

Fall 12-16-2016

Distortion of Arab Character in Films and Literature

Issa D. Alsulami

Clark Atlanta University, issa.alsulami@students.cau.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/cauetds>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alsulami, Issa D., "Distortion of Arab Character in Films and Literature" (2016). *Electronic Theses & Dissertations Collection for Atlanta University & Clark Atlanta University*. 50.
<http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/cauetds/50>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Clark Atlanta University at DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses & Dissertations Collection for Atlanta University & Clark Atlanta University by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. For more information, please contact cwiseman@auctr.edu.

ABSTRACT

ENGLISH

ALSULAMI, ISSA D.

B.A. KING ABDUL-AZIZ UNIVERSITY, 2009

DISTORTION OF ARAB CHARACTER IN FILMS AND LITERATURE

Committee Chair: Timothy Askew, Ph.D.

Thesis dated December 2016

The work under consideration scrutinizes the distortion of Arab character in mass media, literature, and cinematography. This research argues that Western culture systematically and consistently projects grotesque images of Arabs, as rich people supporting terrorism and violence in an innocent world, which contributes to the perception of Arabs as terrorists, rich, greedy, and killers of children. The work illustrates that Arabs are constantly vilified in a variety of ways especially in film and literature. The paper will critically examine two films *The Rules of Engagement* and *Exodus* and two novels *Broken Bridge* and *The Pirate*. Chapter one serving as the Introduction, each following chapter will be dedicated to the critical examination of each film and novel. Chapter two will focus on both *Broken Bridge* and *Exodus* both examine the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the film. Chapter three will examine the novel, *The Pirate*. Chapter four will analyze *The Rules of Engagement*. While also summarizing my argument, the conclusion will offer new ways to analyze the misconceptions of Arab stereotypes as depicted in fiction and film.

DISTORTION OF ARAB CHARACTER IN FILMS AND LITERATURE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

BY

ISSA DAKHILALLAH ALSULAMI

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

DECEMBER 2016

© 2016

ISSA DAKHILALLAH ALSULAMI

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Timothy Askew as my principal advisor for his guidance, motivations, and patience. This process would not have been nearly as successful or enjoyable without his knowledge and dedication. He has taught me more than I could ever give him credit for here. Also, I am grateful to Dr. Mitra Bansari for her support.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciations to Dr. Georgene Bess Montgomery, the Interim Chair of English Department. I am grateful to have such a knowledgeable and awesome professor. Thank you for being such an amazing person and a true inspiration. Also, this thesis would not have been completed without her help.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, brothers, and wife whose love and advice are with me in whatever I pursue. Most importantly, I wish to thank The Saudi Culture Mission for its support to reach my goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
III. ISRAEL AND PALESTINE CONFLICT IN MEDIA.....	11
<i>Exodus</i>	14
<i>Broken Bridge</i>	25
IV. DISTORTION THROUGH OIL QUESTION	33
<i>The Pirate</i>	36
<i>The Pirate Background</i>	36
<i>The Role of Israeli</i>	39
<i>Oil Crisis Background</i>	41
<i>Arab Oil in The Pirate</i>	43
<i>Oil Embargo</i>	47
V. ARABS AS TERRORISTS	50
Terrorists in <i>The Pirate</i>	53
<i>Rules of Engagement</i>	57
VI. CONCLUSION.....	67
WORKS CITED	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, Arabs have been seen as exotic and foreign in the eyes of the media, and this misunderstanding has led to a xenophobia that has spread throughout Western media. Various factors have contributed to preconceived ideas and stereotypical perceptions that are often perpetuated in Western media of Arabs being un-socialized and violent in nature. However, the reality in the Arab world is very different from the Western perception, and it is mostly this misconception that guides Western people's overall view of Arabs and their culture. The Cultural Anthropologist, Laurence Michalak, reports that a majority of Americans see Arabs only in films that stereotype them as violent terrorists, greedy and rich, radical Muslims, and killers of children (11). Despite this depiction, Arabs have historically made significant political and cultural contributions to the Middle East and the global society. These contributions continue today with new progressive Arab associations, financial institutions, and welfare organizations. Also, more study groups have formed, as displays of public expressions of personal piety are more socially accepted, for example, the increase in mosque attendance and Arabs performing more public prayer in the United States. Despite these contributions, Western people only associate Arabs with terrorism, radical Islamic beliefs, and greed.

The long history of interaction between Arabic culture and Western culture has

produced a tradition of representing most Arab nations and cultures in wildly negative ways in the West. First, racial prejudice is widespread, but since September 11, 2001, the focus has increased towards Arabs and Muslims. The United States has a long history of stereotyping African Americans, Native Americans, and other newly immigrated minorities. For example, Laura Green notes that stereotyped depictions of African-Americans have a huge effect on attitudes towards African American minorities in the United States. Mass media presentation also formed the stereotypes about Native Americans that have affected their modern life (1). Moreover, Professor Jack G. Shaheen at Southern Illinois University observes that contemporary distortion of Arabs in the U.S. media and films closely resembles how Nazis depicted Jews before the World War II (37). Thus, the malicious distortion of Arabs and Muslims is not a unique phenomenon for Western culture and Western literature. Numerous works of English literature have also explored the Arab and Israeli confrontation (Jensen, Foote, & Neighbor 5). There is a similar tendency present in the presentation of the other conflicting questions, for example, the terrorist acts of radical Islamists or the discovery of oil throughout the Middle East.

It is evident that the distortion of Arab culture has been ongoing throughout the history of the Western world's interaction with the Middle East and Arab people. With the growing impact of the media, the variety of new media resources has only contributed to the distortion, their current work primarily focuses on negative aspects, in particular on the acts by individuals. This media bias has perpetuated as being the truth when looking at Arab character, with the primary sources of distortion are often seen in works of fiction

and cinematography. This work will investigate how the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which is currently being presented one-sidedly in the West, helps to further perpetuate the negative stereotypes by the Western world. This paper will further review the issues of the immense Arab oil ownership and the rising oil crisis that forms the background for the distortion of Arabs being greedy. In addition, the rhetoric of the Western oil industry using various media to help distort the view of this ownership of oil. The paper will also focus on the question of Islamophobia, which is related to the activity of the radical terrorist groups within the Middle East and to the even more influential stereotypes about the Arabs. There are many Western books, films, and a variety of media resources that present Arabs as heartless aggressors.

Finally, the paper will review the conflict between the Arabs and Jews which biased media have fueled and distorted in their representation of the relationship of Arabs and the Jews who have been in conflict for over 50 years. Israeli-influenced media has viewed Israel as the innocent victim while the Palestinians were depicted as heartless aggressors. This kind of distortion is typical for Western media that focuses on the attacks of the Palestinian Islamists; however, the media coverage of the violence of Israeli militia is rather limited. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been the subject of artworks which only help to create an impression that is distorted and exaggerated. Western literature has also been influential in spreading misconceptions about the Arabs through the distorted telling of tales about this conflict between Arabs and Jews. The novel for teenagers, *Broken Bridge* by Lynne Reid Banks, presents Arabs as violent killers of innocent Jewish children. While the film *Exodus*, directed by Otto Preminger,

aims to paint the epic picture of the establishment of the Israeli state, but the film is only filled with the highly stereotyped images of violent Arabs who resist the path of Israeli to freedom.

Another depiction of Arabs being greedy and controlling is the current oil crisis which emphasizes the role of the Arab world. About 66% of the OPEC crude oil or 52% of the world reserves are located in the Middle East. This factor raises attention to the region, where the majority of Arabs live. There have been numerous conflicts and disputes over the confiscation of oil reserves as the West tried to gain control of them (Owen 1). Oil is one of the energy resources that formed the backbone of economies in the West as well as in the Middle East. It was important to the superpowers like U.S., France, Soviet Union, and Britain (Tibi 432). Thus, this conflict also raises the aspect of distortion because the West has used the principles of stereotyping to degrade the Arabs. Moreover, Tibi claims that the West attempts to enhance its military presence in the region even today (431). This paper will also review the distortions of Arabs involving the oil that is illustrated throughout the novel *The Pirate* by Harold Robbins.

The tragic event of 9/11 exploited the image of Arabs in more negative ways, especially in Islam which has been a subject of misunderstanding for many years, and the Western media explicitly and implicitly portrayed this religion to be against the values like tolerance and democracy (Aburaiya 57). The accusation of the terrorism led to defamation of the religion of Islam and consequently the Arabs have been widely along with unjustly accused. Historically, the West has continued to view the Arab world negatively, deemed it to be evil, and has often considered the inferiority of the Arabs as a

fact. After the 9/11 attacks, many Americans attempted to learn about the Arabs and books discussing Arabs, the Middle East, and terrorism have turned into being best sellers (Walzer 107). Unfortunately, even prior to this event, the perceived image of Arabs as terrorists was already common within most of the United States' media industry. An example of this can be found in the film *Rules of Engagement* and the focus on the terrorist paradigm present in the novel *The Pirate*.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The distortion of the Arab minority group as terrorists, greedy, heartless, and evil has been the focus of scholars for many years. There is a wide range of articles analyzing the general and specific aspects of this subject. Analysis of biased depiction of Arabs is considered part of the overall trend of minorities being stereotyped, which has been increasingly spread across the Western culture. This study highlights the aspects of distortion of Arabs in Western literature, media, and cinematography, and it uses a variety of scholarly sources to prove the depiction of distortions of Arabs. The novelty of the research is in the focus on specific works of American and British literature along with cinematography and the critical analysis of these examples of distortion. The research also links theoretical works with fiction and reviews the distorted elements through the light of historical facts.

First, the research discusses the overall framework of distorting the images of many minority groups along with Arabs throughout the Western world. In the article “‘Frozen in Time’: The Impact of Native American Media Representations on Identity and Self-Understanding,” Leavitt, Covarrubias, Perez, and Fryberg analyze how the U.S. media distorts the images of minorities like Blacks or Native Americans. The researchers argue that with the help of biased mass media coverage, the audience forms a correlated perception of these groups based on the reports of the media. Another researcher focusing

on the similar question is Laura Green. In the article “Stereotypes: Negative Racial Stereotypes and Their Effect of Attitudes Toward African-Americans,” she reviews the process of stereotyping in the media and its impact on minorities. The research reveals general concepts about shaping expectations of human groups and the material provided through the article gave the theoretical explanation for shaping beliefs and biases about Arabs in the U.S. culture. These two articles create the background for the research. They both reveal that distortion of Arabs is not a unique or new phenomenon in the U.S. media and culture, which in the early days depicted Native Americans and African Americans as heathens and now depicts Arabs in very similar ways.

The scholar who dedicated much effort to the analysis of this issue is Professor Jack Shaheen. Shaheen studies U.S. mass media and Hollywood films that scrutinize the images of Arabs. In the article “Media Coverage of the Middle East: Perception and Foreign Policy,” he highlights the examples of distortion in the media. Shaheen argues that distortion of Arabs in the U.S. mass media is extremely pervasive. Moreover, according to Shaheen, such media coverage helps in the formation of attitude accept the stereotypes help to shape the political agenda and make it easier for the U.S. audience to accept new military policies regarding the Middle East region. Shaheen’s *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People* provides a substantial analysis of the Hollywood films that form a negative perception of Arab characters as villains. Shaheen analyzes more than 900 films that contain at least one negative Arab hero. The book helped to shape the argument about the films used in the research: *Exodus* and *Rules of Engagement*. These two works of Jack Shaheen helped to expose the reality of distortion, its pervasiveness, as well as its impact on the politics in the Middle East.

The article “The Role of the Media in the Construction of Public Belief and Social Change” by Happer and Philo discusses the notion of public belief. The author argues that mass media has a large impact on the perceptions and attitudes of the general public. Moreover, Happer and Philo promote an idea that mass media is able to present a distorted picture of reality to people who do not have access to facts. Similar ideas are present in the work by William Hutchinson, Particularly this article “Media, government, and manipulation: the cases of the two Gulf Wars” William Hutchinson focuses on the Middle Eastern conflict. He presents examples of the methods used by numerous journalists to distort the real picture of the events during these conflicts. These articles reveal the grounds of media distortion of Arabs and Middle Eastern states.

Some research works helped in establishing the frames of distortion in the film *Exodus*. The book *Whose Promised Land? The continuing conflict over Israel and Palestine* by Colin Chapman highlights the differences between historical facts and numerous claims of the film. The elements of distortion that the author analyzed, reveal that the film has greatly deviated from reality with its overall depiction of the situation and history of this conflict. In the article “The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine,” Ilan Pappé examines the events depicted by *Exodus*, which happened in 1948-1949. Pappé provides different examples proving that the film shapes a distorted and one-sided picture of historic events. This work provided new aspects exploring the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which is at the core of the film *Exodus*, the novel *Broken Bridge*, and even to some extent the novel *The Pirate*. These resources served to analyze the Middle Eastern conflict through the prism of scholarly research, comparing fiction and films with facts.

The book *Radical Conflict: Essays on Violence, Intractability, and Communication* by Andrew Smith confirms that the stories, which both sides shape, are highly contrasting. The author surveys the subject of Israeli-Palestinian conflict and provides theoretical background for analysis the novel *Broken Bridge*. The author introduces an important notion, which is relevant to the topic, “schismogenesis.” It explains the complications of the conflict, which appear over time. The researcher scrutinizes various aspects of this conflicting question, which help in the analysis of the novel and distortion of Arabs that Banks uses.

