
(Muslim) Women's Bodies, Islamophobia, and American Politics

Juliane Hammer, Assistant Professor of Religious Studies University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
jhammer@email.unc.edu

With sweeping and cutting rhetoric, anti-Muslim activists claim that all or nearly all Muslim-Americans support terrorism, violence, *the abuse of women*, and the abrogation of American law and ideals.

*The Right-Wing Playbook on Anti-Muslim Extremism*¹

Islamophobia is not about innate or natural fear of Islam or Muslims. Rather, it is an ideological construct produced and reproduced at the intersection of imperial ideology, political expediency, and the exploitation of nationalist, racial, and religious insecurities. The term itself has gained currency and is now frequently used as a tool of critical discursive and political intervention developing in response to the intentional and well-funded reproduction of this “phobia” in American public discourse. There are a growing number of academic studies addressing the history, politics, and expediency of Islamophobic discourses including the work of Andrew Shryock (2010), Peter Gottschalk and Gabriel Greenberg (2008), Stephen Sheehi (2011), and others. Some of the recent contributions discuss in greater detail the term itself and its meaningful usage as an analytical category. These academic works have been joined by several reports that specifically address the networking and financing of Islamophobic discourses in the United States and beyond, including *Fear Inc.*, a report published by the Center for American Progress and “The Right-Wing Playbook on Anti-Muslim Extremism” quoted above.²

I admit to having some trouble with the term, as what is often called Islamophobia, literally “fear of Islam,” is in fact a spectrum of political positions and ideological strategies that are aimed at generating or increasing fear, hatred, and distrust of Muslims and Islam. They serve a range of ideological and political purposes and have become part of a register of strategies to other, marginalize, exclude, and at times also hate those who are not identified as white, Protestant, and thus mainstream. Both in unifying a di-

verse set of political interests and strategies into one single term, and in over-determining a set of phenomena with distinct histories, causes, and locations, using the term Islamophobia risks becoming counterproductive for deeper analysis. As I demonstrate in what follows by focusing on a particular aspect of these diverse phenomena, factors such as time, location, and particular circumstances are significant for a meaningful analysis of the broader phenomenon called Islamophobia in the United States.

Islamophobia has been described as a particular form of racism, as creating unfounded fear of Islam, as an extension of Orientalism, as a response to multiculturalism, and as an ideology scapegoating Muslims in order to distract from or re-center other issues in contemporary societies. Each of the definitions advanced seems to hold a kernel of truth or to reflect a specific angle on the ways in which contemporary European and North American societies seem to have focused much of their attention on Islam and Muslims.

This essay focuses on the ways in which Muslim women's bodies have become a canvas for inscribing some of the above-mentioned political objectives. The focus on Muslim women's bodies is part of a larger attempt at thinking about Islamophobia in gendered terms.³ The role of gender as a category of analysis should not be limited to Muslim women's bodies or, for that matter, Muslim women at all. In the broader picture it should always be supplemented by rigorous and critical inclusion of how Islamophobia directed against Muslim men is, of course, gendered as well. Most obviously, the construction of violent and threatening Muslim men is routinely complemented by the representation of Muslim women as oppressed and silenced by said men. In other words, the gendered representations of Muslim women and men are but two sides of the same coin, and as such they have become part of the same register of tools for generating Islamophobia. And, as Jasbir Puar has shown, assumptions about Muslim attitudes to sexuality and gendered bodies have also produced complex and politically productive discourses on

homosexuality, homophobia, and American nationalism, or what she terms “homonationalism” (Puar 2007).

Similarly, the focus on Muslim women in imperial ideology and discourses of civilizational as well as religious superiority are not an isolated twenty-first-century phenomenon but part of a discernibly much longer historical trajectory of using the purported oppression and plight of Muslim women at the hands of their men and their religion as convenient justification for colonial projects of domination and exploitation (Ahmed 1992). My focus on several contemporary episodes of Islamophobic inscription onto Muslim women’s bodies should not obscure that fact but rather situates these recent episodes within the analysis of that longer history. This emphasis on historical trajectory is of significance for better understanding the causes and purposes of Islamophobic discourses and the historical specificity of Islamophobia in the beginning of the twenty-first century. And while a tired trope, the “veiling” of Muslim women (the wearing of headscarves) deserves to be mentioned repeatedly because of the hijab’s physical presence on women’s bodies and its central role in anti-Islamic and anti-Muslim discourses.⁴

