel Childers saves the flag and proves his patriotism.

**Picture 4. A Shoot at a target of American flag**



**Source:** *Rules of Engagement* (2000)

The film also is as an indicator for the justification of American's mistakes. Moreover the film celebrates the black man's masculinity. This is a man who rescues American ambassador, the American flag and American soldiers and honorably retires from his work. Furthermore the film shows that America is a righteous world policeman and again the ones who have been affected the most from the incidents are women and children (Khatib, 2006).

The critics after the release of the film showed that it "not only reinforces historically damaging stereotypes, but promotes a dangerously generalized portrayal of Arabs as rabidly anti American" (Shaheen, 2001: 15).

### **3.3. Hollywood Films during the Presidency of George W. Bush**

On September 11, 2001, al Qaeda attacked the United States by turning four hijacked airplanes into weapons of mass destruction. Two of them hit the World Trade Center towers, the third hit the Pentagon, and the last one hijacked airliner crashed down in Pennsylvania. Thus the US was hit for the first time within its soil. As a result thousands of people lost their lives on their soil. That's why September 11, 2001 was a date that changed everything especially in America and the world. It was a date to be commemorated and discussed again and again. It was a great shock to the world and



an event which was somehow familiar to film audience watching it on the big white screen. In the aftermath the President Bush announced that international terrorism became the US government's first major war of the 21st century (Vanhala, 2005). Helena Vanhala described this scene good enough to make us feel the atmosphere at that time as;

“On that day real-life terrorism produced a bigger spectacle than any Hollywood film had every produced. The attack was beyond Hollywood scripts, i.e., it combined into one simultaneous attack several attacks that action-adventure moviegoers had in the past seen in films. Airliner hijackings were familiar from Hollywood films, as was the threat of using an airliner as a bomb, as happened, e.g., in *Executive Decision* (1996). But the simultaneous hijacking of several airliners and their use against American economic and military symbols were events too wild even for Hollywood to have portrayed on the screen. Screenwriter Stephen Gaghan explained in a *New York Times* article in October, 2001, that Hollywood had in the past succeeded in creating what the world saw on television screens on September 11, 2001” (Vanhala, 2005:254).

After September 11 attacks, actor definition in international relations has been begun to scrutinize critically. In order to be an actor in international system, having a determiner power capacity is believed to be much more important than having a complementary power in intra system relations. That's why global terrorist organizations like Al-Qaeda are accepted actors within the system anymore. As a result border perception has gone beyond the geographical border and the security of the nation-state model within its border has begun to be scrutinized (Ejder, 2007).

9/11 attacks have given rise world public opinion to re-focus on the thesis of “clash of the civilizations”. The President Bush always emphasized the discourse “you are with us, or against” after the attacks and the US government stressed that they would take the revenge of these at all times. That is the reason why America took severe precautions. This trauma left by the attacks affected the foreign policy of the US and the Americans' opinion on Muslims and all foreigners. Nevertheless the US has successfully used the September 11 attacks to re-strengthen its role as a world security which began to be lost slowly in somehow. Thus it can be claimed that America took the advantage of 9/11 attacks to legalize its global existence reason within new world order (Ejder, 2007).

Americans have sought the answer who the responsible of these attacks and the loss of lives soon after the attacks and saw the Middle East as the responsible of all of these and blame worthy. In everywhere from television to the magazines stories on Middle East took place. They have been showed as what American does not. They speak, dress, act and think differently than Americans. The coverage of the Middle

East has been augmented in number especially in the aftermath of the attacks. Television news, for example, focuses on the differences between a woman in Afghanistan and in America. The former is being showed as in oppression, whereas the latter is being showed as enjoying her freedom (Fries, 2005).

Also Hollywood serves to the government to affect the public opinion. It usually attracts attention that Hollywood uses public myths which serves to keep nation together especially during a crisis. The motto is “this terrible event brings America and the world together to help those in need.” Thus it shows the superiority of America in front of others and strengthens an exclusive American national identity. As it is understood American public myths have been used, reused, created and written according to the political projects of the era. For instance as Khatib stresses Iraq’s position has shifted from an “ally during the conflict with Iran to an enemy with the Gulf War-shifting with it the myth of the Gulf friend to that of an all-threatening essential evil embodied in Saddam Hussein-and again to a country in need of “our” help with the war on Iraq in 2003” (Khatib, 2006: 177). Consequently it can be said Hollywood has been acting as a creator for the new frontier myth in the case of Islamic fundamentalism and accordingly serves as a significant factor to strengthen American national identity.

Therefore Middle Eastern terrorist theme films have been reflected to the silver screen of the US soon after September 11. By creating the myth Hollywood tries to show its consumers how Middle Eastern terrorists are a threat for the world peace, freedom and human rights as seen in the films *Charlie Wilson’s War* (2007), *Grace is Gone* (2007), and *in the Valley of Elah* (2007) with *Body of Lies* (2008).

As mentioned above Hollywood reflects the zeitgeist. Hollywood had full of films having the message that proofed the power of America all over the world from Cold War till the September 11 era, whereas, after the attacks Hollywood released films emphasizing the terrorists being a threat against the universal values and the liberty. And the chronological information about the terrorist attack or the relations between USA and the Middle East is usually given. Thus most of the films turn in to be a documentary file. Hence American’s revengeful policies after September 11 attacks have been tried to be gained a legal base with the emphasis that the attacks against the US have been in fact made against the world peace and welfare (Ejder, 2007).

Attacks on 11 September 2001 can be accepted as a turning point in American history and in Hollywood because it provided new materials to Hollywood. The enemy is

terrorists who are working as at a global dimension and independent anymore. September 11 attacks urged a meeting among the big studio representatives, screenwriters, and political consultants of the president on October 2001. The aim of the meeting is to support American foreign policy dominated with the thought of “War on Terrorism” via Hollywood films. As a result of the meeting with its films Hollywood supported the strategy of Pentagon. Thus it is regarded;

“The key figures in the US film industry have a well-established close relationship and interdependence with the military and politicians. The evidence of this so deep-rooted for it to be seen for what it is: a giant system where political force, military might and the power of film pervade one another and are closely inscribed in the history of American strategy, largely defining its uniqueness” (Valantin,2005:X).