In other works of research on Arabs, the distortion is evident in the questions of the oil crisis and depiction of Arabs as terrorists. The article by Roger Owen titled “One Hundred Years of Middle Eastern Oil” scrutinizes the elements of distortion connected with oil discovery and management. Owen reviews the perception of oil wealth from the Western and Middle Eastern viewpoints. Then, in the article “Saudi Arabia: Discovery! The Search for Arabian Oil,” David E. Long highlights the history of oil discovery. The author argues that Western media shaped the discourse, degrading the role of Arabs. These sources have been valuable in review of the oil question, forming the background for analysis of Harold Robbins` novel. Other articles also review the aspects of distortion in the novel *The Pirate*. In the “Foreign Policy and its Impact on Arab Stereotypes in English Popular Fiction of the 1970s-80s,” Ahmed Al-Rawi critically analyzes several novels that distort the Arab character, including well-received novel, *The Pirate*. The author provides numerous examples that focus on deliberate degrading by the images of Arabs in the novel. The analysis of Ahmed Al-Rawi has been useful in the analysis of the

book and framing general concepts of distortion involving the oil conflict. The articles by Jones and Ilie have also helped to provide examples of distorting historical facts in fiction. In the article “America, Oil, and War in the Middle East,” Jones analyzes the reasons and impacts of the oil embargo in 1973. This historical fact played a significant role in *The Pirate*, which presents a biased picture. Moreover, the article “Economic considerations regarding the first oil shock, 1973 – 1974” by Ilie, also provides historical background to the matter utilizing historical evidence, these articles helped to prove distortion in the novel.

The depiction of Arabs as terrorists in media and films is prevalent and troubling. In the article “Critical Analysis of Racist Post 9/11 Web Animations,” Cassandra Van Buren scrutinizes the effect of political agenda on Arab distortion in mass culture. The author indicates that in the recent years this phenomenon has been escalating. According to the article “Hollywood and the Spectacle of Terrorism” by Boggs and Pollard, Hollywood films have much contributed to the public paranoia about terrorism of Arabs. In the article “Reel Bad Arabs,” Jack Estes examines the various aspects of distortion of Arabs in the film *Rules of Engagement*. Finally, distortion of Arabs in the Western fiction and films is a topic, which is gaining resonance, and so the variety of research sources follows this direction.

CHAPTER III

ISRAEL AND PALESTINE CONFLICT IN MEDIA

Mass media is often known to influence public opinion. British researchers Catherine Happer and Greg Philo argue that media resources directly affect the formation of public views on certain topics: “media shape public debate in terms of setting agendas and focusing public interest on particular subjects” (321). As a result, public beliefs and attitudes form because of media coverage. The researchers indicate that media resources show limited information that mostly focuses on one side of the discussion. They also claim that certain political priorities are followed by news media. Moreover, the tools of media are “repetition and reinforcement of media messages, and the absence of proposed alternatives and also a possible role in shaping behavior, especially where these are linked to other types of structural support.” (Happer & Philo 332).

It is possible to view mass media as the “Weapons of Mass Deception” (Hutchinson 40). Hutchinson applies this identification to the biased depiction of different countries and conflicts; however, nowhere is it so skillfully applied as in the case of conflicts involving the Arabs. For example, various military journalists report that during the Iraq war there were two wars developing: the one fought by the United States of America military forces and the second one followed by mass media forces (Hutchinson 38). The similar means of ongoing mass deception regarding the Arab world related not only to the Iraqi war, but also to the general presentation of the Arab in Western mass media, particularly in the U.S.

Where the distortion of the Arab character is concerned, the Israel and Palestine conflict play a significant role. Throughout the conflict, U.S. mass media has been continuously hyperbolizing the intervention of the Arab side and diminishing the terrible acts done by the Israeli side. The ways media represents the conflict affect the U.S. audience as well as the other nations that take the Israeli side. Therefore, media serves as a biased mirror distorting reality and consequently belittles the Palestinian version of the conflict. This distortion has led to the perception of all Arabs as the Western world depicts it currently. This distortion in media depicts the focused situation; for instance, the acts of terrorism against Israel have been continuously highlighted in the U.S. media. On the other hand, these were mostly suicide attacks of Palestinians that proved fatal to Israelis. Consequently, the media highlights the bombing done from the Palestinian side not as the response to the Israeli attacks but as individual violent assaults. The resulting situation is that the public receives only the half of the factual information, which is supplied by popular media resources. It would not be fair to claim that all U.S. media are completely corrupt; not all of the available resources focus only on the depiction of Arabs as evil in the conflict. Only some media resources justify and explain the violent acts such as suicide bombings by the Palestinians towards the Israelis, as the response to the trouble they face concerning their displacement and frequent humiliation. However, such claims in U.S. media are rather limited and only independent resources tend to express them. Michael Suleiman illustrates this difference in media representation by the following terms:

The evidence suggests that, by and large, the Israelis have had tremendous success in defining the problem in their own terms and having these accepted by the Americans. When the background to the Arab-Israeli conflict is discussed, for instance, Jews in Israel are seen to be the victims of persecution, but the problem of Palestinian Arabs is seen merely as one of the victims of circumstance, lacking both the sharpness of suffering and identifiable sources of oppression that are bestowed upon Jewish victims of Nazism. (109)

Consequently, the contrast in the presentation applied by the mass media forms the perception of the Arab side of the conflict as the aggressor while the media views Israel simply as the victimized side in the conflict. Naturally, understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is challenging due to opposing viewpoints of Palestinians and Israelis. The involved sides view the conflict differently and the difference in discourse presented in each state is a common process. The positioning of the insiders and outsiders towards the sources and development of the conflict also differs a lot (Jensen, Foote, & Neighbor 31); however, justification of the Israeli side is common not only for the Jewish discourse but for the overall media coverage made in the United States. The researchers Jensen, Foote, and Neighbor make a pivotal claim that researchers and historians have a difficult task of cataloguing the entire history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The biggest challenge is the difficult task to create an inclusive timeline of events without being perceived as being or biased or judgmental to either side (4).

This statement illustrates the difference in the depiction of the events. This display mainly depends on the perspective of the observer. As a result, the timeline

accepted by the Israeli side is the one that the Western media resources promote in the United States. The perceptions of outsiders also differ. Edward Said discusses in his book *Orientalism* the perception of reporter Emmet Tyrrell in his article for Harper`s magazine “What links the people of the Middle East together?” by writing ““The answer, given unhesitatingly, is,` The last link is the Arab` hostility - hatred – toward the Jews and the nation of Israel” (287). This misconception leads to defamation of the Muslim religion, the role of Prophet Mohammed, and Koran. Such media claims are charged with misunderstanding and hostility. Thus, the media reduces a complicated Middle Eastern conflict to the Arab hatred towards Israel.

Exodus

Jack Shaheen claims that depiction of the Arab characters as evil has been common for U.S. mass media resources and for Hollywood cinematography. Presentation of people within the media, including popular primetime TV shows and big budgeted films, from the viewpoint that becomes recognized in society. The depiction of an ethnic group in a negative context, regardless if the story is fictional or documental, will influence public perception of the people and their culture. According to Shaheen, the fact that films are entertaining affects the audience even more. The easygoing manner of films makes stereotypes and distortions better remembered. Moreover, fictional films, which become quickly popular due to the popular leading actors involved, have the greatest potential to create special stereotypes about nationalities, some historic events, or different phenomena (6).

This work, reviews the Hollywood created film *Exodus*, directed by Otto Preminger in 1960. The film is based on the bestselling book of the same title written by Leon Uris in 1958 (Crowther). Shaheen noted the troubling history vilifying Arabs in Western cinema. Among the many movies mentioned in his book, he wrote that the film version of *Exodus* was created:

In the 1950s, when Americans were largely apathetic about Israel, the eminent public relations consultant Edward Gottlieb was called on “to create a more sympathetic attitude” toward the newly established state. And so, Edward Gottlieb sent Leon Uris to Israel to write a novel, which became the bestseller *Exodus*. (Shaheen 80)

Consequently, the film formed the biased attitude to the Jews as victims and heroes whereas Arabs were depicted as villains in the conflict. The plot of the film centers around the Israeli-Palestine conflict during the Partition. The director has shown an obvious bias and guides the audience’s attention and sympathy toward the Israeli side, as almost all the main characters are Jewish, and one is American. The events of the film develop around the ship “*Exodus*,” which carries Jews to their homeland in 1947, and then in Palestine during the formation of Israeli state in 1948. The plot is filled with the scenes of romance, the fight for freedom, and political struggle. In the center the conflict, there is the idea of establishing the state of Israel, which each character approach differently. One strategy is the Zionist underground network Irgun, which uses radical means. Dov Landau, Akiva, and Ari, who are the protagonists in the film, represent this movement, whereas Barak, Ari’s father, follows another approach which is more

diplomatic and focused on reform.

Arab characters presented in the film are nationals who resist the formation of Israel. The positive accounts of Arabs in the film are not numerous; however, they can be impressive enough for the audience. The kibbutz where the female characters come from the ship is Gan Dafna, which is named after Ari's love Dafna, who the Palestinians tortured and killed. Then, the attack on the kibbutz that the Arabs plan also plays an important role in the plot. The only "good" Arab Taha, warns his Jewish friends about the plan and several villagers to manage to escape. However, here one of the most tragic and touching murders occurs: Arab protesters kill 15 year-old Karen, whom the Zionist activist, Dov Landau loved. The murder of the female character directly follows a romantic scene where Karen tells Dov Landau about her love for him. They promise each other to marry "When things are all over," then Dov Landau warns Karen: "Stay down, girl, there are Arabs out there" (*Exodus* 00:25:10-12). The plot presumes that if Arabs are there, they will undoubtedly kill her, and the Jewish military leader does not suggest another alternative variant. Later, the murder breaks expectations of a happy ending and so this turn of the plot causes more sympathy for the Jews and more hatred towards Arabs, who killed an innocent American girl.

A striking scene from the film *Exodus* involves the character of Mukhtar Taha. This person is the most positive Arab character in the film because he is the friend of the film's Jewish protagonist Ari. Taha warned Ari about the Palestinians' plan of attack. Thus, this collaborating "good Arab" is a contrast to the rest, who conduct brutal attacks. The Israelis discovered the death of Taha soon after Karen. His fellow Arabs hung the

man in his own village because they took vengeance on him for betraying the plan of attack. Moreover, Taha has the Star of David that the killers carved on his chest. Prior to his death, Taha told Ari: "I am a Muslim; I cannot kill another Arab" (*Exodus* 00:27:30-34), but still he was murdered by fellow Arabs. Thus, Shaheen concludes, "The film's only 'good Arab' becomes the dead Arab" (81). The film not only illustrates the majority of Arabs as evil, but also shows that presumably peace is not possible from Arabs who even kill their own people. As a result, the plot contrasts Arab characters with the Jewish characters because they only play the roles of villains in almost all scenes where they are present.

Another element of the plot that clearly illustrates how the film defamed Arabs is the claim of their cooperation with Nazis. The audience can sympathize with the Jewish characters because they have recently survived the Holocaust and have come to their promised land. However, once the Jews arrived, a new evil confronts them, consisting of the Palestinians. An impressive scene of the film illustrates the captain who warns Jews, who are traveling to Palestine on the ship "Exodus":

The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who sat out the war as the Hitler's guest in Berlin, has met with representatives of the Arab nations to coordinate action against Palestinian Jews in the event partition is granted. (*Exodus* 00:35:10-12)

Association with the post-Nazis intentionally leads to perversion of the Arab character. Only some nationalist Arabs in the film cooperate with the Nazis, but it is the image that the audiences will best remember. It is only possible to link the Palestinians to the Nazis is the fact that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem was in contact with Adolf Hitler

(Cooper & Brackman). Still, the film develops this theme further and shows Nazi activists among Arabs after the war. Jacob Victor resists this claim and argues that the wartime connection could not prove that Nazis were present in Palestine after the World War II. Therefore, Jacob Victor calls this liaison as “of quite dubious historical validity” (5). Nevertheless, the audience would remember what they saw in the film and not everyone would verify the historic facts.

The overall attitude towards Arabs that the film *Exodus* creates is biased and one-sided. Additionally, there are numerous details within the film that indicate the stereotyping, adopted against the Arabs for the Arab characters, depicts a constant aggressive and violent nature. A British soldier tells a Zionist character Dov Landau: “Don’t wander into the Arab section. Run into one of the Grand Mufti’s gangsters and they’ll kill you, son. They’ll slice your throat” (“*Exodus*” 00:40:05-07). No motives or explanations explain this violence, so such claims help to further the stereotyped images of Palestinian’s as unreasonably cruel, and this stereotype extends to all Arabs.