Setting the Stage

In a video clip posted on YouTube, the viewer sees small groups of Muslims, men, women, and children, walking in what appears to be early evening towards a building. Police officers stand around the entrance and a man greets the families at the entrance. The camera moves from them to a group off to one side holding American flags and signs in what is clearly a protest of some kind. A man repeatedly shouts through a megaphone, “Muhammad was a pervert, Muhammad was a fraud.” Amid screams including “Go home, no shari’a. Do you beat up your wife, too? Are you a molester?” one woman shouts, “Why don’t you go beat up your wife like you do every night!” A few seconds later another one adds, “She probably needs a good beating!” (CAIR Los Angeles 2011).⁵

The video was put together and posted by the regional Southern California office of the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR), an American Muslim advocacy organization founded in 1994. The event in question was a fundraising dinner, orga-

nized by ICNA Relief, the charity arm of the Islamic Circle of North America, which took place in February 2011 in Yorba Linda, California. The purpose of the dinner was “to raise money for women’s shelters, and to help relieve homelessness and hunger in the U.S.” (CAIR Los Angeles 2011). The excerpt from the video strikes me as relevant in several ways. One, the insulting statements were yelled exclusively at the Muslim men, despite the fact that women and children were walking alongside them. Thus, Muslim women here were merely objects of a hate discourse that in other incarnations assumes their continued oppression by Islam and violent Muslim men. They are not spoken to, but rather spoken about, a common feature of much of Islamophobic discourse as we have seen it reincarnate in various forms over the last decade. Secondly, these statements demonstrate the centrality of Muslim women and their bodies: beaten, oppressed, molested, and violated in these discourses. The protesters are familiar with the tropes of such discourse, including the accusation that Muhammad married a young girl, that Muslim men routinely abuse their wives, and that the menace of Islam has something to do with *shari’ah*.⁶ The screamed slogans are at least somewhat ironic when considering the purpose of the event, especially the raising of funds for women’s shelters. And the last comment in the paragraph above seems puzzling at least, as it seems to support physical violence against Muslim women, thus implying either their less than human status or that physical violence against women in general should be condoned.

The issue of violence inflicted on Muslim women’s bodies is central in both direct and indirect ways. Verbal violence is directed at Muslims, men directly, and women indirectly, while the shouted statements of the protesters also express “concern” about violence perpetrated by Muslim men against Muslim women. In what follows I distinguish these dimensions as two distinct angles of Islamophobic discourses on Muslim women and their bodies: the very real experiences of discrimination and hate crimes in relation to hijab and gendered bodies; and discussions of domestic violence, honor killings, and hijab as violence inflicted upon them by Muslim men as represented in Islamophobic discourses.

Discriminatory Speech, Hate Crimes, and Muslim (Women's) Bodies

When Muslim women are discriminated against in the labor market; when they are treated differently in the public sphere because they are recognizably Muslim; when they are verbally abused, threatened, and physically assaulted—certain forms of Islamophobic discourses can be discerned as underlying such acts. In discussing select examples of discrimination against Muslim women and hate crimes against them I want to set the stage for the argument that this type of Islamophobia directed against women is part of a larger fear or discomfort with the presence of Muslims in American society and that it makes sense to see this dimension of the phenomenon in direct relation to racism and fear of non-white minorities.

In an essay provocatively titled "Time to Address Violence against Muslim Women," Sahar Aziz argued in late 2011 that it was high time for the American public to take note of the many incidents of physical and verbal harassment leveled against Muslim women in the United States. Aziz lists and links to a series of incidents in which American Muslim women were assaulted, their headscarves pulled off and insults shouted at them. Aziz argues that "contrary to popular belief, the biggest threat to Muslim women is no longer limited to domestic violence in the home but rather unprovoked attacks in public places by bigoted strangers. To many, the Muslim woman's headscarf marks her as a terrorist or co-conspirator to terrorism. Meanwhile, her gender marks her as easy prey to cowardly acts by those who seek to violate her body and personal dignity." She continues by calling for "the attention of government officials, women's rights advocates and all Americans concerned with violence against women" (Aziz 2011). Notably, Aziz does not deny that there are other threats to the safety of Muslim women; however, she calls for a reevaluation of such threats as more dangerous to Muslim women than hate crimes. She also points to the ideological use of the trope of the oppressed Muslim woman when the oppression is at the hands of her husband or other Muslim men, which seem to contradict Muslim women's treatment in a discriminatory fashion in the American public sphere. Many of the almost fifty comments to her article in the *Huffington Post* could be cited in analyzing responses to her essay, some supportive