Accordingly many films focusing on terrorism and war have been shot such as *The Sum of All Fears* (2002), *Collateral Damage* (2002), *We were Soldiers* (2002) and *Black Hawk Down* (2001) (Yilmaz, 2007). Thus it can be concluded that there is a close relation between military intelligence, the White House and Hollywood film makers; on the one hand the U.S. military intelligence and the White House asked Hollywood to help in determining what future attacks and methods terrorists might use and help them to convince the public on their military strategy and join them to fight against terrorism, on the other hand Hollywood uses the material provided by them (Vanhala, 2005). Hence it would be hard to think that a screenwriter is likely to place the deceit of 9/11 and reflect the wrong policy of the government, with the possible exception of Michael Moore’s *Fahrenheit 9/11* (2004) (Lewis, 2006).

Because 9/11 attacks were not just a scene from the silver screen of Hollywood it was real and a main event. The U.S military intelligence, the White House wanted to prevent other attacks because they thought that the war against terrorism would not be ended. Robert J Bresler summarized the anxiety in his article “Are We at War or What?” by remarking;

“The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the counterterrorist efforts at home to prevent another 9/11 are against an enemy as dangerous as the most fanatical fascist or communist. These with us-or even to take things from us. They wish to destroy us and our civilization. As one of their leaders claimed, "We are fighting to eliminate you." They have no single home address, and they wear no uniforms. There is no Kremlin to plot against, no Berlin or Tokyo to bomb. With potential access to modern technology, they could let loose any number of biological, chemical, or radiological horrors on unsuspecting innocent victims. Just ask the people of New York, London, and Madrid. Even if we are successful in Iraq, as I suspect we will be, this war will not be over” (Bresler, 2006: 27).

Thus as the Hollywood films coincided with the 9/11 attacks during the presidency of President Bush, the main theme of the films are about “You are either with us or not” and “War on Terrorism” as parallel to the policy of the President of the era.

Hence many films having the post 9/11 themed issues were shot. The most outstanding films among many others were *Munich* by Steven Spielberg (2006), *World Trade Center* by Oliver Stone (2006), *United 93* by Paul Greengrass (2006), *Syriana* by Stephen Gaghan (2005) and *A Mighty Heart* by Michael Winterbottom (2007), *In the Valley of Elah* by Paul Haggis (2007), *Grace Is Gone* by John Cusack (2007), *Lions for Lambs* by Robert Redford (2007) and *The Kingdom* by Peter Berg (2007). Among these films two of them *Lions for Lambs* and *The Kingdom* will be tried to be analyzed under the light of the policy of the President of the Era.

### **3.3.1. Lions for Lambs**

**Running Time:** 88 min.      **Genre:** Drama

**Release date(s):** November 9, 2007      **Director:** Robert Redford

**Starring:** Robert Redford, Meryl Streep, Tom Cruise, Michael Peña, Derek Luke, Andrew Garfield and Peter Berg

#### **3.3.1.1. The Plot of the Film**

*Lions for Lambs* is a drama film released in 2007 by the director Robert Redford by Cruise/Wagner Productions. The film is mainly about three different simultaneous stories of a college professor, a senator and two soldiers and the U.S. government’s trial of the wars in the Middle East. Thus the film can be divided into three parts. In fact each of these three parts possibly crosses fertilizing the others. The first part is about a college professor named Dr. Stephen Malley (Robert Redford) who tries to reach a talented but disaffected student named Todd Hayes (Andrew Garfield), in other way of saying; Dr. Malley tries to reengage this promising student. The second part is about a senator named Jasper Irving (Tom Cruise) who plans a new military strategy in Afghanistan and details to a journalist named Janine Roth (Meryl Streep) from whom the senator hopes to help him to convince the public on this initiative. The plan of the senator is about using small units to seize the strategic positions in the mountains before Taliban can hold them by force, that’s; to send small group of soldiers to secure advance positions. And the third part is about two soldiers named Arian Finch (Derek Luke) and Ernest Rodriguez (Michael Peña) in Afghanistan who were once students of

Dr. Malley and gave a radical decision to enlist the army to fight in Afghanistan. They face with Taliban soldiers in Afghanistan. During this time Hayes is watching television and sees on the screen the announcement of Senator Irving's new military strategy in Afghanistan and he begins to consider about what Dr. Malley has said him (The Free Encyclopedia, 2010b).

### **3.3.1.2. The Analysis of the Film**

Lions for Lambs has a good quality of cast that has taken the public's attention, however it has criticized severely for repeating the facts already known. The film begins with the words "At least 3,555 members of the US military have died since the Iraq War started back in 2003". Then the camera shows the office of Senator Irving. The scenes in Washington DC are highly emphasized as showing the plan "War on Terror". Irving also invites journalist Janine Roth to detail his plan on a new military strategy and thus speaks to the public about his new plan. Here it is always emphasized by the Senator that "a new plan that will win both the war and, as cliché as this might sound, the hearts and minds of the people" and through the new plan it is aimed to make the press inform better and "to change the subject from the past to the future, acknowledge mistakes and talk openly about ways of fixing them, step by step." Also the Senator states that they are determined rather than panicked on the new plan. Moreover the scenes at the Bagram Air Force Base shows that U.S. government is determined this time to win the war and can't wait NATO to decide before they put their new plan into motion. So it is understood that the President aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks has taken more severe actions on its foreign policy.

When Senator Irving expresses his thought on this new plan, it takes consideration that America will whatever it takes to win the war to keeps its role as righteousness in the world as seen in the dialogue "not only the end of hope for millions of Afghans but the end of American credibility, the end of America as a force for righteousness in the world. We'll square off against a shattered Iraq, a hopeless Afghanistan and a nuclear Iran." Thus we can see how the government is determined on this new plan.

Nevertheless by admitting America made mistakes in the past and decisions on war made by decision makers who have never bled in a fight, Senator Irving shows that America has taken lesson from the past and hence acting fairly. Meanwhile Senator Irving confesses that America needs to win in Afghanistan, in other words to win the war against the Other in order to "make Americans refocus" and keep the nation

together. Also Senator Irving is a member of the party which is known for representing security and power and this is well understood he is one of the members of the Republican party because of the pictures of the President George W. Bush, Dick Cheney and Condoleezza Rice on the wall as seen in Picture 9.