The film tells the history of the Zionist underground network Irgun in the more terms, for example, the film shows how Zionists struggled for freedom of the state. The protagonist of the film, Ari Ben Canaan, belongs to the movement as well as Dov Landau. Although Irgun fighters commit clearly abhorrent acts in this scene, the film suggests an absolute violation of ethics of these acts. Instead, the film portrays liberation of the Irgun activists from the prison as an epic escape from the oppressor. However, there are some historic accounts of the Irgun’s activity in Palestinian settlements. Pappé constructs a positive perception of Irgun forces, even when they engage in atrocities such as ethnic

cleansing of Israeli territories from Palestinian citizens (204). When Irgun attacked innocent civilians, the film attributes no immorality to the actions of the former, even though their attacks resulted in the death of civilians. Pappé provides the fact “the Irgun bombarded it [Tirat Haifa] ...killing thirteen people, mainly children and elderly” (205). Then, Pappé illustrates that the attacks of Irgun on Palestinian settlements were numerous: “a bomb was planted on the market, killing civilians” (201). Up to two hundred civilians were killed in the attack, which was not military commanded, on the Deir Yassin village by Irgun (Pappé 275; Chapman 30). In general, the researchers report that Israelis destroyed about 400 Palestinian villages with numerous civilian casualties. These historical accounts create the background and partial explanation of Arab violence towards the Israeli people; however, this justification is completely omitted in the film *Exodus*.

The film’s director and producers were focused on illustrating the Jewish radical military forces in romantic terms. The main characters of the film are the fighters of Irgun and audience sympathizes with them. Even after the attack at the hotel, the terrorists from Irgun are called “freedom fighters” in the film. Instead, history reveals that Irgun was responsible for a number of violent attacks, which may even surpass the actions that are described on the Arab side in the film. *Exodus* emphasizes the crimes of Arabs, but the film shows Zionist movement in romantic terms without revealing any facts of their historical violence. There is an obvious contradiction in the film and history where the exile of Palestinians is concerned. Addressing the people Barak, the leader of the Jewish agency, claims in one of the scenes:

The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem has asked you [Palestinians] to either annihilate the Jewish population or abandon your homes, and your land, and seek the weary path of exile. We [Jews] implore you, remain in your homes, and we shall work together as equals in the state of Israel. (“*Exodus*” 00:44:23-24)

However, Pappé estimates that Israeli forces drove about 50,000 Palestinians from their settlements to the West Bank with limited food and water at gunpoint (167). McDowall and Palley report that in total 726,000 of Palestinians had to leave their settlements (11). They did it either because of direct Israeli military pressure or because of fear of military force. Thus, the claims expressed in the film strongly deviate from historic reality. Nevertheless, what the American audience saw in the film was the generosity and benevolence of the Israeli newcomers while the film depicts Arabs as unwilling to accept the collaboration with the Jewish state and violently resisting the formation of Israel. There is only one scene throughout the film that shows the Palestinians had to abandon their settlements. At one point, an older man tells the children from Gan Dafna Kibbutz that “Arabs have been leaving their villages” (“*Exodus*” 00:50:22-23). This comment insists that Palestinians abandoned their settlements willingly; instead, the real processes that forced Arabs to leave the settled lands are completely disguised in the film. The previously outlined historical facts reveal that there was also much violence on the Israeli side. Therefore, what the film omits to express is the real treatment of the Arabs who settled the land prior to the Israeli. As a result, the picture showed in the film contributed to the formation of the distorted Arab character.

In general, the film depicts the period of formation of Israel in 1947-1948 using themes of romance and portraying the tragic tale of Israel's fight for freedom from the Arabs, who are violent and resisting against Israel. The film focuses on the crimes that Arabs committed, for example, the killings of Taha and Karen; however, the film completely lacks the historic background and reasons for the Palestinian resistance. At the end of the film, Dov Landau and other Irgun fighters plan an attack against the Arab settlement Abu Yesha which is near the Gan Dafna Kibbutz. This operation occurs after the planned attack of the Arabs guided by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem that failed after Taha's warning and it appears that the Israeli fighters were only planning to respond to the violence of Arabs. As a result, the film depicted the Israeli side as fighters for freedom, who only defend themselves and their people from the violent Arabs. However, the grounds for Arabs defending their own villages and history are omitted.

The film *Exodus* also attempts to show that in the conflict it was the Jews who strived for peace while the Arab side pushed for conflict. Moreover, such claims in the film not only belong to the Jews, but to the British also. In the film, the general Sutherland says, "The Arabs simply won't keep the peace...The Arabs are fanatic on the subject of Jews immigration" (*Exodus* 00:55:12-13). On the Arab side, only Taha expressed the similar claims and so he was killed for treason. He urged the leader of a Jewish kibbutz: "We dwell together as friends. It is natural that we should live in peace" (*Exodus* 00:60:03-04). However, the later murder of Taha, who resisted the attack on Israeli kibbutz, indicates that Palestinians did not favor the peaceful coexistence of Israeli and Arabs.

The film disregards the historic fact that Arabs had settled and lived on these lands for centuries. The film does not explain why “Arabs are fanatic on the subject of the Jews immigration.” The history reveals that in 1918 there were only 2% of Jews in Palestine. In 1947, only 6% of the land belonged to the Jewish people (Chapman 28). According to the United Nations Partition Plan of 1947, the state of Israel had to receive 56% of the land; yet, the film simply omitted these historical details. Such facts could have provided some explanation for the acts of Palestinian militiamen who wished to preserve the lands that had previously belonged to them. This challenges the idea that Israelis were the ones wishing peace with Palestine. Pappé indicates that the Jewish activists assassinated United Nations Emissary Folke Bernadotte for promoting the idea of re-division of these states (168). The emissary also claimed for peaceful repatriation of the refugees, and Israel ignored his claims (169). Thus, the film’s depiction of the Israeli side as unstained and only defending itself from the evil Arabs is much exaggerated.

Moreover, the film presents only the limited perspective on the formation of the state of Israel and participation of Palestinians in this process. The audience of *Exodus* witnesses the Jews coming to the land that they believe belongs to them, and evil Arabs resist them. In fact, Arabs had long settled and lived on these lands for centuries, so they had “historic and family claims to the land” (Smith 43). In the film, the lines from the biblical text “Exodus” grounded the rights of Israeli newcomers to settle the land. Barak, the leader of the Jewish community, tells the British General Sutherland about the words told to Moses by God, cited from “Exodus”: “Go unto Pharaoh and say unto him, thus sayeth the Lord. Let my people go, that they may serve me”. The exodus of Jews from

Egypt is associated with the return to the promised land in the twentieth century (Chapman 187). Moreover, the attempt of Israeli to expel the Palestinians from the territory is called the “ethnic cleansing” (Chapman 188). Throughout his book, Pappé used the same terms about the historic processes that occurred in 1947-1948. Chapman makes a claim, justifying the attitude of the Arabs to Jews, which people can observe in the film: “How are you likely to think about the book that seems to give the Jews a divine right to take your land in the twentieth century AD?” (188).

Andrew Smith calls the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation as the “prototypical intractable conflict” (43). The researcher recognizes that distortions are present on both sides. Every party in the conflict willingly promotes its own story. According to Smith, migration of Jews to the land settled by Arabs started at the end of the nineteenth century. The more active resettlement happened in the beginning of the twentieth century. Both sides had right for the land in equal shares. Moreover, in the course of the division, many native Arabs had to resettle (43). Officially, in 1947 the United Nations intended to divide the territories, previously settled by Arabs, into the states of Israel and Palestine. The authorities planned to divide the land in the following way: 56% of the land to Israel and 44% to Palestine (Chapman 29). Initially, Israel seemed to accept the plan, but Palestine rejected it from the beginning. This division was the background for the opposition of Palestinians against the Israeli state.

The film shows how Jewish people migrated to the region and cultivated the land, which substantially increased agricultural production. In his address to the Israeli people, Barak claims: “We changed the mosquito-infested swamps into such fertile fields. On a

quiet night you can hear the corn grow...” (“*Exodus*” 01:10:02-03). Such claims aim to show that the changes implemented by Israeli in the territory were beneficial; however, Palestinians had no use for these changes, as the Israeli used the cultivated land for their own purposes. Furthermore, the division of the cultivated land between Israel and Palestine was a crucial historical point. Chapman indicates that the 6% of the land that was owned by Jews in reality comprised 12% of the arable land. The land that is suitable for agriculture is limited in the region of Middle East, and thus it is the most precious asset (28). Chapman also argues that by purchasing a great proportion of cultivable land “the damage they [Jews] inflicted on the Palestinian psyche is less easy to calculate. But it was undoubtedly great” (76). These facts also may serve as an explanation for the attitude of Palestinians towards the Israeli, their resistance, and even their violence.

To summarize, the implications of the film *Exodus* in terms of the Arab character distortion are vast. The film paints a completely Jewish-oriented picture of the events that transpired in 1947-1948 at the modern Israeli territory. The Arabs present in the film mostly play the roles of villains who torture and kill innocent girls, attack villages with civilians, and simply attack any Jew that enters their territory. Numerous scenes from the film focus on the representation of the Arab character as evil and violent. However, the crimes of Israeli militia against the Palestinians are completely omitted. The *New York Times* 1960 film review proves the effect of the film as propaganda. The author of the review, Crowther, describes the film as “a massive, overlong, episodic, involved and generally inconclusive ‘cinemarama’ of historical and fictional events connected with the liberation of the State of Israel in 1947-1948” (Crowther).

The explanation “liberation of Israel” implies that Palestinians, who settled in the land, were invaders in the territory. However, the historical background reveals that Palestinians were the ones who settled the land for centuries, so the arrival of Jews caused the resistance from the side of Arabs and the forced exile of Palestinians. The media coverage of the events depicts Israel as struggling against Palestinians without explaining the reasons why Arabs resist the new state.

Broken Bridge

The previous parts of this paper have illustrated how media resources and cinematography affect the public opinion. The examples provided show how media misconstrues the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In this case, the Western media mostly takes the viewpoint of the Israeli side. Not only the news media, but also fictional literature, has this effect on the public opinion. Howard McCurdy argues that fiction can have an influence on public opinion by “entering the public consciousness or popular culture and becoming part of the cognitive base” (1). Therefore, analysis of fiction is also necessary to review the representation of the Arab character.

The novel that shows the conflict from the Israeli perspective is *Broken Bridge* by Lynne Reid Banks. The *Broken Bridge*, which is a sequel to *One More River*, is a novel of a British-Jewish writer Lynne Reid Banks. The author lived for eight years in Israel, and this experience may have influenced her to write the novel. The book was published in 1994 and is targeted for a children’s audience. The example of this novel illustrates how the distortion of the Arab characters still continues. Moreover, Andrew Smith claims that with time the conflicts like the Israeli-Palestinian one only “become more distinct and

exaggerated, and the two sides can actually drift into intractability. The arms race where one side defends itself and the other side responds in kind produces a dangerous progressive differentiation” (44). Smith indicates that this conflict has become even more intractable. With the more time passed after the events of 1947-1948 and more witnesses already dead, there are fewer and fewer chances to learn who was right and who was wrong in the conflict. Nevertheless, the more accepted international discourse moved towards sympathy with Israelis and condemnation of the Palestinians. Smith further explains this process by the term “schismogenesis,” which means that the narratives discussing the problem become more and more complicated and filled with stereotypes (44).

In comparison with the film *Exodus*, the *Broken Bridge* uses a slightly milder approach, not focusing on the history. The book is completely fictional, however, the means the author uses have even greater impact on the target audience. The plot of the book revolves around the murder of a 14-year old Canadian Jew Glen Shelby. Two Arabs simply stab the teenager on a street. His cousin Nili witnessed the death but she was unharmed. The novel develops as different characters present their perspectives of what happened. The impact of the novel on the formation of stereotype about Arabs is powerful due to two aspects. As a youth targeted piece of literature, it can have great influence on a susceptible category of readers. Thus, it helps to introduce stereotyping to a young audience at an influential time in their education. Second, the novel does not focus on historical military events like *Exodus*. During wartime, some political reasons can partially justify the crimes and murders. Instead, the stabbing in *Broken Bridge* is unreasonable and thus even more violent, because the book centers on the murder of a

teenager in broad daylight. A situation like this can have a harsher impression than the killing of hundreds of people during wartime.

The reactions of people in the book reveal how the audience may react to such a scene. Yocheved calling his sister Lessley on the phone claims: “A child`s been stabbed on a street... It was in Gilo, right near here. It just happened. Right out in the street in broad daylight” (Banks 26). It is obvious that such a scene can be highly impressionable for the young audience. Although this is a fiction, it is made for children. Thus, the image of the Arab men, killing children “in broad daylight,” can become the most memorable impression of the plot of *Broken Bridge* on readers.

The further exaggeration that Arabs can be killers of children is illustrated within the novel: “A teenager. That`s all they said. Some teenage kid right here in our district! Lesley, what are we coming to, they`re killing our children in a *street*” (Banks 26). This expression most vividly illustrates the case of hyperbolized reaction. One teenager becomes “our children,” and an Arab murderer with his accomplice becomes “they” who are killing. Then, Yocheved tells his sister that “The news just came over the radio. It just happened. It was in Gilo, right near here. Right out in the street in broad daylight! Can you imagine? Some dirty Arab murderer stabbed a boy” (Banks 26). Thus, when a child who is reading this novel learns of the murder of a boy who is about the same age of the reader can immediately form a specific unfavorable attitude towards the Arabs. The precursor to the story of the book aims to instill a negative notion of Arabs to any reader, especially an impressionable child.