of her arguments, many accusing her of ignoring the much larger problem of women's oppression in Islamic countries. The link between Islamophobic attitudes and discrimination is exemplified in this comment: "Violence cannot be condoned. However, by wearing identity-concealing garments, these women are sending the message that they are victims. They shouldn't be surprised when they are victimized. If they don't take their own rights seriously, then those who are inclined to violence certainly won't" (Aziz 2011).

An episode of the popular ABC show *What Would You Do?* that aired in early 2008 took up the issue of discrimination against Muslim women through the creation of a situation in which an actress wearing hijab entered a roadside bakery in Waco, Texas, and was refused service by a sales clerk (also an actor) because she was "dressed like that." The reactions of other customers were recorded and some were later approached to discuss and explain their reactions. With the exception of very few responses supportive of the Muslim woman, the overwhelming majority of customers did not react, or supported the verbally offensive clerk. While not a proper measure of public opinion the episode demonstrates the pervasiveness of negative attitudes to Muslim women in hijab who, in the episode, were invariably coded as foreign, from a different and alien culture, and associated with terrorism by those supporting the discrimination. When the young actress pointed out that she was a native Texan and not foreign at all she was dismissed and insulted some more. That "What would you do?" is more than a TV show is pointed out in an article about the show on the ABC website:

The young woman in our experiment was an actor, but many of the hateful words she heard were based on the experiences of Chicago-born Nohayia Javed, who was watching our experiment from the control van. Javed said she has continually suffered verbal abuse and said she has even been physically attacked by fellow Americans—just because she is Muslim.

"They always start off with, 'You're a terrorist, Osama-lover, towel-head, camel jockey' on and on," Javed said. "If I tell them I'm American, they're like, 'No you're not. Just because you were born here doesn't make you American.' And I'm like, 'What makes you American?' " ("Witness to Discrimination" 2008)⁷

That discrimination because of wearing hijab is also a legal issue has been demonstrated by Kathleen Moore in her article "The Hijab and Religious Liberty: Anti-Discrimination law and Muslim Women in the United States," published in 2000. That her findings from more than a decade ago (and before 9/11) are still relevant is evident in her conclusion where after reviewing a set of cases in which Muslim women sued for religious discrimination, she found that women often fail to win accommodation of their religious and minority needs especially when employers can reasonably argue that such accommodation would mean a loss of profit on their part (Moore 2000).

Finally, discrimination and verbal abuse are also cited as reasons by Muslim women for deciding to remove their hijab. In an NPR feature in 2011 unfortunately titled "Lifting the Veil: Muslim Women Explain Their Choices" Asma Khalid, the author, profiled twelve Muslim women who had recently decided to remove their head covering. Several of the women cited negative reactions to their hijab by non-Muslims in public as one of the reasons for their decision.⁸

In probably the most stunning example of discriminatory rhetoric, Texas congressman Louie Gohmert took to the floor of the House in June 2010 to argue that Muslims were involved in a plot that would bring women to the United States to birth what would later be dubbed "terror babies." He is quoted as saying,

It appeared they would have young women who became pregnant [and] would get them into the United States to have a baby. They wouldn't even have to pay anything for the baby, ...And then they would return back where they could be raised and coddled as future terrorists. And then one day, 20, 30 years down the road, they can be sent in to help destroy our way of life. (Hu 2010)

Anderson Cooper debated with Gohmert on his "Keep Them Honest" segment on August 12, 2010. No evidence of Gohmert's claims has ever been presented (Schulman 2010). However bizarre such claims may seem, and laughable too, they point to a deep-seated distrust and dislike of the presence of Muslims in American society. In addition, Gohmert's remarks link Muslims in the United States and the children born to them to the discussion of "anchor

babies" as brought into the conversation by South Carolina Republican Senator Lindsey Graham, also in summer 2010. Graham alleged that illegal immigrants were abusing the 14th amendment by entering the United States to birth United States citizens ("The Debate" 2010).