**Picture 5. The President George W. Bush with the Senator**



**Source:** Lions for Lambs (2007).

Like many other Hollywood films, it can also be said for this film that almost there is no woman scene except from Janine Roth and it is hard to see a Middle Eastern woman in a film of which scene is full of war. She is a journalist who writes about the policy of the President. Although the Senator tells her about the new plan in order to make the press informed better about it, Janine Roth is not pleased with this new plan. For this reason when she get backs to her office she explains her thought. Nevertheless it is said to her that if she insists on not writing the story she can't find a job at an age of 57 rather than this office, also in a condition that she has to take care of her mother who needs 24-hour care. Thus as it is seen that Janine is in a world where man is dominant and although she has a job related to woman, it is emphasized that it will be difficult to find another job at this age. Also it is stressed throughout the film that she is put in a position where she writes about the policy of the country how a man or the Senator Irving wants. So she is not able to create the image, but the Senator who is in a position of decision maker.

In brief, the film simply can be said to address the U.S. role as both world policeman and a credible force for good. Unlike many other films released after 9/11, *Lions for Lambs* openly names the wars, the politicians and the propaganda and like many other this film has not given much place to woman, either (Gardner, 2007).

### **3.3.2. The Kingdom**

**Running Time:** 109 min.    **Genre:** Fiction

**Release date(s):** September 28, 2007    **Director:** Peter Berg

**Starring:** Jamie Foxx, Ashraf Barhom, Chris Cooper, Jennifer Garner, Jason Bateman, Kyle Chandler, Richard Jenkins, Jeremy Piven and Ali Suliman

#### **3.3.2.1. The Plot of the Film**

The Kingdom is a fictional film released in 2007 by the director Peter Berg by Universal Pictures. The film is mainly about an imaginary terrorist attacks in a softball game of the American Oil Company employees in Al-Rahmah Western Housing Compound in Saudi Arabia. A team of FBI agents were sent to Riyadh in the aftermath of a bombing to make investigations and found themselves blocked in each turn. The film was inspired by the bombings at the Khobar housing complex in 26 June 1996 and Riyadh compound in 12 May 2003 in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It was severely criticized by the critics in Kuwait and Bahrain in order not to reflect the reality (The Free Encyclopedia, 2010a).

#### **3.3.2.2. The Analysis of the Film**

Like many Hollywood films, *the Kingdom* begins with scene of desert. A timeline sequence on the diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia is presented. After the foundation of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1932, the relations between the U.S. and the Kingdom began and in 1933 the oil was discovered in that region by an American expedition. Then the U.S foreign policy towards the Middle East is given until the president time. Here it is clear that why Osama bin Laden commenced actions against the Kingdom and the U.S. As a result the terrorist attacks increased in the 1990s as seen in Riyadh, Nairobi, USS Cole. Although the relations between those two country is good as it is understood from the information given in the film as “the U.S. offered its half million American soldiers to fight in the invasion in 1990” and “Saudi Arabia is the 1<sup>st</sup> oil producer in the world. United States is the 1<sup>st</sup> oil consumer in

the world in 2000”, 15 out of the 19 hijackers on September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks are Saudi. The Saudi Monarchy quickly condemned the attacks. The reason is to condemn the attacks is that Laden provided the thought that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is the enemy of the U.S. Thus bin Laden killed two birds with one stone.

Hence it can be said that like *Lions for Lambs*, in some way *the Kingdom* presents information on the Persian Gulf War, increasing terrorist networks and many things about the 9/11 attacks like a documentary film, too. In addition, this film used the cliché for depicting the Arabs as being bearded villain, the corrupt officials and evil terrorist (Gardner, 2007). FBI agent Janet Mayes summarizes the image of Arabs as “It is a very confused culture. Extremely religious. Had nothing; wanted nothing. Sixty years ago, they hit oil. Simple religious men become trillionaires ... a schizophrenic nation is born. The royal family, who we back, and everyone else.”

Here the film also gives emphasis to “a man who can plan the mass-murder of women and children, then go home at night to his own and sleep soundly. That kind of Man is supremely difficult to catch”, however, “every Amir at some points gets bitten by his work”. Thus it is seen that the Arabs are being depicted as merciless who kills any enemy regardless of their gender.

Moreover Middle Easterner women are depicted as they are wearing jilbab and it is even difficult to see their eyes as seen in Picture 10. So, negative images have been laid on them.



**Picture 6. Middle Easterner women**



**Source:** *The Kingdom* (2007).

Like their Middle Easterner fellows, white American woman agent Janet Mayes has been looked down by men in the region. Before having arrived there Agent Mayes had stressed her anxiety about this by saying “I’ll be looked at with what I can only describe as disdain.” So we can get the idea that no matter whether American or the Middle Easterner, all women are oppressed by the male gender in the region. The scene when The Prince of the Kingdom visits the FBI team at the investigation area is taken attention as Agent Mayes has been made to cover her breast when the Prince come. Because the thought is that they are a womanish part and should not be seen by anyone else and should be covered. Also the Prince does neither shake her hands nor invite her to his palace. Thus it can be seen that Agent Mayes has been tried to be excluded from the world of men. In addition to this, when Middle Easterner are depicting like their fellows they are shown as having role of the protector and care giving as it is seen in the scene when FBI agents are under fire with terrorists, the mother Middle Easterner tries to protects her child. Also Janet has been depicted as having this role when she gives lollipop to the Middle Easterner girl.

Above all, at the scene showing the death of Abu Hamza, he whispers to his grandchild in Arabic “don’t worry, we will kill them all”. At the very end of the film it is also realized that Agent Ronald Fleury whispers to Agent Mayes at the beginning of the film the words “we will kill them all” after the death of their friend at the attacks in Al Rahman.

Thus the film ends with the thought that the attacks will not end and all sides are going to bear a grudge to each other and it can be concluded that terrorist attacks and “the war on terror” will keep on being on agenda.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The States principally take the advantage of the media while reshaping their foreign policy. The United States of America, being the country which is using this method repeatedly, can be asserted to be one of the countries that is carefully chosen its message to be delivered to the people via the media. The reason is that it is important to reshape and reflect the mindset of the era. And cinema has been among one of the most used tools of popular culture since it was occurred. Hollywood, being the film industry of the USA, reflects the zeitgeist and makes the audience interpret the American philosophical thought as well. That is to say, "if the definition of a great political movie is the way it pertains to show how political power is exercised, it is a literal investigation into the theories of American political culture" (Scott, 2000: 17). In any case, there is "a general consensus that Hollywood films are complex cultural documents which speak either implicitly or explicitly to the concerns and preoccupations of their own moment of production" (McCrisken and Pepper, 2005:2).