The novel contains numerous details that depict Arabs as violent and unworthy of trust; one example is a scene of two boys stopping a car. A boy Nimrod tells his friend “If it’s an Arab driver, don’t get in!”. When his friend asks “Why?”, the boy simply answers “Dangerous” (Bank 21). This claim does not provide any explanation as to why it is dangerous and simply illustrates the general attitude. Such claims distort the Arab character in small details and consequently from the stereotype. The following scene illustrates another example of the distrust and biased attitude. The two boys eventually stopped an Arab man driving a van. When Nimrod mentions that he got a lift from an Arab driver, his brother Yonatan replies:

Are you stupid or what? I’ve told you. You can’t trust them. Oh well. You’ll learn when you get into the army... They’ll have that kuku [hair] off you as well. The army barber will stuff a cushion with it. (Banks 33)

It is clear that for the Jewish youth, the fact that an Arab man can do no harm to a child is nonsense. As Smith argued, the stereotyping of the enemy is becoming more elaborate with the time. The reasons for mistrust and hatred disappear, but instead people develop a stereotyped attitude towards each other (44). Nimrod’s elder brother further develop an idea of what Arabs can do to a young boy:

It was one thing to sit beside one in an old van - a friendly Arab, one of “ours” ... But if you’d stood in a street in Gaza and had them running at you in waves, with masks covering their faces, hurling stones and throwing stones at you, if you’d patrolled in Nablus and never known when a rock was going to drop on your head, if you’d driven in an open jeep through the streets of Hebron or the roads of

the West Bank and not known when you might get hurt or even killed... then you knew. (Banks 34)

These words of an Israeli man reveal a collection of stereotypes towards Palestinians. In the development of the plot connected to the Arab driver of the van, who gave Nimrod a lift, illustrates how such stereotypes formed. When the boy told his elder brother Yonatan that he rode with the Arab man, Yonatan called him “stupid” (Banks 33). This might not seem like a terrible incident to the reader, because Nimrod was not injured or hurt, but Nimrod felt stupid for such careless behavior. The author illustrates that:

Nimrod cursed himself for being an idiot. Bragging like that. He shouldn't have ridden with that Arab. He shouldn't let Lev do it. When Yonatan had said “You can't trust them,” and called him stupid, Nimrod had known he'd never do it again. (Banks 35)

In her argument, Banks indicates that the biases towards Arabs were not natural for a sixteen-year-old boy: “Nimrod cursed himself for being an idiot. Bragging like that. He shouldn't have ridden with that Arab. He shouldn't have let Lev do it. Nimrod broke rules on principle, but not if they made sense to him” (Banks 35). Nevertheless, the opinion of the elder boys had a great influence on him. As a result, the scene illustrates that despite the help of the Arab driver it is still reckless and unwise to trust them again.

When the scene of Glen's murder occurred, the murderer Feisal aimed to kill Nili too; however, the accomplice Mustapha told him that their leaders instructed them to kill only one Israeli person. Thus, they let Nili go free and physically unharmed. Consequently, she protects Mustapha by not revealing to the police that she recognized

him. It was a personal choice of Nili, but she was convinced of that fact that Mustapha was speaking the truth and it is not disproved in the novel that this idea was wrong. Nili told her uncle: “There were two of them, a young one and older one. The young one did it, and the older one saved my life” (Banks 96). Her uncle completely disagreed and regarded this idea as nonsense:

Listen, daughter-of-my aunt. You don't know the Arabs. I do know them.

Believe me. No one tried to save your life... Just hope they catch him before he kills someone else. (Banks 96)

The two last scenes show how the distortion of Arab develops from generation to generation. Yonatan teaches his younger brother Nimrod that an Arab driver could have been dangerous and it was a mistake to ride with him. Then, Yonatan persuades his niece Nili that an Arab accomplice did not intend to save her from death. Thus, it is vivid that the novel explicitly illustrates stereotyping about Arab people. The elder generations tell the youth about their experiences, full of fears and biases. With the help of this literature such stereotypes pass further. The theme that follows from such stereotyping is recognition of the Jews as superior to Arabs; this became another tool that the author used to further distort the Arab character.

The novel makes a clear distinction between the attitudes and principles of Israel, as a nation of morally guided people, as opposed to the Palestinian Territories. When Miriam hears the news about the stabbing, she exclaims: “No Jew would ever dream of doing such a thing” (Banks 49). Then the characters say that after the murder Israeli settlers took weapons and “went after the nearest Arabs with guns” (Banks 76). This act

is an indication of a revenge seeking, but still, Nimrod argues that violent settlers could not do any serious harm to Arabs: “The settlers are Jews, aren’t they? They can do no wrong” (Banks 76). The novel implicitly claims that the Israelis are not able to commit such a crime that the Arab have committed. Lynne Reid Banks defames the Arabs, showing them as capable of violent and cruel murder. What is more, Banks tends to illustrate that such acts are not possible in thinking for the Israeli. Nevertheless, she reports that Israelis who were close to the boy also thought of revenge and murder. The uncle of Glen and Nimrod thought: “Those murderous Arab pigs. Killing a little kid. Killing my cousin. I’ll kill them. I’ll catch them and kill them” (Banks 77). Though these are mere thoughts, this attitude balances the unrealistic benevolence of Nili.

However, the author also makes some attempts to justify the Arabs in their deeds. The novel presents opinions of different people. Some of them offer a more stereotypical view of the Arabs, but some others are more reasonable. In the scene between Nat and Miriam, the man tries to convince his wife that there can be some reasons for the attacks attempted by the Arabs. While discussing the murder, Nat, shaking his head as he switches the TV off after the news “It just shows you what the Occupation has brought us to” (Banks 48). Then, when his wife argues that “We don’t repress them!” Nat answers:

Miriam! The only newspaper you ever read is that rag and even they can’t deny – although they play it down – that our troops are shooting demonstrators in the streets of the territories every week. (Banks 48)

What is the most important is that the author even recognizes that the Israeli mass media is distorting reality? The man even claims that the local newspaper does not show

the full picture of the events. Thus, on the one hand, Banks attempts to present some sort of balance in the novel. On the other hand, expressions like this one are few compared to the scenes that vilify the Arabs. Therefore, as a result, *Broken Bridge* distorts the Arab character in numerous small details.

To summarize, in both of the reviewed works, the common feature is vilifying the Arab characters and showing the Jewish ones as more benevolent. At the end of *Exodus*, Ari is depicted as wishing to reach peace. His words at the funeral of Karen and Taha, whom the Arabs kill in the end of the film are: “But I swear... that the day will come when Arab and Jew will share in a peaceful life this land that they have always shared in death” (*Exodus* 03:10:16-17). Instead, the film focuses on the violence attempted by the Arabs who do not want peace. In *Broken Bridge*, the character Nili, who accompanied the stabbed teenager, tries to protect the accomplice of the crime, Mustapha. The girl tries to protect him by lying to police and not showing the man in a lineup. Although he did not actually stab Glen, he also took part in the crime; however, the writer makes the Jewish character of Nili sympathetic towards the Arab. This pattern is similar both in the film and the novel. These works on the one hand distort the Arab character and on the other hand, present the Israeli as benevolent and desiring peace. The illustrated distortion is ongoing and penetrating into media, fiction, and cinematography.

CHAPTER IV

DISTORTION THROUGH OIL QUESTION

The current wealth of the Middle East directly associates with deposits of crude oil. Indeed, per data of 2014, 66% of the OPEC crude oil is present in this region, whereas OPEC accounts for 80% of the global reserves. Thus, 52% of the world oil reserves are in Muslim states of Middle East, which are mostly Arabic. The largest Middle Eastern producers of oil are Saudi Arabia with 22.1%, Iran with 13.1%, Iraq with 11.9%, Kuwait with 8.4%, and the United Arab Emirates with 8.1%, and Qatar with 2.1% (OPEC 1).

Oil is a significant natural resource that is the backbone of the modern industry, transportation, and energy. Furthermore, oil has remained the basic source of energy throughout the twentieth century and will remain so in the twenty-first century as well. The growing pace of industrial development is directly related to the extraction and utilization of oil. That is why dependence of the modern society on this natural resource has been solid, both for oil-exporting countries and for those that do not have their deposits. Ryan Catryle claims that oil is “horribly important,” accounting for one-third of global energy supply (2). Moreover, the researcher also indicates that availability of cheap energy sources contributes to the wealth of the nations. This relationship concerns both the nations that possess and use this fossil fuel. There are many positive outcomes in the Middle-Eastern countries after the discovery of oil deposits. The pace of economic

progress is the most visible result and countries, like Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, present examples of high economic and social development in the region. The countries reached general advancement in building infrastructure, improvement of social and health sectors, and progress in education (Haider). Moreover, Arabian countries are attempting to be more diversified within their own economies in order to reduce their own dependence on oil. On the other hand, oil produced by Arab countries is also important to the other nations, and apart from the advantage, this factor imposes challenge.

There are various disadvantages connected to the discovery of oil, including the relations within the region and with the world. The first oil deposit in the region was found in 1908 in the southeast of Iran with the following of other discoveries of more oil in other countries in the later decades. Owen et al indicates that the history of Middle Eastern oil discovery is distorted as well. There are two basic discourses which tell the story of oil discovery and development: the Arab and the Western. The Western states have adopted the point of view of the position of pioneers who managed to “conquer the world’s last oil frontier” (Owen et al 1). Given that at the stage of oil discovery, not all of the countries of the Middle East were in full development, the Western discourse prevailed on the global arena. At the same time, states of Middle East “Learn to challenge Western oil companies in such a way as to force them both to pay more for the oil and, beginning with Iran in 1951, to surrender control over this vital national asset” (Owen et al 1). For example, Saudi Arabia consisted mostly of nomadic tribes, so the Middle Eastern countries struggled to gain full control over their national oil resources.

One of the examples of one-sided misrepresentation of the issue is the book *Saudi Arabia: Discovery! The Search for Arabian Oil* written by Wallace Stegner in 1955. On the one hand, it is a grounded exploration of the history of Saudi Arabian development connected with the discovery of oil. On the other hand, an outsider wrote this book on a crucial aspect of Middle Eastern history. Stegner 's competency on the issue can be argued because he was primarily a novelist, creative writer, and historian. Moreover, Stegner is not there to witness any of these events in person and did not perform any primary research when writing this book. The book is a collection of anecdotal stories about the pioneers of the oil industry in Saudi Arabia. One of the largest oil, producing countries is presented as a low-developed state, which was centuries back in time for the Westerners who came to the region (Long 3). Thus, the main message in the West about the oil resources is the richness of deposits combined with low level of development, which demands Western investment. As a result, end-users learn the names of companies that extract oil rather than the countries that export them.

The persistent distortion of Arabs is also one of the consequences of the vast oil wealth of this region. The former Saudi minister of oil Zaki Yamani once claimed, "All in all I wish we had discovered water" (Owen 2). There is an idea in Western literature that abundance of natural raw resources can lead to some "undesirable political and economic outcomes from the point of view of development," and it is even "a sort of serious curse" (Owen et al 2). This concept is connected with the recent history of Middle East, particularly the Gulf nations that possess significant oil resources.

The Pirate

The Pirate is a novel written by Harold Robbins, an American writer who was one of the best-selling authors of his time. Robbins' personality deserves attention, as it relates to the topic. The author was born in 1916 in New York and later invented some elements of his biography for the press (Pallardy 3). The writer claimed that as a child a Jewish family took him from a catholic orphanage. Although the newspapers copied these details, Robbins in reality was a son of a Jewish pharmacist. It is unknown whether the author wanted to dramatize his childhood past or disguise his nationality. Nevertheless, his descent may provide a partial explanation of the prejudiced depiction of Arab characters in his novel *The Pirate* and its subsequent screen version. Besides depicting numerous Arab characters, including the hero, as vilified, he elevates the Jewish characters in the novel.

***The Pirate* Background**

The book *The Pirate* was written and published in 1974 with the later 1978 film adaptation, which made the work even more popular. The book features a young Arab entrepreneur who manages the oil reserves of his country. Baydr is a Jew by birth, adopted by a wealthy Arab family, who is the brother of the ruling Prince of Lebanon. The novel follows the activity of Baydr who becomes a young businessman, cooperating with Western companies. Young Baydr combines both the features of a Western-type person and the traditional outlook of a Muslim Arab. The major theme of the novel is the development of the business empire by Baydr and the political threats that it faces; as well as the relationship Baydr has with his two wives. Distorted stereotypes of Arab

characters are present in the turns of the plot concerning both political and personal life of Baydr and Ali. The novel also connects the oil crisis faced in the 1970s in the Middle East with the operation of the Palestinian-related terrorist group, which tries to manipulate Baydr and his oil company. *The Pirate* contains several distortions that penetrate the plot of the novel. The major focus of the chapter is on the discovery of oil in the 1970s, the development of oil reserves by the Middle East, and oil embargo causing the crisis. Presentation of these events is connected with much distortion of Arab characters, such as Baydr Al Fay, Ali Yasfir, Hamid, and Leila Al Fay.

The novel does not focus merely on the details of politics, but on the personal life of Baydr, which offers the reader a negative impression of a noble Arab male. On some occasions, he is depicted as a savage person, who beats his wives and spends much time with the other women. This factor does not relate to the oil question directly, but it amplifies the distortion of the main Arab character, that he is personally corrupt positive protagonist. Moreover, in the novel there is also a plot line of a Palestinian terrorist group calling themselves Fedayeen. This terrorist group is a Palestinian organization which has been responsible for numerous attacks on Israel. Thus, the author intentionally involves the real terrorist group in his presentation of the Arab oil issue and implies they benefited from the oil embargo as well.