Taken together, these few items of discussion, selected for their merit in demonstrating the breadth of the ways in which Muslim women's bodies are at the center of one dimension of Islamophobic discourse, point to the fact that American Muslims indiscriminately and collectively are perceived as foreign, as a fifth column for terrorists, and as threat to the United States. Women's bodies, especially those who visibly identify as Muslim through hijab bear the brunt of a particular kind of visual profiling that can result in verbal assaults, hate crimes, exclusion, as well as in increased surveillance of their communities and insults to their religion. But Muslim women also become victims of broader fears over shifting race relations, perceptions of racial discrimination, and a very specific fear of non-white minorities. Women birth the children of these minority communities and thus their bodies are directly linked to shifting demographic balances as well as the bogus link to terrorism for Muslims specifically.

More specifically, Muslim cultures are perceived and represented as foreign, alien, and introducing cultural impurity—thus the need to code Muslim women's bodies as foreign and decidedly not American—which is then directly linked again and again to the threat of terrorism (through Muslim men) and doubts about their loyalty to the United States. These fears were reformulated and introduced as legislation in several states through the "creeping shari'ah" campaigns of Islamophobes in 2011.⁹

When William "Jerry" Boykin warned in 2011 that Muslims were such a threat to the United States that he was worried for the "three females" among his six grandchildren because he was "concerned about the day coming when they will be wearing burkas" (Mantela 2010), he made the link between the presence of Muslim women's bodies (and the garments covering their Muslim bodies) as a threat and the purported oppression of Muslim women by their religion and by Muslim men.

Honor Killings, Domestic Violence, and Misogynist Islam

This oppression of Muslim women is a central trope of Islamophobic discourses and takes many forms in the writings, discussions, and speeches of a range of pundits from Newt Gingrich to Pamela Geller and Phyllis Chesler. And it serves a neoconservative and right-wing agenda to mark Islam as a religion not only foreign to the United States but also threatening the very foundations of its society. The assumed gender inequality and oppression of women by Islam is juxtaposed with a quintessentially American gender-egalitarianism and respect for women's rights that can only be described as ironic in the face of recent political developments regarding women's reproductive rights in the months leading up to the 2012 presidential elections.

Nevertheless, pointing out the abysmal situation of Muslim women, their oppression by Islamic law, their suffering at the hands of Muslim men, and even their own resistance to such oppression all serve to legitimate Islamophobic rhetoric in both domestic and international affairs. And ironically, the Muslim women that Islamophobes claim to be so concerned about, the women in need of saving, are the same ones rejected as part of the enemy, a fifth column, and the source of Islamic terror from within! The focus of Islamophobic discourses on American Muslim women generates the perhaps greatest irony in how Muslim women are portrayed as in need of liberation from Islam and from Muslim men, while simultaneously alienating and marking as foreign and unwelcome the very women they are trying to liberate. More broadly yet, Islamophobic discourses alienate American Muslims only to then turn around and accuse them of not integrating into American society. Neoconservative pundits and writers have taken up many causes, and have spoken on behalf of Muslim women both in the United States and abroad. In what follows, several examples will demonstrate a distinct pattern of focusing on violence against women, "honor killings," and the oppressiveness of *shari'ah* as well as of hijab.

When Aasiya Zubair was murdered by her husband in February 2009, Phyllis Chesler published an article in the *Middle East Quarterly* refuting the widespread reading of this tragedy as a result of a case of domestic violence. Chesler focuses specifi-

cally on cases of murder in Muslim families in North America and describes them as distinct from "normal" domestic violence. She also accuses American Muslim organizations and advocates of trying to shift the blame away from their religion and their communities by insisting that domestic violence is at the core of these killings. Chesler also supported the niqab ban in France arguing that "apart from being an Islamist act of assertion that involves clear security dangers and creating mental and physical health hazards, the burqa is a flagrant violation of women's most basic human rights" (Chesler 2009).

Chesler is a sophisticated and knowledgeable representative of Islamophobic discourse: In a letter sent to and read at a panel in Toronto titled "Islamism's War against Women" in September 2011, Chesler writes about recent developments after discussing Egyptian scholar and reformer Huda Sha'rawi:

Huda would weep if she saw how women have been deeply veiled in Egypt and how Islamist forces have taken over — dare I say, colonized? — the Egyptian state. She would be amazed at all the Muslim girls and women living in the west who are veiling too, wearing the suffocating, hot, and heavy totalitarian and fascist flag of Islamism on their heads, faces, and bodies as they walk behind men who are perfectly comfortable in light, modern clothing.