In the period of Clinton between the years 1993 and 2001, different from Bush's administration, the strategies were based on economic power not military power. Clinton administration adopted a perception that economical supremacy was more significant than the military power and for them the biggest threat was global economic crisis. When President Bill Clinton explained the theme "expanding democracy" after the collapse of Soviet Union he stated;

"In a new threat and opportunity period our main aim should be to expand and strengthen the world society of the democracies based on market economy. During the Cold War we were after for limiting the threat against the free institutions. Now we would like to enlarge the circle in which nations living under these free institutions become present. Because our dream is a day when each person in the world is able to express their thought and energy, cooperate with each other and live in a peace in a successful democracies world" (Kissenger,2006: 782).

When Bill Clinton elected as the President, "his favorite slogan being: 'We must think about the Middle West before thinking about the Middle East.' Once in power, as the first president of post-Cold War Era, President Clinton and his team had little taste for foreign policy, even less for strategy" (Valantin, 2005: 44). In fact, Clinton administration focused on the global and ethnical problems in various regions, however, between the years 2001 and 2004, Bush and his foreign policy team gave importance to the relations with the great powers and its neighbors. In other words, President Clinton did not follow an active role in foreign policy and did not fall over

himself to possess the role of world police. He preferred using power and military in case of needs, instead of this he preferred to use benign policies or globalizations. Also throughout his presidency President Clinton tried to spread democracy, threat cooperation, all nations' security and unification of nations against terrorism. On the other hand his successor President George W. Bush, especially after 9/11 attacks, saw the world as a Hobbesian jungle in which force is mainly what matters and he announced that as a president of war he would follow the policy of "war on terrorism".

Nonetheless the USA felt the threat of terrorism within their soil with the terrorist attacks to the World Trade Center which was bombed by the Arab terrorist in 1993 and two years later in 1995 terrorist destroyed Federal Building in Oklahoma City and this sinister incident resulted in killing more than 150 innocents. That is to say;

"The April 19, 1995, bombings of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the first attack on the World Trade Center on February 26, 1993, and the anthrax scare just months after September 11 had cautioned the nation about stateside catastrophe; still, the magnitude of the Al Qaeda airline scheme had surpassed the imagination of our (Americans) best defenses" (Havis, 2010: 3).

Valantin told that question on the threat of terrorism was polarized between the end of the 1980s and of the Gulf War, "well before the attack on the basement of the World Trade Center in 1993. This unique event, as well as the Al-Qaida attacks against American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, would feed the terrorist threat production industry until 2001" (Valantin, 2005:50).

The relationship between Hollywood films and American foreign policy does require further and deeper scrutiny. Long years ago, Hollywood moviemakers repeatedly depicted American Indians, Asians, Italians, Japans and Latinos as the "Other" or "Enemy", however owing to the changing global system and the policy of the U.S. the new target of Hollywood is the Middle Easterners or in a word the Arabs.

The "Middle East is a Western term, denoting a region stretching from North Africa to the rest of the Arab World in South West Asia, but also including largely non-Arab nations such as Israel, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan" (Chaudhuri, 2005:54). In addition, "although U.S popular cultural representations often conflate the categories "Arab" and "Muslim", not all Arabs are Muslim and not all Muslims are Arabs" (Naber, 2008:5).

In spite of the known facts about the Middle East region or the Arab world such as their inventions on algebra, astrolabes, water clock and contributions to the navigation, star maps, celestial globes, architecture, pioneered water works and secular literature,

scientific and philosophical thought, they are made to sustain adverse portraits across generations through repetitious and negative images. Through these repetitious and negative images Hollywood creates a false opinion in the minds of the viewers that “all Arabs as Muslims and all Muslims as Arabs” and mislead viewers (Shaheen, 2001: 4).

Thus, non-Arab, non Muslim racialized groups became temporarily incorporated into the notion of American identity, while Arabs and Muslims were racialized as terrorist threats to the nation” (Alsultany, 2008:207).

For all intents and purposes, in order to recreate an identity and prove its strength the U.S needs an “Other” and so attributing negative image to the other nations at some certain times. As the opinions on this issue;

“He (the Middle Easterner) is robed and turbaned, sinister and dangerous, engaged mainly in hijacking airplanes and blowing up public building. It seems that the human race cannot discriminate between a tiny minority of persons who may be objectionable and the ethnic strain from which they spring. If the Italians have the Mafia, all Italians are suspect; if the Jews have financiers, all Jews are part of an international conspiracy; if the Arabs have fanatics, all Arabs are violent. [...] we are all more alike than we are different” (Shaheen, 2001: 1).

Especially after 9/11 attacks the enemy being fought is “illusory and highly mobile, spreading throughout the world in numerous clandestine cells” (Dixon, 2005:1). As a matter of fact, in pre 9/11 attacks period, Arabs had mainly been depicted as villains, oppressed women with veil, “exotic belly dancers, rich sheikhs with harems, and most remarkably as terrorists, however, representations of Arabs as terrorists continue with increased dedication after 9/11” (Alsultany, 2008:205). The attacks of September 11 had the effect of confirming the stereotype of the Arab terrorists.

Ponder the consequences. It can be affirmed that as long as the U.S keeps these images, the identity, the security and the strength of America are under a guarantee. Accordingly, all American strategy takes its base from the idea of threat to help legitimizing agreements on “defense and security strategies, from the implementation of large scale weapons programmes to decisions to launch military expeditions all over the world. The American foreign policy and strategy universe is dominated by this idea of threat” (Valantin, 2005: XI). Stated in other words;

“Discourses on safety and risk are a form of governmentality. In this case, ‘crisis’ is used to justify racist views and practices; to racialized Arabs, Arab Americans, Muslims, and Muslim Americans as threats to the nation; hence to use them as the contemporary racialized enemy through which the nation defines its identity and legitimizes its abuse of power” (Alsultany, 2008:228).

As a result there is a mutual relationship between Hollywood and the U.S. government. In this way, the government defines its identity and legitimizes its actions. Even so, Hollywood does not reflect the actual reality but something resembling the reality. That is to say, “the enemy (Other) and the hero (America) have been strained from the text of the scenarists of Hollywood” (Alatlı, 2009: 13). However the themes of Hollywood films have changed according to the policy of the era. For example, in the 1950s the enemy was Nazis, however the enemy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is Middle Easterners. Thus as it is understood both Presidents Clinton and George W. Bush had turned their attention towards the Middle East region during their presidency periods, however their attitudes were changed in practice.