The image of Baydr Al Fay as a womanizer and opportunist also distorts the Arab character. Ahmed Al-Rawi argues that the distortion of the image of Arab men is used deliberately in fiction and cinematography (2). It is after the oil boycott of 1973 that “the image of the Arab worsened because some Arab countries threatened the West and its

interests in the region. Hence, the image of a wealthy Arab womanizer, who was stupid and debauched, appeared” (Al-Rawi 2). It may seem that romantic relationships within the plot do not contribute to serious distortion; however, Al-Rawi claims that such plots help in “simplifying the moral and emotional issues” (3). As a result, when a popular book’s main character is a rude man beating his wife, this image can be easily generalized to describe any representative of any Arab nation.

The Pirate contains numerous scenes that depict the protagonist from a negative side. First, it is his conduct with women which is consistent with the “womanizer” image discussed by Al-Rawi. Baydr marries a young and beautiful fifteen-year-old Arab girl who bears him two daughters. Meanwhile, there are several scenes where Baydr spends time with prostitutes. He meets Jordana an official event and proposes to marry her when he learns that she is pregnant with his son. However, since Baydr lives by the Muslim principles of marriage, the relationship with this Western woman is not perfect. He tells his American wife: “You are my wife, my possession, and you are only entitled to those rights and feelings which I allow you” (Robbins 195). Such conduct of an Arab man in a novel reveals a Western stereotype of Muslim family relationships. The author also indicates “In his world the woman was nothing, the man everything. If she said to him that she had the same needs he did, the same sexual and social drives, he would regard it as a threat to his male supremacy” (Robbins 143).

Jordana expresses the contrast between the Western and Arab world when she confronts her husband: “This isn’t the Middle Ages. Neither are we in the Middle East, where you can lock me in a harem. Tomorrow I will leave for home and file for divorce”

(Robbins 196). As a result, the author emphasizes the difference between the Middle East and the United States, equating the former to underdeveloped Middle Ages. The main hero threatens his wife telling her that she will never see her sons again if she files for divorce. This depiction shows Baydr as a manipulative and insensitive character who is only focused on the accession to the throne by his elder son and attainment of wealth. Having the main character's image formed of a despot, the author degrades the image of the entire ethnic group. Naturally, the audience may easily transfer this distorted image to the other Arab characters they later see in popular culture or people they encounter in real life. Furthermore, these claims degrade the Arab world by implying that despite riches, it still retains archaic traditions and values.

The Role of Israeli

In the novel, there is also a place for adding positive imagery for Israelis, which is apparent on several occasions in the work through the character of General Ben Ezra. General Ben Ezra is an Israeli who aids Baydr in his fight with Fedayeen and this character emphasizes how Arab terrorists degrade the Israelis with his description of Arab people throughout the book. Baydr tells another Arab Salah:

You have to try to understand the American mentality. They have sympathy for the underdog. And Israel has very successfully played upon that in their propaganda. First against the British, now against us [Lebanon]. (Robbins 135)

Furthermore, the idea of Arab hatred towards the Israeli is emphasized throughout the novel when Baydr expresses his hostility towards the Israelis by urging his wife to sleep with anybody she wishes except a Jew. In the prologue, Ben Ezra cautiously asks

Samir Al Fay: “You know of course that we are Jews? And you are still willing to help us?” (Robbins 7). Within the novel, it is normal for a Jew to wonder if he will receive the help in a desert from an Arab because of the overall depiction of hostility the Arabs have towards the Israelis.

The plot of Baydr’s Jewish origin presents a dubious context to the novel. On the one hand, he is a true Muslim who distrusts Jews. Then on the other hand, he is a Jew by blood, despite being ignorant of this fact. This happened when his biological parents met an Arab family in a desert while both families were traveling to the holy land. The wife of a Jewish soldier Isaiah Ben Ezra dies delivering a son and the wife of Arab doctor Samir Al Fay delivers a stillborn daughter. Ben Ezra gives his son, Baydr, to the Arab family because his son will not survive unless he does this. Therefore, Arabs raise Baydr as a true Muslim, and he distrusts his own biological father when Ben later asks for Baydr’s help in adulthood. His Jewish biological father is a truly honorable character because Ben Ezra helps Baydr to find the camp of Fedayeen, and he is shown as a wise man with religious openness in general.

The personality of a Jewish general Ben Ezra is presented as the opposition to the militant group of Fedayeen. In the beginning of the book, the author presents Ben Ezra as a selfless man when he gives biological son away to an Arab family. In general, Ben Ezra is presented as “the traditional Israeli superhero of the stereotypical fiction of the twentieth century” (Al-Rawi 12). He is called “the Lion of the Desert” who is the last resort of the Baydr to return his family (Robbins 221). However, in the novel, the

introduction of an Israeli hero in a struggle with the Fedayeen emphasizes the overall inability of Arab fighters in fighting this opposition.

Later, because the Prince of Lebanon refuses to provide support, Baydr has to ask the support of Jewish militants. With this action, Robbins promotes a double objective: the Arab Prince is willing to sacrifice his relatives' lives for the sake of his image in front of the Arab nations and the Jewish general instead helps the hostile party in their struggle with the Palestinian fighters. Thus, the Israelis are depicted as more benevolent and helpful even to their enemies when the right cause is pursued. Because of this depiction, the author also emphasizes the distortion of the Arabs in the novel.

Another element of the novel that degrades Arabs is the connection with the activity of Fedayeen. Baydr's executive assistant Dick tells his boss the story of his childhood where his village refused to host the Palestinian fighters; therefore, they killed many people including the parents of Dick. Dick later learns that it was Ali Yasfir who murdered them when the Arabs claimed that Israelis were to blame for the massacre. With this plot twist, the author again vilifies the Arabs once more in the novel by revealing the Arabs were to blame for the attacks and not the Israelis who were wrongfully accused.

Oil Crisis Background

The events of the Robbins' book take place in the 1970s when the world faced a major oil crisis. In 1973, the controversial Arab oil boycott took place, and the reasons for this event can be depicted differently depending on which perspective you review. In October 1973, the Arab countries proclaimed an embargo on the exporting of oil that led

to an increase of oil pricing and global economic recession. The cause of the crisis relates to the Arab-Israeli resistance because the Arab nations introduced the embargo during the Yom Kippur war between Egypt along with ally Syria against Israel. The Arab nations were irritated by the support provided by the United States to Israel (Jones 211). The embargo lasted till March 1974 and resulted in increase of \$3 per barrel of oil to \$11.65 per barrel (Ilie 2). This price per a barrel was the highest in the history of oil industry and affected the world economy for decades.

When the Western media discusses the oil crisis, they frequently omit the political cause that stimulated the embargo. As a result of this omission, the West reviews activities of Arab countries through the negative lens of the overall impact of the embargo on the Western countries. Hamilton mentions in the article “What is an Oil Shock?” some political events cause the oil flow in the Middle East, in many cases the audience ignored these political problems, which focused attention on the aftermath, affecting U.S. economy (365). By connecting two different issues of the Middle East, which are the Palestinian conflict and the oil market, Harold Robbins distorts these issues by diminishing the political causes that caused them.

The oil crisis had different influences on the world in general and Arab nations in particular. The positive effect of the oil crisis was the price of oil increased, leveraging the capital inflow for Arab countries. When the Arab countries “finally seized direct control over production and pricing mechanisms from the giant Western oil conglomerates, leading to a massive increase in oil revenues for those nations.” (Jones 210). The downside of the crisis was an aggravation of the negative image of Arab

nations in the question of oil domination. As the Arab countries attempted to impose more control over the pricing and exporting of the national oil resources, the consequence was and increased the distortion of Arab characters in literature and films. Jack Shaheen regards that “stereotyping of Arabs regularly appears in media designed to entertain” (165). With the intensified amount of stereotyped images of Arab characters and culture in popular Western culture, the Western audience accepts these heightened stereotyped images as true.

Arab Oil in *The Pirate*

The theme of Middle Eastern oil in the novel starts in 1973 in Beirut when the uncle of Baydr, who is the Prince Feiyad, introduces the importance of national reserves. Eighteen-year-old Baydr has just returned from his educational studies of business in the United States. The fact that it was the Prince’s idea for Baydr to study business in the United States instead of Israel presents some shade of distortion because the choice of the Prince. The Prince “had the basic Arab distrust of the Western people he did business with: he felt they regarded him as somehow inferior, almost childlike in his lack of knowledge” (Robbins 55). Thus, the author implies that the distrust of the Arabs towards Western people is “basic” and forms the background of their behavior.

In the novel, Baydr Al Fay becomes a successful businessman who manages the oil potential of his country. The Prince of Beirut had promised the father of Baydr, Samir Al Fay, that his son would become the heir of the country because the Prince did not have children of his own. However, in 1973 after a discussion with the Prince, it becomes clear that he changed his plans for Baydr. The Prince wants Baydr to play a more significant

role in the Middle Eastern oil matter. The Prince indicates that the most important thing for the country is the rightful management of the oil reserves. He claims:

All through the Middle East the tide of the future flows from beneath the sands of the desert, promising riches such as we have never envisioned. The source of this wealth is oil. The lifeblood of the modern industrialized Western world. And our little country sits upon some of the greatest pools of oil known to man.

(Robbins 63)

The Prince does not only imply the importance of the oil deposits to the Middle East, but the impact the oil has on the entire world. The Prince also is aware of the utmost importance of oil to the rest of the world calling it “the lifeblood”. The author emphasizes that even one country can have a real impact on the Western world with this scene in the book. Thus, Robbins strengthens the role of Arab oil to the world by making it clear that the Arabs are aware of their oil’s significance and wish to manipulate its impact. These claims of the Prince of Beirut imply that Arabs wish to impact directly the economy of the Western countries by exploiting their oil resources. In the book, Lebanon is a prototype of a Middle Eastern country that has recently discovered its oil potential and wants to exploit it with much profit. Robbins explicitly presents this issue through the words of Yasfir: “They will have to listen to us, we control their oil supply. If we turn it off, they will come to their knees” (Robbins 44).

The distortion of the oil-related wealth forms the preconception that all Arabs are rich due to this natural resource. Throughout the timeline of the book, Baydr became extremely rich: “He controlled an international investment fund of over five hundred

million dollars. And perhaps the most curious part of it all was that he conducted his business without a centralized organization” (Robbins 36). The film especially emphasizes this element of the book when Jordana learns that Baydr is of Arab ancestry, she then exclaims: “So, it’s true that all Arabs are so rich?” and Baydr answers “True, and getting more” (Robbins 42). In this scene he is simply a seducer, who can buy any woman he wants, boasting that he has a personal plane and can arrange a flight anywhere. Thus, the book implies the wealth attained by means of oil trade covers the whims of rich Arab men. Later, when their relationship develops and Jordana’s mother hears that Baydr is going to transfer some money to the account of her husband’s company, she is appalled. Jordana convinces her that it was genuinely her idea, but still this impression remains in her family. Her mother focuses on an image of a wealthy Arab who wants to buy her daughter.

The focus on the distortion of greed caused by oil wealth is another element within the book. A fellow soldier Hamid tells Leila: “Hussein, the oil sheiks, even your father and his prince, do you think they would willingly share what they have with the masses?” (Robbins 163). Robbins then further comments in the book on the growing wealth of Arabs: “With the development of oil leases, the money had begun to flow to their coffers” and “Rich to begin with, Baydr became even richer” (36). The author also expresses ideas that rich Arabs only use oil only their own personal interests by describing Baydr’s activities in management of oil and enrichment as well as the actions of the other wealthy Arabs in the following way:

Wealth was his by birth and his only concern was to increase it. He loved the luxury and the power that sprang to his beckoning finger. And the terrible truth was that he was not alone. The sheiks, the princes, and kings, the bankers and the men of wealth were all the same. (Robbins 157)

Furthermore, the mistrust of the Western partners by Arabs follows the discussion of business development: “And the family’s investments were turned over to Baydr because they could not bring themselves to trust the Westerners” (Robbins 36). This is the reason why Leila fights against her own father:

The war not only against the foreigners- that was only the first step. The second step and probably the more difficult would be the war against their own oppressors – men like her father, men who took everything and shared nothing. (Robbins 158)

The remark of Leila’s father as a man sharing nothing is also of importance. Baydr refused to cooperate with The Brotherhood in their drug trade when he suspected their activity as not trustworthy and thus the Fedayeen decides that he does not want to support this nationalist organization either. Therefore, Yasfir used Leila to put pressure on her father, so the shipments are not disrupted and the terrorists gain their objectives.

The author emphasizes the ideas of internal confrontation and focuses on enriching the Arabs’ fortune rather than mutual support among the Arabs. When Ben Ezra discusses the activities of Baydr Al Fay: “He certainly isn’t interested in turning his wealth and power over to the masses, anymore than any of the other rich sheiks. But they are all walking a narrow line” (Robbins 224). The author is depicting entrepreneurs who

manage oil resources as greedy. The novel then delivers the message that with the use of oil, the Arabs have a lack of moral standing, are greedy, and desire to manipulate others, even their fellow citizens. Because of this message, this stereotyped image easily transfers into the overall image of the Arab oil industry to the readers.