My dear sisters: The hour is late. The body count of female honor killing victims in the west is a mainly Muslim body count. Aqsa Pervez, in Canada, was lured home by her mother and honor murdered by her father for being too Canadian, too western, and for refusing to veil properly enough. Based on my research, the highest torture rate of honor killing victims is not in Pakistan, but in Europe. When Muslim girls and women seek to assimilate, modernize, reject lives of utter subordination, an example must be set so that other Muslim girls and women will not do so. (Chesler 2011)

Pamela Geller, another neoconservative American pundit and feminist, has engaged in countless verbal attacks on Islam and Muslims, often on behalf of oppressed Muslim women. One example is the "Jessica Mokdad Human Rights Conference" convened in Dearborn, Michigan, early May 2012. The conference, organized by the American Freedom Defense Initiative (AFDI) and Stop Islamization of America (SIOA), both of which Geller is involved

in, was “dedicated to increasing awareness of honor killings and gendercide under the Shariah” (Geller 2012). Named after a murder victim Geller and SIOA claim to have been the victim of an honor killing, the conference generated critical responses from Muslim communities and organizations, which were promptly utilized by Geller as fodder for her denunciation campaign against American Muslims. Muslim women appear in her propaganda narrative as abused, and beaten, becoming most useful to her arguments when they are dead. Geller’s arguments are inescapably circular, and anyone contradicting her is either a hypocrite or an Islamist. No argument is possible against this representation of Islam, Islamic law, and Muslim leaders as misogynist, “standing up for honor killings,” and a threat to Muslim as well as non-Muslim women in the United States and beyond (Geller 2012).

But the picture is more complicated, and anti-Muslim neo-conservative rhetoric is sometimes difficult to separate from secular feminist discourse, which sometimes but not always aligns itself with neo-conservative agendas regarding Islam and Muslim communities. It is at the more complicated intersections, when secular American feminists decide to become spokespersons for Muslim women and against their oppression that Islamophobic rhetoric and expression becomes somewhat more difficult to debate. Well-intentioned and yet patronizing discourses on “white women saving brown women from brown men” abound and have a distinct history of their own. Such feminist discourses have been described as imperial feminism, as feminist orientalism in relation to Muslim women, and as outright racist.

Feminist service of empire in its more recent incarnations include the calls by the Feminist Majority to declare war on Afghanistan in order to liberate oppressed Afghani women in 2001 and the justification of war against Iraq with the argument that Iraqi women needed to be liberated as well. Both scenarios have been critiqued as such by scholars from Lila Abu-Lughod (2002) to Saba Mahmood and Charles Hirschkind (2002). In early 2002, the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan (RAWA) criticized the Feminist Majority agenda and rhetoric as counterproductive for the rights and safety of Afghan women and as anti-feminist (RAWA 2002).¹⁰

The anti-shari’ah legislation mentioned above has also incorporated the representation of Islam as against equality and women’s rights. For example,

in the months leading up to the senate vote on a law banning “foreign laws,” Kansas lawmakers were inundated with materials proclaiming that it was really about protecting “women’s rights.” The bill helps “women know the rights they have in America,” said state Rep. Peggy Mast (R). “To me, this is a women’s rights issue,” said Sen. Susan Wagle (R)” (Shakir 2012).

By rejecting Islam as foreign to American society and the legal system, by justifying military intervention in Muslim majority countries, and by chastising Muslim communities for insisting on their freedom to practice their religion, this form of Islamophobic discourse as well inscribes Muslim women’s bodies with meaning that they have no control over and that uses them as pawns or tools in a politics of neoconservative imperialism internationally and a political agenda of scapegoating a conveniently targetable minority population and its religion in domestic politics. Neither allows Muslim women any agency unless they are willing to denounce both their religion and their communities and societies.