As a consequence Hollywood was affected from the periods of the Presidency of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. Basically cinema does not play a neutral role while transforming the message to the audience. As a product of Postmodernism cinema like “Funhouse Mirror” both reflects and alters our image, as a result, exposes and highlights our beliefs and values. It helps us to understand how discourses have a function to perceive the knowledge. As Derrida asserted world is something like a text and can be understood through an interpretive experience. Postmodernism or the tool of postmodernism cinema makes us interpret the world. It means that Hollywood makes us interpret the discourses of the foreign policies of the presidents in a sense.

According to David Campbell sovereign states depend on the discourse and threat in order determine its identity after the end of Cold War era, the USA required a new threat and danger that would replace the old one. Thus the USA has turned towards to the new forms of violence such as terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism (Campbell, 1998). That is to say, the USA is putting the Middle East in a subordinated position. It means that the East has been made written by the West. Stated in other words, the discourse on the East is shaped by the West. The West writes and the East is written about. As Joan Hoff claims a nation prefers war to prove its national identity in case the nation has doubt on it (Hoff,19??). Thus, after the end of the Cold War the USA was left without enemy to strengthen its identity. And Postmodernism is interested in how sovereignty is spatially and temporally formed.

Different from those feminism gained place in IR in the late 1980s, however it included variants. Many feminists claim that the place of women in society has been determined not by God but by society itself. And the world is shaped by gender and many discourses on IR are determined by a masculine perspective. Hence a division

between two genders has been made as the low and high policy. High policy is related with man whose interest areas are strategy, military and security and low policy is related with woman whose interest areas are education, health care and culture. In this way, women are limited to the home and family sphere. Even women take a place in high policy, according to the feminists, these women are either problematic or know how to behave in a man way, or in other words mannish.

If we go over the issues mentioned above, although cinema is a product of culture which is a part of low policy to be an interest area of women, is highly dominated by male. As the decision makers or givers become men, Hollywood films are dominated by male gender. Especially films such as war and action are usually excluded women. Basically, in a place of man, that means in Hollywood there is not any place given to the women.

When we scrutinize four films named *the Siege* (1998), *Rules of Engagement* (2000), *Lions for Lambs* (2007) and *the Kingdom* (2007), it takes attention that they reflect somehow the foreign policies of the Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush especially towards Middle Easterners. As the first two Presidents after the end of Cold War, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush tried to create a new Other to strengthen the nation's identity and to find a legitimate way for their actions and gained the role of world police and mediator. Although Bill Clinton had a moderate foreign policy, George W. Bush had not. What is more, the President Bush had mostly discourse on "war" and encouraged the "warrior spirit" among people. Both presidents make Americans feel the danger and the threat so giving them way to legitimize their actions. Although 9/11 attacks is a sinister incident in the history because many innocents had died, President Bush took the advantage of the attacks by the help of the media, especially Hollywood films. Because, President Bush declared war against Afghanistan and Iraq and thus he tried to prepare a legal base for these wars. Also the films as seen in *the Kingdom* and *Lions for Lambs* during his presidency resemble to documentary films which gives us detail information on the relations between Middle East and the USA. The "stark rhetoric of the Bush administration's quest to eradicate 'evil' finds a perfect correlate in films that cast A-list Hollywood stars in battles against the calculating and murderous violence of highly racialized terrorist 'others'" (Dixon, 2005:22).

Above all, the terrorist threat remained fairly at the margins of Hollywood until *The Siege* came to the silver screen in 1998. A small group of Palestinians bombed successively in Manhattan. The reason was that they want to "avenge the manner in

the CIA abandoned them to Saddam Hussein in 1991 after training and preparing them to assassinate the Iraqi leader, while on the other, they want to secure the release of their inspirational sheikh leader secretly captured by the army secret services” (Valantin, 2005:54).

Lawrence Wright the screenwriter for *The Siege* (1998) that presented the fictional tale of the “abduction of a U.S. military leader by a group of Muslim militants, said the events of 9/11 were cinematic in a kind of super real way. It was too Hollywood and they could never used in *The Siege*” (Dixon, 2005:9). Thus as it is understood the extent of the threat is at an alarming extent.

*Rules of Engagement* (2000) released during the Presidency of Bill Clinton, usually emphasized the negative images of the Middle Easterners as if they are threat to all people. Thus creating the Other the USA government shows that they are next to the innocents and try to extend democracy and peace around world. When we look at *The Siege* and *Rules of Engagement* it is important to give attention that as Bill Clinton had not much war discourses in his foreign policy towards the Middle East, in both films it can't be observed, and at the end of both films the US has tried to both secure its own land from the threat and dangers and punish the whoever the guilty, being a threat against the peace of the world, is.

During the presidency of George W. Bush, Hollywood films are usually on the attacks of 9/11. The film frequently reflects the discourse of “war on terrorism”. *Lions for Lambs* is like a document on the foreign policy of the USA towards the Middle East. In addition the film is completely about the war plan in Afghanistan. In *The Kingdom* it is again taken attention that it is like a documentary film which tells us about the chronological relationship between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the USA. Again those two films reflect all Middle Easterners are barbaric people who are heartless one loving to kill people under the orders of Allah.

The Middle Easterners, or Arabs or terrorists are all usually depicted in those films as wearing black beard, head dresses, narrow minded with harem and driving camels. Being parallel to these depictions, Middle Easterners women are presented as humiliated, demonized, eroticized and oppressed wearing black veils or bombers. They are generally depicted as silent object just carrying babies or looking after them and never work in jobs like the women in the West.



When we examine the four Hollywood films mentioned above, it is seen that women especially Middle Easterner women are put in background and they are rarely showed in films. Even so they are presented as bombers, terrorists as in *Rules of Engagement*, or wearing completely black veils or like other Western women taking care of their baby as in *The Kingdom*, or they are hardly seen as in *The Siege* and *Lions for Lambs*. The western women in those films even they are at a one step higher than the Middle Easterner women, they are oppressed by male dominancy as well. They are again not at the decision maker position. As many feminist discussed, in all those film men are presented as the protector, suppressing all his fears and defend the weak, whereas women are presented as care givers and nurtures. Thus, as Barker affirmed “social, cultural and political discourses of gender lie at the root of women’s subordination” (Barker, 2000: 235).