The main target of influential Arabs who manage oil is to improve their image in front of the other Arabs politically. The oil is a resource that helps the Arabs to help the terrorists. Robbins notes that the authorities of the Arab countries supported the Fedayeen:

The sums of money that passed through his hands were astronomical.

Contributions came from the rulers of oil-rich sheikdoms and monarchies like Kuwait, Dubai, and Saudi Arabia that were anxious to keep their images in the Muslim world intact. (28)

Oil Embargo

Although the novel discusses the distortion of the wealth of Arabs from oil from various perspectives, the oil embargo imposed in 1973 by Arab countries is also addressed. In the book, the Jewish general Ben Ezra expresses the ideas about the power of oil control:

The Arabs have come up with a better weapon than they ever dreamt of an oil embargo. They can stop the Western world faster than an atom bomb... If we [Israelis] control the oil of Libya and the Syrian pipelines, the embargo would fall apart. But if we do not, the whole world economy may come tumbling down around our ears. The Arabs will split the world. (Robbins. 163)

Therefore, the novel depicts the use of oil resources and embargo by the Arab officials as pure political manipulation, whereas it omits the true cause of the embargo due to the Arab opposition to the United States of America's support of Israel during the Arab-Israeli conflict. The author presents the opinion of Baydr, who's thoughts about Americans during the crisis is, "By spring, when they realized it would take five years for them to redevelop their own sources of oil which they had allowed to lapse because of cheapness of import, they would be on their knees begging for mercy" (Robbins 257). In the book, the Arabs who are in charge of oil reserves come across as manipulative and greedy.

Moreover, the terrorist organization of Fedayeen also uses the crisis caused by oil embargo. Hamid tells Leila: "Perhaps the worst is that the embargo is in danger of being bypassed" (Robbins 178). The Brotherhood also uses the embargo in its political purpose to leverage money. This organization is "as a group of thieves, blackmailers, and murderers who demean and bring dishonor to the cause they pretend to serve" (Robbins 188). Nevertheless, Baydr's uncle, the Prince, does not want to confront them. Thus, during the 1970s embargo, the Arab authorities in real life didn't help the terrorists, but in the book they did. The author presumes that oil embargo helped the Arab terrorists to finance their attacks.

Robbins, however, also wishes to emphasize the dependence of the Arab sheiks on the American economy and business partnership:

All of those countries were tied to America not only by sentiment, but by cold hard money. Their investments in the American economy was so great that they dared not tamper with it too much for fear it would lead to chaos and the loss of all their investments. The fact that their self-interest stood in the way of complete freedom for the Arab world meant nothing to the select few who ruled those countries. They only used the crisis to enhance their power and wealth.

(Robbins 258)

To summarize, Robbins emphasizes the role of Arab oil for the development of this region only for self-interest of a few men and not for the overall welfare of the country. This is another huge distortion of the oil embargo situation that is still present nowadays. The author uses various tools of distortion by blending together the oil wealth, the Palestinian cooperation with the terrorists, and the Israeli's suffering. Introducing the Palestinian cause and cooperation of the Lebanese Prince with the Fedayeen, the author demeans the oil business of this region. As a result, the book forms the negatively shaded impression of oil management by Arabs, who manipulate it for enrichment, entertainment with women, and manipulation of the rest of the world. The author uses the history of Arab oil in general and embargo of 1973 in particular to emphasize the manipulation. He depicts the wealthy Arabs who manage oil as focused on wealth and personal gain. The author also presents the oil crisis as a tool of different Arab parties to impose their control instead of the historical political reasons that were purposely omitted.

CHAPTER V
ARABS AS TERRORISTS

Of the various images distorting Arab characters in fiction and literature, one of the most widely used and most profound in its impact on the audience is the image of an Arab as a terrorist. The attack on September 11, 2001, further enhanced the association of Arabs and Muslims with terrorists. For instance, Cassandra van Buren mentions that in the aftermath of the attack, the researcher counted 106 examples of animations and cartoons containing anti-Arab messages using terrorist images (537). The modern escalation of attacks throughout the world involving Arab extremists also helps to influence this image of Arabs and Muslims as terrorists. However, even before attacks took place, the portrayal of Arabs as terrorists has been a popular stereotype. Examples can be derived from the Robbins' 1974 novel *The Pirate* and director William Friedkin's 2000 U.S. film *Rules of Engagement*. According to Al-Rawi "the fictional portrayal of the Arab as a dishonest, primitive Muslim fanatic goes hand in hand with the image of the Arab as a terrorist. Arabia is shown as a place still living in medieval times; its people are backward womanizers, but they are filthy rich" (18).

The example of the negative portrayal of Arabs and Muslims in mass media, fiction, animation, television, and cinematography has evidently outnumbered the positive ones. Most of the narrative of the media mentioned develops around the topics of torturing, bombing, attacks, and murders. Thus, the Western audience receives the image

of Arab terrorists via different channels (Van Buren 538) Furthermore, according to researchers Park, Felix, and Lee, the Implicit Association Test reveals that many Americans associate the word “terrorism” to Islam and Arabs (42). Psychologists Craig Anderson and Brad Bushman introduce the theory of General Aggression Model and emphasize that when certain images are frequently combined, there is a strong structure, which later affects perceptions and interpretations (31). As a consequence, the regular depiction of Arabs as terrorists in different types of media forms the stereotypes associated with violence; these are then used in future behavior by the audience.

Carl Boggs and Tom Pollard explain that growing number of negative images in television and cinematography reflects the public paranoia with the subject of terrorism. Hollywood filmmakers frequently deploy the images of political intrigue, violence, and overestimation of the threats faced by the United States and its citizens. Moreover, the researchers conclude that the Middle East of today “now exists as a mystical category largely outside of time and space, a ready source of dark fears and threats” (Boggs & Pollard 335). The media now aims to create more enhanced dramatization of the terroristic events and potential threats. As the media resources continue to frequently depict Arab characters as terrorists, this label becomes more firmly attached to this ethnic group.

Moreover, Ahmed Al-Rawi points out that distortion of the Arab character in Western fiction has only strengthened over time. The process started in the aftermath of the Arab-Israeli War of 1948 and the image of an Arab terrorist first entered Western fiction. After the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1967, this image of an Arab terrorist was further deteriorated. In addition, the oil embargo and crisis of 1973 stimulated more vilification

because Arab countries revealed in this crisis that they could have economic influence on the Western countries through oil resources (Al-Rawi 1). According to the researcher Al-Rawi, fiction becomes a reflection of the adopted foreign policy. That is why a clear connection can be traced between the change of British and U.S. foreign policies in the Middle East and increase of distortion of Arabs in fiction and media with special attention to the terrorist portrayal (5).

Hollywood filmmaking most often presents the images of Arab or Muslim terrorists as “semi-civilized, violent, shady, beyond redemption, capable of horrendous crimes - traits making them suitable for extermination” (Boggs & Pollard 336). As a result, the terrorists in films most frequently do not deserve any sympathy but extermination, which are rightfully provided by US militants. Such consequence awaits both the Palestinian-Lebanese terrorists in the novel *The Pirate* and Yemeni terrorists in the film *Rules of Engagement*.

Jack Shaheen also indicates that the American television presents not only foreign Arabs as vilified, but the American Arabs as well (161). In the documentary film *Reel Bad Arabs* based on his book of the same title, Shaheen claims “Words such as Arab or Muslim are perceived as threatening words” (11). The researcher says that images the Western audience sees in films and television greatly contribute to the Islamophobia. In particular, the stereotyped images used in media, fiction, and films also affect the Arabs living in the United States and other Western countries too.

Jack Shaheen provides a clear analogy to illustrate how vilification of Arab characters work. In the documentary *Reel Bad Arabs*, Shaheen claims that the invasion of

2003 into Iraq was easier to U.S. citizens with the help of constant presentation of Arabs as fighters, terrorists, and in other negative roles in cinematography and television (102). Whereas Shaheen does not deny that terrorists are present among the Arabs and other Muslims, he argues that this image is generalized and applied to the entire ethnic group, reinforcing negative perception.

The documentary reveals numerous examples of distortion of Arabs and Shaheen draws a parallel between the image of a Muslim Arab as a terrorist and a Ku Klux Klan member as an average Christian. He argues that the media stereotyping is similar if the deeds of the U.S. terrorist organization Ku Klux Klan were used as a model of all Christians. Ku Klux Klan was an anti-black organization and it also opposed the Catholic, Jews, or immigrants (de la Roche 115). However, there is understanding about the difference between mainstream Christianity and activity of this racist terrorist organization. The researchers James Lutz and Brenda Lutz describe this American organization as a “successful right-wing terrorist group” (14). Such an idea may seem to be absurd to the Western audience, but still it represents how the Arabs are perceived in the West through this stereotype. People regard representatives of Ku Klux Klan to be psychopaths and do not associate as a portrayal of the Christian religion as a whole. On the contrary, the activity of some Arab terrorist organizations influences the way the Western world perceives Arabs and Muslims as terrorists.

Terrorists in *The Pirate*

The previous chapter discussed the novel *The Pirate* by Harold Robbins in its

focus on the subject of Arab oil and its management; however, the author also effectively intertwines this plot with the Palestinian problem. Since the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, “Palestinians as a whole were viewed as terrorists in the West”; in the novel Palestinians play the role which is most acceptable for the American readers– the terrorist group of Fedayeen or freedom fighters (Al-Rawi 9). The readers may perceive the line connected with terrorists merely as entertaining and adding thrill to the story. Then again, the great numbers of films with the plot of terrorism and a common portrayal of the pervasive stereotype of Arabs as terrorists is frequent in fiction and films in popular culture.

The organization of Fedayeen or Brotherhood of Palestinian freedom fighters is a real organization that operates in the Middle East. These groups are responsible for numerous terrorist attacks in Israel and abroad; however, its connection to authorities of modern Arab countries and to oil business is of dubious nature. Al-Rawi indicates that:

Any destabilizing factors like militant Islamic groups or Arab national movements in the region are presented as a threat, so the characters involved in these movements are vilified. (2)

As a result, the connection of the hero of *The Pirate* with Palestinian fighters greatly undermines his activity and creates even stronger association of Arabs as terrorists. Jack Shaheen observes that the media presentation lacks humanization of Palestinian people, whom the media and films consistently depict merely as terrorists or other villains (21). In the documentary *Reel Bad Arabs*, Shaheen argues that in the Western popular culture there are absent images of Palestinians who deserve sympathy, for example, children suffering from horrible conditions because of Israeli occupation. If

there are no images of Palestinians whom the audience can sympathize with, the terrorist images fill the gap in Hollywood cinematography (Estes 408). *The Pirate* obviously lacks the images of fighters to sympathize with. Leila may be an exception, but still even she approves the terrorist acts of Fedayeen, claiming: “Brotherhood is right, the only way to stop them is to exterminate them” (Robbins 166).

Moreover, by involving the Palestinian fighters plot to the storyline of *The Pirate*, the author also provides numerous details that distort the Palestinian fighters’ image even more. He depicts them as being immoral, treacherous, and more like a band of gangsters than fighters for freedom. Leila is unaware of the terrorist group exploiting her to further its interests. Still, she is ruthless and prepared to risk lives of her brothers for the interest of Brotherhood. It is worth mentioning that Ali Yasfir ordered to kill her in the end, despite her true beliefs and loyalty to the Brotherhood. It is only because of the intrusion of her father and Ben Ezra that she is saved from this fate. Nevertheless, Leila is a faulted character; even though she is being manipulated by the Brotherhood, she still does what she is told to do; she lies to her father, betrays him, hates and offends her father’s second wife. Leila also seduces her father’s executive assistant Dick Carriage in order to gain knowledge about her father’s business and manipulates him to continue the drug shipments for terrorists.

Then the author further vilifies the Brotherhood through their horrible activities as a continuation of the distortion of the Fedayeen fighters. When the Israelis killed one of the female Fedayeen leaders in an attack, a Fedayeen soldier took a diamond ring from her finger. When Leila witnessed this, she was shocked, but the fighter simply said, “The

dead need nothing” (Robbins 168). Therefore, the author depicts them simply as a gang of bandits, marauders, and they trade drugs, namely cocaine, in order to raise funds for their organization. Leila and her friends hijack the plane with Jordana and her sons because Baydr refuses to cooperate with The Brotherhood due to his suspicion of the Brotherhood’s involvement of illegal activities.

The author also focuses on the priority of sexual relations among the fighters. In the book, the author portrays the only reason many men enter this army is in order to sleep with women without any limits. Hamid tells Leila: “There are fourteen girls in that platoon. You`re the only one I haven`t f*ked” (Robbins 165). The author creates an impression that this practice is even normal for the female fighters. One of the brightest females in a group, Soad, concludes about her experience in a camp, “It wasn`t so bad and I got some of the best f*king I ever had” (Robbins 166). Some women made their career in the training camp simply by the means of sexual contact with officers. Thus, Robbins presents the camp of Palestinian fighters as a group of people who only have lust and dubious ideals. Only Leila is portrayed more positively by the author compared to the other soldiers, truly believing in a noble cause of their fighting (Robbins 165).