Much more could be said about the role of women pundits in the development and perpetuation of anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic discourses in the United States. Even more needs to be said about the central role that women of Muslim background, touted as heroes, martyrs, reformers, and courageous ex-Muslims, have played in furthering Islamophobic discourses and agendas. Some of this analytical work has been carried out by others and need not be repeated here (Mahmood 2008). Suffice it to say that it is precisely in the complexity of agendas, the machinery that fuels anti-Muslim sentiments and exploits them for a host of political purposes, and the resulting amorphousness of the phenomenon called Islamophobia that makes it so difficult to combat.

Conclusion

Based on examples selected from a much larger number of events, debates, and episodes, this essay has argued that one aspect of the gendered nature of Islamophobia can be uncovered (unveiled) by focusing on the ways in which Islamophobic agendas are mapped onto Muslim women’s bodies. A distinction has been made between Islamophobic expressions that reflect the rejection, hatred, and/or fear of the presence of both male and female Muslim bodies as citizens and residents, i.e. members of American

society. This dimension of Islamophobia is closely linked to broader racist and xenophobic discourse and the use of hate speech and hate crimes for the purpose of furthering anti-minority domestic agendas. Ironically, one could argue that the infliction of verbal and physical assault and discrimination onto Muslim women's bodies also lowers the bar for acceptance of the victimization of women in American society more generally. Recent discussions and legal changes to the Violence against Women Act (VAWA) may point in this direction ("US: Senate Vote a Victory" 2012).

I want to close with a quote from Wendy Brown that perhaps sums up best why it is not enough to call out Islamophobic discourse as a conscious and politically expedient product of political interests and actors, and why it is even less acceptable to only advocate tolerance of Muslims and Islam. Rather, it is necessary to perceive xenophobic and other such discourses as part of the ideological production of liberalism. Brown writes, "This would be a liberalism potentially more modest, more restrained in its imperial and colonial impulses, but also one more capable of the multicultural justice to which it aspires. Above all, it would be a liberalism less invested in the absolute and dangerous opposition between us and them, thereby losing one of its crucial justifications for empire under the flag of liberal democracy." (Brown 2006, 175)

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2002. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others." *American Anthropologist*, 103: 783–90.
- Ahmed, Leila. 1992. *Women and Gender in Islam*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Aziz, Sahar. 2011. "Time to Address Violence Against Muslim Women." *The Huffington Post*. November 2. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sahar-aziz/violence-again-muslim-women_b_1072529.html.
- Brown, Wendy. 2006. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- CAIR Los Angeles. 2011. *Hate Comes to Southern California*. Video, 5:52 minutes. March 2. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NutFkykjmbM>.
- Chesler, Phyllis. 2009. "Are Honor Killings Simply Domestic Violence?," *Middle East Quarterly*, 16: 61–69
- . 2011. "No More Harems: The Hidden History of Muslim and Ex-Muslim Feminists." October 4. <http://www.phyllis-chesler.com/1040/muslim-feminism>.
- "The Debate over Anchor Babies and Citizenship." 2010. National Public Radio, August 18. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=129279863>
- Esposito, John and Ibrahim Kalin eds., 2011. *Islamophobia: the Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gottschalk, Peter and Gabriel Greenberg, eds. 2008. *Islamophobia: Making Muslims the Enemy*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Geller, Pamela. 2012. "Muslim Americans Stand Up for Honor Killing." *Atlas Shrugs*. May 10. http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/jessica-mokdad-human-rights-conference/
- Hu, Elise. 2010. "TX Rep. Louis Gohmert Warns of Terrorist Babies." *Texas Tribune*, June 28. <http://www.texas-tribune.org/texas-mexico-border-news/arizona-immigration-law/tx-rep-louie-gohmert-warns-of-terrorist-babies/>
- Mahmood, Saba. 2008. "Feminism, Democracy, and Empire: Islam and the War on Terror." In *Women's Studies on the Edge*, edited by Joan Scott, 81–114. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mahmood, Saba, and Charles Hirschkind. 2002. "Feminism, the Taliban, and Politics of Counter-Insurgency." *Anthropological Quarterly* 75: 339–54.
- Mantela, Kyle. 2011. "Boykin Terrifies Dobson with Dire Warnings of America's Pending Islamification." February 18. <http://www.rightwingwatch.org/content/boykin-terrifies-dobson-dire-warnings-americas-pending-islamification>
- Moore, Kathleen. 2000. "The Hijab and Religious Liberty: Anti-Discrimination law and Muslim Women in the United States." In *Muslims on the Americanization Path?*, edited by Y. Haddad and J. Esposito, 105–27. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- RAWA. 2011. "Why Is a Leading Feminist Organization Lending Its Name to Support Escalation in Afghanistan? August 8. <http://www.rawa.org/rawa/2009/07/08/why-is-a-leading-feminist-organization-lending-its-name-to-support-escalation-in-afghanistano.html>.
- Sayyid, S. and AbdoolKarim Vakil, eds. 2010. *Thinking through Islamophobia: Global Perspectives*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schulman, Daniel. 2010. "Rep. Louie Gohmert's 'Terror Baby' Meltdown." *Mother Jones*. August 13. <http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2010/08/rep-louie-gohmerts-terror-baby-meltdown>.
- Shakir, Faiz. 2012. "Kansas Legislature Passes Discriminatory Anti-Muslim Bill by Calling it a 'Women's Rights' Issue." *ThinkProgress*, May 13. <http://thinkprogress>.