All in all, postmodernism gives importance to the text and writing which regard the world like a text and the real world formed like text. In order to understand this world as Derrida affirmed we need close reading which means double reading and also deconstruction both of which are indispensable part of postmodernism. Thus it is taken attention when those four films mentioned above are scrutinized that deconstruction’s main focus is easily seen. That means for deconstruction the inevitable hierarchical relations between two opposed terms are important (Devetak, 2001). In those films the emphasizes on “We” and “They”, “Us” and “Other”, “the West” and “the East”, “Men in West” and “Men in the East”, “Women in West” and “Women in the East” and “Men” and “Women.” Thus the opposition puts the former side to the privileged position, while putting the latter side to the subordinated position. As Michel Foucault suggests that apart from the just being symbol, discourses and words are practices shaping the objects (LaBrance, 2002). Hence we see the East from the point of how the West writes. And our image and bias are shaped accordingly.

When it is looked from the lens of feminism, the sharpest point about these four Hollywood films is that they are related to action and war genre which is again the area of male gender and the USA is always denoted the role of men, while the East has the role of feminine who needs care and protection. That is, in these films it can be viewed that there is an emphasis that American government and men are privileged side, whereas the East being seen as feminine is subordinated side. And these four films mention about the violence and the conflict that the USA faces. Nevertheless feminist perceives that the focus point of the discourses and practices of the states are violence

and conflict. This is expected from them because men naturally have tendency to violence and conflict as the states are shaped by men as result by violence and conflict (Enloe, 2000). On the other hand, women compared to men have a different negotiating style as Caprioli suggests (2005). In *The Siege* (1998) and *The Kingdom* (2007) CIA agent Elise Kraft and FBI agent Janet Mayes try to solve the problems more or less emotionally. For instance Elise tries to learn the plan of the terrorist by having a romantic relationship with Samir Nazhde or Janet Mayes by always carrying lollipop in her pocket shows that she is brittle and kind like a child and even when a Middle Easterner child bursts into tears she gives one of her lollipops. Also in *The Siege* (1998) and *The Kingdom* (2007) CIA agent Elise Kraft and FBI agent Janet Mayes have the responsibility of security as liberal feminists affirm that women like men can debate about the issue represented by men. Other women depicted in *The Siege* (1998), *Rules of Engagement* (2000), *Lions for Lambs* (2007) and *The Kingdom* (2007) are again showed as mother, silenced a docile wife as seen in *Rules of Engagement* (2000), or doing the job related with women like teacher and a writer who writes something to support men. But they are always behind the man. However it is taken attention that the study area of feminism is mostly on women; but white, middle class and American and European women. Hence a very little place is given to the "Other" women. Thus Middle Easterners women's conditions are much worse than the women in West. In those four films the common point is that they are depicted as having the role of women which is associated with women as feminists generally state, this means they are mother or caregiver. The point differing them from these general role of women is that they are also shown as bombers or terrorists who threaten all human and peace in the world. In addition they are showed while they are working out of their houses like the women in West.

In conclusion, throughout history the USA has had different enemies or threats from abroad. These have changed according to the era. In the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, the new threat of the USA became the Middle Easterners, or as they called Muslims, Islamic fundamentalists, Arabs, terrorists or bombers. As the first two presidents after the end of Cold War Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush in fact need these threats in order to strengthen its identity and find a legitimate base for their actions. For this, the USA takes the advantage of cinema, that is to say, Hollywood. As having a close relationship with Hollywood, the USA government can easily transfer its message to people. Therefore they carefully chose the target and discourses. The new target is the Middle Easterners. When they depict them they generally use negative

images. Especially the terrorist attacks in the early 1990s and 9/11 attacks turned the attention towards them. Through these images all Middle Easterners are being regarded as terrorists and bombers. Above all else Middle Easterners women are usually presented as silent objects and are put in the background. In short from the point view of feminism, it can be observed through those films that the USA becomes the dominated side and the Middle East is the subordinated side, thus while the USA shows its strength to all world, the Middle East is presented as it needs help of the USA to develop itself. Nevertheless for further study it would be useful to analyze that how Americans react against Hollywood films on Middle East, and what the relationship are between American women in the army and the Middle East. Throughout these depictions, the general opinion on the Middle East, the women in this region and the relations between the USA government and Hollywood are gained.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACKERLY, B.A., M. Stern and J. True (2006), *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- ALATLI, Alev (2009), *Hollywood'u Kapattığım Gün (Amerikalılara Çok Büyük Bir İyilik Yaptım) Kaan'ın Kitabı*, Everest Yayınları, İstanbul.
- ALSULTANY, Evelyn (2008), "The Prime-Time Plight of the Arab Muslim American after 9/11: Configurations of Race and Nation in TV Dramas" Editors: JAMAL, Amaney and Nadine Naber, *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11: From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, Syracuse University Press, New York, pp. 204-29.
- ARONOWITZ, Stanley (1989), "Postmodernism and Politics", *Social Text, Universal Abandon? The Politics of Postmodernism*, Duke University Press, No. 21, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/827808>, 07/10/2010, pp. 46-62.
- BACIK, Gökhan, (2006), "Westfalya Sisteminin Direnişi", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp.21-48.
- BARKER, Chris (2000), *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice; with a Foreword by Paul Willis*, SAGE, London.
- BEIRMAN, David (1997), "The Role of the United States as an Initiator and Intermediary in the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process: Comparing the Approaches of the Bush and Clinton Administrations", Editors: WHITE, Paul J. and W.S. Logan, *Remaking the Middle East*, the United Kingdom, pp.259-275.
- BLEIKER, Ronald (2000), *Popular Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics*, Cambridge.
- BOZKURT, G. Saynur (2006), "ABD'nin Orta Doğu Politikası", Editors: SANDIKLI, A., and K. Dağcı, *Büyük Ortadoğu Projesi, Yeni Oluşumlar ve Değişen Dengeler*, İstanbul.
- BRAIDOTTI, Rosi (1996), "Cyberfeminism with a Difference", [http://www.let.uu.nl/womens\\_studies/rosi/cyberfem.htm](http://www.let.uu.nl/womens_studies/rosi/cyberfem.htm), 15.07.2010, pp.1-14.
- BRESLER, Robert J. (2006), "Are We at War or What?", *USA Today*, Academic Research Library, 134, 2730, March, pp. 27.