The distortion in the novel *The Pirate* has some common features with the *Broken Bridge*, which focuses on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The novel *The Pirate* involves more parties, but a similar confrontation also takes place. In the novel, there are both Arab and Jewish characters, whose images are presented differently. The author depicts Fedayeen simply as a violent and merciless terrorist group. The fighter Hamid obviously expresses the joy of a successful violent attack done by the Brotherhood: “Yesterday we

won a great victory, according to the radio. In Tel Aviv a school bus was blown up, killing thirty children...” (Robbins 166).

Moreover, the scene that is most vivid in the novel *The Pirate* is when the terrorists hijack the plane with Jordana, her two little sons, and other women aboard. The author emphasizes that the Fedayeen are ready to attack women and small children for the sake of their interests. The fighters treat them brutally at the Lebanese camp and it is obvious from Yasfir`s behavior that terrorists are not going to keep their hostages alive. Overall, the novel presents the members of Fedayeen organization as merciless towards the Israeli women and children and ready to conduct any terrorist attack. Not only does the author demean the subject of Arab oil by the means of involvement of terrorists, he also presents the members of the Brotherhood in the most degrading manner, having no moral principles at all. The image of Arabs that the novel forms is that every issue or conflict is connected with terrorists and that this mode of fighting is common in the Middle East.

Rules of Engagement

Jack Shaheen argues that *Rules of Engagement* is one of the most racist films when it comes to the distortion of Arab characters. The former Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary of Defense, and journalist Jim Webb create the film. The fact that a military politician wrote the script for the film emphasizes the presence of propaganda in the plot. According to Shaheen, Hollywood creates numerous films in cooperation with the United States Department of Defense. These films frequently use the plot of “killing

Arabs at random” (2). Shaheen bases his research on reviews of more than nine hundred Hollywood films, which utilize popular stereotypes of Arabs. So, *Rules of Engagement* is only one of the films that Shaheen uses in order to illustrate how stereotyping works and how it is deployed by modern mass culture.

The war film *Rules of Engagement* was produced in 2000 and directed by William Friedkin. The major part of the film happens in a courtroom where the convict is Colonel Terry Childers. As an officer at Marine Expeditionary Unit, the Colonel was sent for evacuation of the U.S. Ambassador to Yemen because of some unrest near the embassy. The mob of locals expresses disapproval of the U.S. policy in the region, so the people started throwing rocks and shooting at the embassy building. As the conflict becomes more aggressive, it becomes clear that there are snipers present who start to shoot at Marines. As a result, the Yemeni kill three American soldiers and Childers gives an order “Waste the Motherf*ers” (*Rules of Engagement* 00:20:10-11). Despite the killing of the three Marines was by snipers and not crowd of people, the Colonel seeing some shooting from the mob, he gives the order to engage the civilian crowd. At his order, the American military soldiers start shooting into the mob below the embassy killing 83 civilians and injuring more than 100 people, including numerous women, elderly people, and children.

Later in the United States, the authorities charge the Colonel of breaking the rules of engagement. The U.S. National Security Advisor Bill Sokal stimulates his case, wishing to get Childers condemned in order to protect the general reputation of U.S. military forces. The title of the film, *Rules of Engagement*, means the principles by which the U.S. militants can act when they perform an operation. These rules indicate that they

can open fire when the opposing side is armed and starts shooting. In the film, there were snipers shooting at the U.S. soldiers and killed three of them. In the beginning, it remains unclear if the mob was unarmed or not and the entire attack scene is a mess; however, the embassy camera footage later reveals that the mob was armed. The protesters of different age and the snipers on rooftops did the shooting. Moreover, the film clearly depicts that both the elderly people and children held guns and shot at Marines on the rooftop.

The scenes of shooting of the US embassy are set in the Middle Eastern country Yemen. Brian Whitaker mentions that originally the plot developed in some fictional Latin American country, but when Paramount Pictures adapted the story into a film script, the settings changed to the Arab world. They attach the stereotype of vilified terrorists in such a way that to audiences they view this group real as a representation of the whole Arab world. The only excuse for changing the scene from the Latin America to Middle East is that the former is too topical (Whitaker). Moreover, there are suggestions made in the film that the protest organized in front of the U.S. embassy was a planned terrorist attack. The film uses the word “terrorists” denoting Yemeni protesters at the U.S. embassy several times, solidifying the stereotype of Arabs as terrorists. Shaheen indicates that Yemen has had no history of attacks at the embassies of Western countries in general and the US in particular. Thus, showing that the choice of country is not justified (65).

In general, the film shows that even children in the Middle East are accustomed to hate the Westerners and can be given weapons to shoot. Being on investigation, Lt. Hodges, the attorney of Colonel Childers, visits the premises where the shooting took place in Yemen. After interrogating victims in the hospital who were injured during the

incident, he sees a small boy, who points his fingers as a gun at him. Although no real weapon is present, the impression is made that white people are at constant danger when visiting the Middle East. Then, there is a scene later with the Bill Sokal, who reviews the camera footage, proving that even children had guns and shot at the American soldiers.

When Lt. Hodges visits Yemen, he also meets a little girl who has lost one leg. Naturally, this episode evokes sympathy from a girl by the audience; however, this impression is not long lasting as the film shows the same girl to be one of the armed fighters near the U.S. embassy. While this girl is shown as a fighter only in a memory flashback of the Colonel who is on trial, this twist of the plot is not doubted as an accurate part of the events that happened in Yemen. The conclusion that the audience presumably makes is that the girl deserves losing her leg if not her life because she is also one of the hateful Arab terrorists. According to Jack Estes “The message is clear: If even this innocent and sweet young child is a killer, then who could blame the Americans for massacring the entire lot of them” (409). In a discussion of the film, Shaheen argues that it promotes an idea: “we’re now on his side. Why does this matter? Because in the end, the massacre of even women and children has been justified and applauded. It’s a slaughter, yes, but it is a righteous slaughter” (2). If even a small girl can have weapons and shoot at American soldiers, then the Arab civilians do not deserve any sympathy from the audience.

Whitaker indicates that it is common for the Hollywood scenarios to include at least one or two positive characters on the other side. The reviewed films and novels can present relevant examples. In the film *Exodus* within the first scenes there is a “good”

Arab Taha helping the Israelis, but he is still killed by fellow Arabs in the end. In the film *The Pirate* the Fedayeen fighter Hamid tries to save Baydr's daughter, Leila, risking his life. The novel *Broken Bridge* also presents one of the Muslim terrorists as benevolent when he decides not to kill the second child. If these other plots have a positive character on the other side, the logic would be the film *Rules of Engagement* should have had such a character as well. However, it makes no such concessions because even a small girl who first evokes sympathy at the beginning of the film turns out to be a terrorist too (Whitaker).

There are also some details considering the image of Colonel Childers that deserve attention. The filmmakers dedicated much attention to presenting this character as honorable, so his later activities can be justified. From the very beginning, the film depicts this officer as a brave commander in Vietnam War. His actions help to prevent his fellow soldiers from being killed in an ambush, so he returns from war to be honored for his actions. His later work at the Marine Expeditionary Unit is not commonly involved in armed operations until his division is called to evacuate the U.S. President from the Yemeni embassy. Childers is a courageous commander who performs his duties when his soldiers' lives are at risk. His soldiers safely evacuate the U.S. president, his wife, and son under his command.

However, it is hard to justify the later actions of Colonel Childers. At the court he exclaims that "Yes, innocent people probably died. Innocent people always die but I did not exceed my orders" ("*Rules of Engagement*" 01:05:12-13). Nevertheless, the review of the soldiers' actions after the evacuation proves the opposite: the decision of the

commander did exceed the orders of the rules of engagement during the evacuation.

When the helicopter with the ambassador and his family flies away, the colonel starts removing the flag. It remains unclear why Childers cannot simply recall his soldiers as they traveled to the embassy by three helicopters and so two of them remain. Even after accomplishing the task of evacuation, the U.S. military has the right to continue and suppress the protest by means of violent counterattack.

The core question of the film is whether the officer had a right to shoot at the mob, that has both armed protesters and unarmed civilians. When protesters kill three Marines, Childers gives his unambiguous command to shoot at the mob. One of his subordinates wonders if he should open fire because he claims “I have women and children in my line” (“*Rules of Engagement*” 01:10:40-45). Childers gives this order when the ambassador already left, but still the U.S. officer has a right to kill dozens of protesters for the lives of three soldiers. The film indeed shows later that the protesters held weapons and were shooting upwards; however, it is not a reasonable explanation to suggest that the people who are far below the Marines protected by high walls of the embassy were able to kill them. The location of the U.S. soldiers proves that it is the work of snipers, but as the snipers cannot be reached; the choice is to shoot the mob in retaliation. As a result, the Marines kill 83 people of different age and gender and injure many others. Yet, the further development of the plot fully justifies the actions of the Colonel, because he was only defending his soldiers.

At the court the attorney of Childers, Lt. Hayes Hodges, follows the point that Childers cannot be convicted of murder, which is the most severe of the charges the

Colonel is facing. The other charges are conduct unbecoming an officer and charge of breach of peace. Willing to justify the murder, attorney Hodges claims in the film:

To ask this man to risk his life for his country, to ask this man to watch his Marines die in his arms and call it murder when he's defending himself, to call it murder for firing back when being fired upon, to call it murder for saving the lives of his countrymen under the most extreme of circumstances... it's worse than leaving him wounded on a battlefield. (*Rules of Engagement* 01:20:40-45)

This quote from the film clarifies the priority of the U.S. militaries, which is the life of their soldiers. By introducing these ideas, the filmmakers depreciate the lives of 83 Arab people who had to die in exchange of three American soldiers lives. In the end, Childers is charged only with the minor accusation of breach of peace, whereas the charge of murder and even the “charge of unsuitable behavior an officer is not proved. A logical conclusion in the film is that killing 83 people is not a murder, only if they are Arabs and some of them are armed. It also concludes that the Colonel acted as any U.S. officer should have acted under the circumstances. Moreover, when Hodges conducts his investigation, he meets his convicted friend asking about the reasons of shooting. Childers, explains his actions to Hodges: “If I'm guilty of this, I'm guilty of everything I've done in combat for the last years,” (*Rules of Engagement* 01:30:33-34). Thus, he equals killing 83 civilians along with women and children to the military operations that demand shooting the enemies. At the court Childers claims “I was not going to stand by and see another Marine die” (*Rules of Engagement* 01:40:06-07), and this statement again proves how the lives of Arab “terrorists” are neglected, compared to the U.S. militants.

In the end of the film, officers congratulate Childers like a hero who saved his soldiers with no sympathy expressed towards the Arab victims.

The film presents a distorted and stereotyped picture of reality because the film depicts Yemeni protesters of different age and gender as terrorists. The violent attack of the U.S. embassy in Yemen is a false portrayal in which no historical background can prove. The film also presents children as cruel Arabs shooting the U.S. soldiers and able to point a gun at non-Arab visiting the country. The most alarming aspect of distortion within the film is that civilian Arabs deserve to be shot if there are at least several armed people among them. As a result, after snipers kill three US Marines, the military forces are justified for wasting the mob, after being clearly informed that there are children and women and that only some people are armed. In general, the film delivers a message that not only Arabs are most often violent terrorists, but also that all of them deserve to be killed at the smallest threat. Professor Jack Shaheen concludes this idea as follows:

The film's message? Colonel Childers made the correct call; his order to kill 83 Yemenis is justified. This movie's Yemenis are, after all, hateful marine-killers and anti-American terrorists. (76)

The film *Rules of Engagement's* prejudice depiction of Arabs was obvious even to numerous Western mass media resources and film critics. They condemned the filmmakers for the alarming biases in the plot. The responses to the film in some of the most respectful mass media were mostly critical. The author of *The New York Times* review Elvis Mitchell points out that for the audience it is obvious that Childers shot innocent civilians. He also argues that objection should be expressed to the ideas

promoted in the film (Mitchell). In *The Guardian* review Peter Bradshaw argues “here could not possibly be a more terrible film on release now than *Rules of Engagement*” (Bradshaw). Finally, the author argues that the film contains “creepy strain of Islamophobia” (Bradshaw).

The notion of Islamophobia, mentioned by Bradshaw, is the trend that has become common for modern United States (Bradshaw). According to the researcher Yaser Ali, “American Islamophobia represents a continuation of a longer history in which law reinforces racism toward Arabs and Muslims and threatens to isolate and alienate one of the fastest growing segments of the American population” (1027). The Islamophobia is present at different levels of existence starting from the prejudiced attitude by Americans towards local Arabs to deprivation of some institutional rights. Ali argues that in the United States Muslims are often not granted full privileges that are provided to other U.S. citizens. Islamophobia has deep roots and affects various aspects of the life of Arabs residing in the United States. The researcher indicates that the basis of this phenomenon there is continuous vilification of Muslims and Arabs in popular media resources, literature, and cinematography (1032). Consequently, the image of Arabs as villains has supported the stereotyped vision of these people and created islamophobia. Among the possible tools of this distortion the image of an Arab as a terrorist, as it is done in *Rules of Engagement*, is one of the most effective.