org/justice/2012/05/13/483278/kansas-legislature-passes-discriminatory-anti-muslim-bill-by-calling-it-a-womens-right-issue/

Sheehi, Stephen. 2011. *Islamophobia: The Ideological Campaign against Muslims*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.

Shryock, Andrew, ed. 2010. *Islamophilia/Islamophobia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

"US: Senate Vote on Violence Against Women Act a Victory." 2012. *Human Rights Watch*. April 26. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2012/04/26/us-senate-vote-violence-against-women-act-victory>.

"Witness to Discrimination: What Would You Do?" 2008. *What Would You Do?* ABC News. February 26. <http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/WhatWouldYouDo/story?id=4339476&page=1#.UM6SybbageN>

Notes

1. People for the American Way, <http://www.pfaw.org/rww-in-focus/the-right-wing-playbook-anti-muslim-extremism>, released July 25, 2011, emphasis mine.

2. See these and several additional reports and essays listed and linked on the website of Carl Ernst, professor at UNC Chapel Hill, <http://www.unc.edu/~cernst/Islamophobia.htm>.

3. While an increasing number of scholarly writings address the gendered dimensions of Islamophobia or at least focus on Muslim women, much of this material focuses on gendered Islamophobia in Europe, Australia, and Canada; comparatively little is available focusing on the United States.

4. It is so tired a trope that the literature about hijab is beyond reference in an endnote at this point. However, talking about hijab has retained its power to delineate types and shades of rightwing as well as progressive (and secular) feminist discourses and thus should not be underestimated, however overanalyzed it might be.

5. The video was clearly edited to put together video footage stretching over a longer part of the day and con-

tains written quotes from protesters and attendees of the event as published in the local newspaper.

6. The term *shari'ah* in various spellings has become shorthand for Islamic law in public discourse.

7. One of several copies of the video can be found here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oKKbIsKBs5M>

8. The title of the feature and the public de-veiling that several women perform on camera seem unfortunate to me in the ways in which both reinforce and re-enact the gaze behind the veil and a certain voyeurism on the part of the viewer. While the feature attempts to be "balanced," it succeeds in representing those women who took their headscarves off as more liberated and invested with agency than the many others who do not make that choice. See the full write-up and audio file here: <http://www.npr.org/2011/04/21/135523680/lifting-the-veil-muslim-women-explain-their-choice>. This link shows pictures of the twelve women, many with before and after photographs <http://www.npr.org/2011/04/21/135413427/lifting-the-veil>.

9. It has been argued that the debate about shari'a, or Islamic law, has replaced the earlier fear-mongering about Jihad. Omar Sacirbey argued in March 2012 that many of the legislative and legal initiatives to ban Islamic law in state courts have died down. See Omar Sacirbey, "Anti-Sharia Movement Loses Steam in State Legislatures," *Washington Post*, March 22, 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/on-faith/anti-shariah-movement-loses-steam-in-state-legislatures/2012/03/22/gIQAphNxTS_story.html. For one of many blogs and websites warning against "creeping shari'a," see <http://creepingsharia.wordpress.com/about-2/>.

10. The article further argued, "Waging war does not lead to the liberation of women anywhere. Women always disproportionately suffer the effects of war, and to think that women's rights can be won with bullets and bloodshed is a position dangerous in its naïveté. The Feminist Majority should know this instinctively."