- CAMPBELL, David (1998), *Writing Security, United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Manchester University Press.
- CAPRIOLI, Mary (2005), *Rhetoric versus reality*, SAGE.
- CAPRIOLI, Mary (2004), "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology A Critical Analysis", *International Studies Review*, pp. 253–269.
- CHAUDHURI, Shohini (2005), *Contemporary World Cinema : Europe, the Middle East, East Asia and South Asia*, Edinburgh University Press, the United Kingdom.
- COTTEY, Andrew (2006), "11 Eylül 2001: Dünya Siyasetinde Yeni Bir Dönem mi?", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp.49-72.
- ÇAKMAK, Cenap (2006), "Irak Savaşı ve Büyük Ortadoğu Projesi", Editors: SANDIKLI, A., and K. Dağcı, *Büyük Ortadoğu Projesi, Yeni Oluşumlar ve Değişen Dengeler*, İstanbul.
- DAĞCI, Kenan (2006), "AB ve ABD'nin Orta Doğu Stratejeleri ve Büyük Ortadoğu Projesi", Editors: SANDIKLI, A., and K. Dağcı, *Büyük Ortadoğu Projesi, Yeni Oluşumlar ve Değişen Dengeler*, İstanbul.
- DERRIDA, J. (1978), *Writing and Difference*, Henley.
- DEVETAK, Richard, et al. (2001), "Postmodernism", *Theories of International Relations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Palgrave, England, pp.181-208.
- DIXON, Wheeler Winston (2004), "Something Lost-Film after 9/11", Ed. DIXON, Wheeler Winston, *Film and Television After 9/11*, the Board of Trustees, the United States of America.
- DOTY, Roxanne Lynn (1996), *Imperial Encounters*, Borderlines Volume 5, University of Minnesota Press, London.
- EDWARD, Beverley Milton (2006), *Politics in the Middle East*, Second Edition, Polity Press, the USA.
- EJDER, Ebru (2007), *Dış Politika Aracı Olarak Tanıtım: ABD Dış Politikası ve Hollywood Örneği*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

- ENLOE, Cynthia (2000), *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, University of California Press, the USA.
- ENLOE, Cynthia (2003), *Muzlar, Plajlar ve Askeri Üsler, Feminist Bakış Açısından Uluslararası Siyaset*, Çev. Kurt, B., ve E. Aydın, Çitlenbik Yayınları, İstanbul,
- FOLKER, Jennifer Sterling and Rosemary E. Shinko (2005), "Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide", *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, pp. 637.
- The Free Encyclopedia (2010a), [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Kingdom\\_\(film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Kingdom_(film)), 15.07.2010
- The Free Encyclopedia (2010b), [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lions\\_for\\_Lambs](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lions_for_Lambs), 15.07.2010
- The Free Encyclopedia (2010c), [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rules\\_of\\_Engagement\\_%28film%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rules_of_Engagement_%28film%29), 15.07.2010
- The Free Encyclopedia (2010d), [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Siege](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Siege), 15.07.2010
- FREEDMAN, Robert O. (1999), "U.S. Policy toward the Middle East in Clinton's Second Term", *Meria Journal*, Volume 3, 1 March, <http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/1999/issue1/jv3n1a5.html>, 15.07.2010.
- FRIEDAN, Betty (1963), *The Feminine Mystique*, Dell Publishing, the USA.
- FRIES, Jamie C.(2005), *Foes on Film: The Evolution of Hollywood Portrayals of Soviet and Middle Easterners, 1980-2001*, Printed Dissertation, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University.
- GARDNER, Frank (2007), "Hollywood's Take on the 'War on Terror'", *RUSI Journal*, Academic Research Library, 152, 6, December, pp. 96-99.
- HAAS, Richard N. (1997), "Fatal Distraction: Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy", *Foreign Policy*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, No. 108, Autumn, pp. 112-123 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1149093>, 22/05/2009, pp. 112-123.
- HAVIS, Allan (2010), *American Political Plays after 9/11*, the Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University, the United States of America.

- HIRSH, Michael (2003), *At War with Ourselves: Why America Is Squandering Its Chance To Build A Better World*, Oxford University Press, New York, the United States of America.
- HOFF, Joan, (19??), "American Diplomacy from a Postmodern Perspective," *The Journal of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations*.
- İSEN, Galip B. (2004), "Amerikan Bilgeliğinin Irak Yazı-Turası: Gücün Gerçeği mi, Gerçeğin Gücü mü?", Editor: ATEŞ, Toktamış, *Kartal'ın Kanat Sesleri 'ABD Dış Politikasında Yeni Yönelimler ve Dünya'*, Ümit Yayıncılık, Ankara, pp. 303-328.
- JARVIS, D.S. (2000), *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending Principle*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- KARADOĞAN, Ali (2005), "Postmodern Sinema mı Film mi?," İletişim Araştırmaları, 3 (1-2), pp. 133-160.
- KHATIB, Lina (2006), *Filming the Modern Middle East, Politics in the Cinemas of Hollywood and the Arab World*, London.
- The Kingdom* (2007), Dir. Peter Berg, Perf. Jamie Foxx, Ashraf Barhom, Chris Cooper, Jennifer Garner, Jason Bateman, Kyle Chandler, Richard Jenkins, Jeremy Piven and Ali Suliman, Universal Pictures.
- KISSINGER, Henry, (2006), *Diplomasi*, Çev. İbrahim H.Kurt, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul.
- KLIMENKOVA, T. A. (1992), "Feminism and Postmodernism", *Philosophy East and West*, Moscow Regional East-West Philosophers' Conference on Feminist Issues East and West, University of Hawai'i Press, Vol. 42, No. 2, April, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1399291>, 29/03/2010, pp. 277-285.
- KRISHNA, Sankaran (2006), "Ne Olduğu Belirsiz Emperyalizm: Dubya, Afganistan ve Amerikan Yüzyılı", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp.179-190.
- LABRANCHE, Stéphane (2002), "Rex the Dog Can Bite: A review of Postmodernism in International Relations (1989-2000)", *The Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Winter, pp.63-78.