Evelyn Alsultany regards that this film is “an attack on multiculturalism and political correctness and opens a space for anti-Arab racism” (365). This racism later affects the lives of millions of Arabs living in the United States and other Western

countries. By diminishing the meaning of Arabian life with the help of special media portrayal, such images create the stereotypes and reduce the rights of Arab people. To summarize, the images of Arabs as terrorists used in *The Pirate* and *Rules of Engagement* are among the most severe examples of the distortion of Arab characters and culture.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The work under consideration has focused on various distortions of Arabs in popular Western mass media, fiction, and films. These images are pervasive as in many fields. Jack Shaheen reviewed 900 films that distort Arabs in many different ways and argued that it is only a fraction of modern popular culture. The most widespread images of Arabs are villains, rich oil sheikhs, or terrorists. This work has discussed a number of issues that are typically concerned with the cases of Arab image distortion. These issues are Israeli-Palestinian relations, oil exports, and the image of terrorists. The post-9/11 media releases contain a lot of prejudice; thus, this work focuses on and reviews the 2000 film *Rules of Engagement* in illustrating that the image of Arabs as terrorists was common for the Hollywood cinematography prior to the attack on September 11, 2001. The work scrutinizes Israeli-Palestinian relations through the prism of three resources: mass media, fiction, and cinematography. Upon a review of numerous examples, the work concludes that Western mass media mainly focus on the images of Israelis as innocent victims whereas they depict the Palestinians as villains, terrorists, and killers; the evidence also illustrates that Palestinians also face numerous injustices and violent attitudes from Israelis. Review of the novel *Broken Bridge* by Lynne Reid Banks proves the point that the image of Arabs as violent killers has become commonplace in Western juvenile literature. In the novel, two Arabs kill a teenage boy on a street of Jerusalem.

Apart from this severely distorted image, the novel also has a rich variety of other stereotypes about the Arab people. The research points out how one murder is able to affect the perception of Arabs by dozens of people. Moreover, the novel is an example of literature that influences the young English-speaking audience and forms stereotyped vision.

Review of the film *Exodus* further advances the question of Israeli-Palestinian relations. The film is an epic drama about the formation of the Israeli state that took place in 1948. The picture of the events is entirely Jewish-oriented and depicts the Palestinians kill the only good Arab, who was helping the Israelis. The omission of the crimes of Israelis, which were numerous while the state of Israel was being created, in the film shows the exaggeration of the innocence of the Israelis. Still, the Western audience accepts the film that supports the state of Israel, rousing sympathy for its citizens and hatred towards Arabs.

Another question highlighted in the work is the oil wealth of Arab nations. An example of the novel *The Pirate* by Harold Robbins illustrates how the literature distorts the images of wealthy Arabs. The book presents the character Baydr Al Fay, who is a protagonist but has numerous negative traits. The stereotypes about Arabs are present throughout the novel that includes the character exploiting his wealth on women and drugs and him beating his two wives. The character Baydr also uses the oil that his uncle, the prince of Lebanon, entrusted to his hands as a means of manipulation of the Western business world. The novel presents the event of oil embargo, which Arab countries imposed in 1973, causing the oil crisis, merely as a manipulative act of Arab sheikhs to

have Westerners on their knees begging for mercy. Moreover, the involvement of the terrorist organization Fedayeen to the plot further demeans Arabs. The author depicts the prince of Lebanon as unwilling to help his nephew in the struggle against the terrorists in order not to lose his prestige among other Arab countries.

Finally, the Western literature and cinematography widely deploy the image of Arabs as terrorists. *The Pirate* and the film *Rules of Engagement* show such examples. In *The Pirate* terrorists hijack the plane with women and children, demanding implementation of their plan. In *Rules of Engagement*, Yemeni protesters become terrorists, attacking the U.S. embassy. The film is specific in presentation of both women and children as terrorists. The U.S. colonel gives an order to shoot at the mob of protesters after three soldiers are killed. As a result, the U.S. soldiers kill 83 people including the elderly, women, and children. At the end of the film, the court fully justifies the U.S. colonel's orders and does not recognize killing 83 Arabs as murder by the U.S. tribunal.

The film raises one of the most crucial aspects of distortion: how the Western world associates Arabs and Muslims with terrorists as well as other villains. The film *Rules of Engagement* does not leave the space for any positive Arab characters. Even a small girl, who lost her leg after the U.S. attack, is one of the shooting protesters. Jack Shaheen argues that this film is one of the most racists in Hollywood involving Arab characters. The stereotype presented in this work is pervasive and can be traced in numerous other films and books. The message of the film is that no Arab deserves sympathy if he or she is in the company of Arabs pointing any weapon at Americans.

The distortion of Arabs reviewed in this research work is multi-faceted; however, the major images associated with these people are villains, killers, and terrorists. The pervasiveness of this stereotyped vision has much more disastrous consequences than negative perception. The Western culture vilifies Arabs and thus treats them differently from the other nations. Yaser Ali addresses the dangers and impact of a growing Islamophobia on the cultural, legal, religious and social interactions between Muslims and non-Muslims in Western societies. Many English and American writers have helped in under-representing the real image of the Arabs to the world and forming the distorted image that is present today. *Broken Bridge* and *The Pirate* are only some of the examples of such phenomenon. Cinematography has also been active in this overall distortion of Arab people and their culture, for *Exodus* and *Rules of Engagement* are only two films from the hundreds of stereotyped works. As Shaheen indicates, this distortion contains much injustice in the treatment of Arabs as second-class people. Understanding these stereotypes is necessary for reducing the distorted images and constructing a more friendly and unbiased dialogue among the Western and Arab nations.

WORKS CITED

- Aburaiya, Issam. "Islamism, Nationalism, and Western Modernity: The Case of Iran and Palestine." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2009, pp. 57-68.
- Al-Rawi, Ahmed K. "Foreign Policy and its Impact on Arab Stereotypes in English Popular Fiction of the 1970s-80s." *Concordia University Montreal*, 2012, pp. 2-24.
- Alsultany, Evelyn. "'Evil' Arabs in American Popular Film: Orientalist Fear." *Middle East Journal*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2007, pp. 365-66.
- Anderson, Craig A., and Brad J. Bushman. "Human Aggression." *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 53, 2002, pp. 27-51.
- Banks, Lynne Reid. *Broken Bridge*. HarperCollins Publishers, 1996.
- Boggs, Carl, and Tom Pollard. "Hollywood and the Spectacle of Terrorism." *New Political Science*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2006, pp. 335-51.
- Bradshaw, Peter. "Rules of Engagement." *The Guardian*, 10 August 2000, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2000/aug/11/1>. Accessed 8 July 2016.

- Catryle, Ryan. "What are the Top Five Facts Everyone Should Know About Oil Exploration?" *Forbes*, 10 April 2016, www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2013/04/03/what-are-the-top-five-facts-everyone-should-know-about-oil-exploration/#41c9c0cc127d. Accessed 8 July 2016.
- Chapman, Colin. *Whose Promised Land? The Continuing Conflict Over Israel and Palestine*. Lion Books, 2015.
- Cooper, Abraham, and Harold Brackman. "The Truth about Jerusalem's Grand Mufti, Hitler and the Holocaust." *Jewish Journal*, 21 October 2015, www.jewishjournal.com/opinion/article/the_truth_about_jerusalems_grand_mufti_hitler_and_the_holocaust. Accessed 24 April 2016.
- Crowther, Bosley. "3 1/2-Hour Film Based on Uris' Novel Opens." *The New York Times*, 16 December 2016, www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9803E2D61130EF3ABC4E52DFB467838B679EDE. Accessed 24 April 2016.
- Dardis, Tom. "The Myth that Won't Go Away: Selling Out in Hollywood." *Journal of Popular Film & Television*, vol. 11, no. 4, 1984, pp.167-71.
- De la Roche, Roberta Senechal. "Collective Violence as Social Control." *Sociological Forum*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1996, pp. 97-128.
- Estes, Jack. "Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People by Jack Shaheen and Sut Jhally" *Teaching Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2008, pp. 407-09.
- Exodus*. Directed by Otto Preminger, performance by Paul Newman and Eva Marie Saint, United Artists, 1960.

- Green, Laura. "Stereotypes: Negative Racial Stereotypes and Their Effect on Attitudes Toward African-Americans." *Perspectives On Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity*, vol. 11, no. 1, Winter, 1998-99, pp. 1-9.
- Haider, Haseeb. "GCC Oil and Gas Expansion Estimated at \$666 Billion." *Propel Consult*, 03 July 2012, www.propelconsult.com/gcc-oil-and-gas-expansion-estimated-at-666-billion/. Accessed 26 August 2016.
- Hamilton, J.D. "What is an Oil Shock?" *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 113, 2003, pp. 363-98.
- Happer, Catherine, and Greg Philo. "The Role of the Media in the Construction of Public Belief and Social Change." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2013, pp. 321-36.
- Hutchinson, William. "Media, Government and Manipulation: the Cases of the two Gulf Wars." *Edith Cowan University*, 2008, pp. 34-40.
- Ilie, Lvia, "Economic Considerations Regarding the First Oil Shock, 1973 – 1974." *MPRA*, vol. 22, no. 6431, 2006, pp. 1-5.
- Jensen, K. Foote, et al. "Understanding the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *World Affairs Council*, 2009, pp. 1-32.
- Jones, Toby Craig. "America, Oil, and War in the Middle East." *Journal of American History*, vol. 99, no. 1, 2012, pp. 208-18.
- Leavitt, P. A., et al. "Frozen in Time: The Impact of Native American Media Representations on Identity and Self-Understanding." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 71, 2015, pp. 39–53.

- Long, David E. "Saudi Arabia: Discovery! the Search for Arabian Oil." *The Middle East Journal*, vol. 62, no. 1, 2008, pp. 164-65.
- Lutz, James M., and Brenda J. Lutz. "How Successful Is Terrorism?" *Forum on Public Policy*, no. 1, 2009, pp. 1-22.
- McCurdy, Howard E. "Fiction and Imagination: How They Affect Public Administration." *Wiley*, vol. 55, no. 6, 1995, pp. 499-506.
- McDowall, David, and Claire Palley. "Palestinians." *Minority Rights Group Report*, no. 24, 1987, pp. 1-35.
- Michalak, Laurence. "The Arab in American Cinema: From Bad to Worse, or Getting Better?" *Social Studies Review*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1-11.
- Mitchell, Elvis. "Film Review; It's a War Out There, Soldier, and the Uniform Is Made of Cynicism and Pain." *The New York Times*, 7 April. 2000,
www.nytimes.com/2000/04/07/movies/film-review-it-s-war-there-soldier-uniform-made-cynicism-pain.html. Accessed 24 July 2016.
- OPEC. "OPEC Share of the World Crude Oil Reserves, 2015." *Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Counties*, www.opec.org/opec_web/en/data_graphs/330.htm. Accessed 24 April 2016.
- Owen, R., et al. "One Hundred Years of Middle Eastern Oil." *Crown Center for Middle East Studies*. no. 24, 2008, pp. 1-7.
- Pallardy, Richard. "Harold Robbins." *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, 16 March 2016
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Harold-Robbins>. Accessed 24 July 2016.
- Pappe, Ilan. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications, 2007.

- Park, Jaihyun, et al. "Implicit Attitudes Toward Arab-Muslims and the Moderating Effects of Social Information." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 29, 2007, pp. 35-45.
- Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Narrated by Jack G. Shaheen, Media Education Foundation, 2006. Transcript.
- Robbins, Harold. *The Pirate*. AuthorHouse, 2010.
- Rules of Engagement*. Directed by William Friedkin, performance by Tommy Lee Jones and Samuel L. Jackson, Paramount Pictures, 2000.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Penguin Books India Ltd, 2006.
- Shaheen, Jack G. "Media Coverage of the Middle East: Perception and Foreign Policy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 482, 1985, pp. 160-75.
- . *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*. Interlink Publishing, 2012.
- Smith, Andrew R. *Radical Conflict: Essays on Violence, Intractability, and Communication*. Lexington Books, 2016.
- Stegner, Wallace. *Discovery! The Search for Arabian Oil*. Selwa Press, 2007.
- Suleiman, Michael. "National Stereotypes as Weapons in the Arab-Israeli Conflict." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1974, pp. 109-21.
- Tibi, Bassam. "The Islamist Venture of the Politicization of Islam to an Ideology of Islamism: A Critique of the Dominating Narrative in Western Islamic Studies." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 96, no. 4, 2013, pp. 431-49.

- Van Buren, Cassandra. "Critical Analysis of Racist Post 9/11 Web Animations." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, vol. 50, 2006, pp. 537-54.
- Victor, Jacob M. "Politics, Cinema, And The Middle East: Reconsidering Exodus." *New Society: Harvard College Student Middle East Journal*, January 2008, <https://newsociety07.wordpress.com/2008/01/29/politics-cinema-and-the-middle-east-reconsidering-exodus/>. Accessed 30 June 2016.
- Walzer, Michael. "Islamism and the Left." *Dissent*, vol. 62, no. 1, 2015, pp. 107-17.
- Whitaker, Brian. "The 'Towel-heads' Take on Hollywood: Arabs Accuse US Filmmakers of Racism over Blockbuster." *The Guardian*, 11 August 2000, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2000/aug/11/2>. Accessed 5 August 2016.
- Yaser, Ali. "Shariah and Citizenship—How Islamophobia Is Creating a Second-Class Citizenry in America." *California Law Review*, vol. 100, no. 4, 2012, pp. 1027-68.