- LADER, Curt (2009), *Painless American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Barron's Educational Series, the USA.
- LEVY, Peter B (2002), *Encyclopedia of the Clinton Presidency*, Greenwood Press, the USA.
- LEWIS, Michael J. (2006), "Hollywood Does 9/11 Commentary", *Academic Research Library*, 122, 3, October, pp. 40-45.
- Lions for Lambs* (2007), Dir. Robert Redford, Perf. Robert Redford, Meryl Streep, Tom Cruise, Michael Peña, Derek Luke, Andrew Garfield and Peter Berg, Cruise/Wagner Productions.
- MALIK, Anas (2006), "11 Eylül Sonrası İslam Dünyasına Bir Bakış", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp.191-214.
- MARQUEZ, Herón (2007), *George W. Bush*, Twenty First Century Books, the USA.
- MAYNES, Charles William (1993-1994), "A Workable Clinton Doctrine", *Foreign Policy*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, No. 93, Winter, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1149017>, 22/05/2009, pp. 3-21.
- MCCRISKEN, Trevor B. and Andrew Pepper (2005), *American History and Contemporary Hollywood Film*, Edinburg University Press Ltd, Edinburg.
- MCROBBIE, Angela (1994), "Feminism, Postmodernism and the 'Real Me'", *Postmodernism and Popular Culture*, London.
- METZ, Allan (2002), *Bill Clinton: A Bibliography*, Greenwood Press, the USA.
- MOGHADAM, Valentine M. (2006), "Şiddet ve Terrörizm: İslamcı Hareketler, Devletler ve Uluslararası Sistem Üzerine Feminist Gözlemler", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp.129-148.
- MOJAB, Shahrzad (2001), "Theorizing the Politics of 'Islamic Feminism'", *Feminist Review, the Realm of the Possible: Middle Eastern Women in Political and Social Spaces*, *Palgrave Macmillan Journals*, No. 69, Winter, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1395633>, 29/03/2010, pp. 124-146.
- NABER, Nadine (2008), "Arab Americans and U.S Racial Formations" Editors: JAMAL, Amaney and Nadine Naber, *Race and Arab Americans Before and After 9/11:*



*From Invisible Citizens to Visible Subjects*, Syracuse University Press, New York, pp. 1-46.

NICHOLSON, Linda (1992), "Feminism and the Politics of Postmodernism", *Feminism and Postmodernism*, Duke University Press, Boundary 2, Vol. 19, No. 2, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/303533>, 29/03/2010, pp. 53-69.

OFFNER, Arnold A. (2007), "Liberation or Dominance? The Ideology of U.S. National Security Policy" Ed.: BACEVICH, Andrew J., *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy Since World War II*, Columbia University Press, the USA, pp. 1-53.

OUMLIL, Kenza (2010), "Arabs and Muslims in Hollywood: Breaking down the Siege", <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/ptb/hhv/vcce/vch7/Oumlil%20paper.pdf>, 10.06.2010.

ÖNAL, Buket (2006), *Amerikan Dış Politikası Oluşum Sürecinde Başkanın Rolü ve Türkiye-Amerika İlişkileri (1993-2004)*, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

PEASE, Kelly and Kate Pease (2008), *International Organizations, Perspectives on Governance in the Twentieth Century*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

ROGERS, Mary F. (1998), *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader*, The University of West Florida, McGraw-Hill Companies, the USA.

*Rules of Engagement* (2000), Dir. William Friedkin, Perf. Tommy Lee Jones, Samuel L. Jackson, Guy Pearce, Bruce Greenwood, Blair Underwood, Philip Baker Hall, with Anne Archer and Ben Kingsley, Paramount Pictures.

SCOTT, Ian (2000), *American Politics in Hollywood Film*, Edinburg University Press Ltd., the United Kingdom.

SHAHEEN, Jack G. (2001), *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies A People*, Olive Branch Press, Brooklyn, New York, the USA.

*The Siege* (1998), Dir. Edward Zwick, Perf. Denzel Washington, Annette Bening, Tony Shalhoub with David Proval and Bruce Willis, 20th Century Fox and Bedford Falls Productions.

- SMITH, Steve (1997), "Postmodernism and International Relations Theory: A Reply to Østerud", *Journal of Peace Research*, Sage Publications Ltd., Vol. 34, No. 3, August, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/425166>, 07/10/2010, pp. 330-336.
- STEANS, Jill and Lloyd Pettiford, (2005), *Introduction to International Relations, Perspectives and Themes*, Peaarson Education Limited, England.
- TALHAMI, Ghada (2006), "Arap Kadınları ve 11 Eylül 2001 Saldırısı", Editors: ARAS, B., and G. Bacık, *11 Eylül Öncesi ve Sonrası*, Güncel Kitaplar, pp. 239-253.
- URAL, Abdullah, (2009), *11 Eylül sonrası ABD'nin Ortadoğu Politikası ve Türkiye'ye Yansımaları*, İstanbul.
- VALANTIN, Jean- Michel (2005), *Hollywood, The Pentagon and Washington: The Movies and National Security from World War II to the Present Day*, Anthem Press, the UK.
- VANHALA, Helena (2005), *Hollywood Portrayal of Modern International Terrorism in Blockbuster Action-Adventure Films: from the Iran Hostage Crisis to September 11, 2001*, Printed Dissertation, the School of Journalism and Communication and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon.
- The White House (20??), "43. George W. Bush", <http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/GeorgeWBush/> , 11.05.2009.
- The White House (19??), "42. William J. Clinton", <http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/williamjclinton> , 11.05.2009.
- YALÇINKAYA, Alaeddin (2006), *Kafkasya'da Siyasi Gelişmeler, Etnik Düğümden Küresel Kördüğüme*, Lalezar Kitapevi, Ankara.
- YALÇINKAYA, Alaeddin (1997), *Sovyetler Birliği Döneminde Moskova ile Türk Toplulukları İlişkileri (Kronolojik Çalışma)*, Yayın No: 23, Sakarya Üniversitesi Basımevi, Sakarya.
- YILMAZ, Yasemin Keskin (2007), *Propaganda Aracı Olarak Sinema: 1990 Sonrası Amerikan Filmlerinde Propagandanın Kullanımı Üzerine Bir Çalışma*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THE THESIS**

Derya Deger was born in Adapazarı in 1984. She graduated from Ahmet Akkoç Primary School in 1995, Atatürk Middle School in 1998 and Ali Dilmen High School in 2002. In the same year she became a bachelor student at the Department of American Culture and Literature in Ege University and got her bachelor's degree in 2006. One year later in the fall of 2007 she became a graduate student at the Department of International Relations at the Institute of Social Sciences in Sakarya University.