## Intro

#### Explaining the term “Daesh”

Guthrie 15 Guthrie, Alice. "Decoding Daesh: Why Is the New Name for ISIS so Hard to Understand?" *Decoding Daesh: Why Is the New Name for ISIS so Hard to Understand?* Free Word, 19 Feb. 2015. Web. 04 Dec. 2015. <https://www.freewordcentre.com/blog/2015/02/daesh-isis-media-alice-guthrie/>. Alice Guthrie is a translator, writer, editor and researcher working in Arabic, Spanish, French, and English. Her translations of Syrian, Palestinian, Moroccan, Iraqi, Egyptian, Sudanese, and Saudi literary works have been published by various UK and US presses and venues. Diverse media and academic translations have included an extensive series of ethnographic documentary films for the “Rebranding the Levant” project at London’s Royal Holloway University, and numerous articles, features and interviews in online and print media. Previously Arab World and Euromed Project Manager at Literature Across Frontiers, she is Translator in Residence 2014 at London’s Free Word Centre, where she has devised and delivered a range of multilingual workshops for schools and community groups in London and Bristol, produced a range of online media content, and curated a panel event on Syrian media. Recent literary publications include sections of The Book of Gaza (Comma Press) and Syria Speaks: Art and Culture from the Frontline (Saqi), and she is currently editing translated novels for London’s Darf Press. She has full-length collections forthcoming of both Rasha Abbas and Zaher Omareen’s short fiction, and is one of the 2014-15 ALTA Fellows. // VS

Over the last few months, there has been a concerted effort by several senior global politicians to give a new name to the group known as ISIS, or Islamic State, IS or ISIL. That new name is ‘Daesh’. If you've followed coverage of this attempted official linguistic sea change, you'll have gathered that the new name, although it’s just an Arabic acronym equivalent to the English 'ISIS', apparently delegitimises the organisation, mocks them, and thus drives them to threaten taking violent retribution on anyone who uses it. But why does this acronym have this power, and what's so offensive about it? If your access to news media is only in English, you might still be none the wiser. You may have got the impression from this coverage that the exact meaning and connotations of the word cannot quite be fathomed by anyone – that this word is a nebulous drifter, never to be pinned down. Basically, the coverage seems to imply, it’s obscured by a veil, like so much else in the Arabo-Islamic world, and we can’t hope to get it spelled out for us. It’s far too Eastern and weird for that. Well, I'm an Arabic translator, so my work revolves around pinning down and spelling out Arabic words and explaining them in English, and I’m here to let you know that there’s nothing mysterious about this new acronym: it may be from a language quite different to English, and an Eastern one at that, but trust me: it can be explained. I’ve come across some wildly inaccurate blethering lately about the word’s significance and its signification: even if you don’t know any Arabic at all, you might have been surprised to read in your major liberal broadsheet that although this new name is a transliteration of the Arabic acronym equivalent to ISIS, there are ‘certain schools of thought’ as to what the name means, or that you are being offered analysis based on ‘rough translations’ of the words in the acronym. If you’re particularly observant, you may have asked yourself how one of the words in the Arabic acronym of 'Islamic State' in Iraq and Syria can also mean ‘to crush or trample underfoot’ (as a major UK broadsheet faithfully ‘explained’ recently) – perhaps pondering, over your cornflakes, which of the words is the one with this double meaning: ‘state’ or ‘Islamic’, ‘Iraq’ or ‘Syria’? And wondering why you haven’t ever heard tell of this strange phenomenon before? If you’re a linguist, you will have scoffed at repeated references to a word that seems to shift between being a noun and a verb according to how it’s ‘conjugated’, taking extravagant semiotic leaps along the way. Perhaps, getting the impression from all this that the Arabic language is such uncharted territory, you even got inspired to start learning it, and get stuck in at the East-West decoding coalface? Is this ringing any Orientalist bells? But it’s really not that complicated, and certainly not uncharted territory at all. The main misapprehensions about the word currently circulating in our media boil down to the following list: That daesh is an Arabic word in its own right (rather than an acronym) meaning ‘a group of bigots who impose their will on others’ That it can be ‘differently conjugated’ to mean either the phrase above or ‘to trample and crush’ That one of the words in the acronym also means ‘to trample or crush’ That it is an insult or swearword in its own right That is has different meanings in the plural form Read around a bit, across several UK and US broadsheets, and you will quickly spot the same misinformation being repeated almost word for word: publications are either quoting each other as supposed reliable sources on the story, with acknowledgments, or simply repeating each other’s lines without explicitly referencing them. In most cases, the explanation is not only wrong, it doesn’t actually make sense. But why all this speculation? Why so much mystery? Why are phrases like ‘rough translation’ and ‘possibly linked to this word’ being used, making the story out to be as elusive and contested as many of the political developments on the ground in Syria? Clearly none of these journalists or their researchers have accessed an Arabic/English dictionary (there are many freely searchable online) nor – even easier – contacted an arabophone, to check these basic facts. So what does Daesh really mean? Well, D.A.E.SH is a transliteration of the Arabic acronym formed of the same words that make up I.S.I.S in English: 'Islamic State in Iraq and Syria', or 'لدولة الإسلامية في العراق والشام' ('al-dowla al-islaamiyya fii-il-i’raaq wa-ash-shaam'). That’s the full name chosen by the organisation, and – when used in full – it’s definitely how they want to be referred to. In Arabic, just like in English, that phrase consists of six words, four of which make it into the acronym (‘in’ and ‘and’ are omitted) : 'دولة dowla' (state) + 'إسلاميةislaamiyya' (Islamic) + 'عراق i’raaq' (Iraq) + 'شام shaam'. That last word, 'shaam', is variously used in Arabic to denote Damascus (in Syrian dialect) ‘Greater Syria’ / the Levant, or Syria – hence the US-preferred acronym ISIL, with the L standing for Levant. In Arabic there is a single letter for the sound 'sh', hence our transliteration of the acronym having five letters, not four. And the vowel which begins the word 'islaamiyya' becomes an 'a' sound when differently positioned in a word, hence the acronym being pronounced 'da’ish' when written in Arabic, and the 'a' coming over into our transliteration of the acronym. Of course the amazing Arabic letter 'ع' which begins the word for 'Iraq' is unpronounceable to an anglophone, and can’t be written in Latin letters, hence the use of an 'e' (or occasionally an ’e) in the transliteration. Still with me? Nothing mysterious there – or nothing that anyone who speaks Arabic wouldn’t be able to explain. It’s not a previously existing word in its own right. It does indeed now mean ‘tyrannical, despotic, murdering fundamentalists who claim to be Islamic and claim to be a state’ but only as a result of how it sounds (more on that in a minute) and as a result of the associations that quickly attach to a neologism, in the same way that they have attached to the word ISIS. So it’s not based on any previous – or mysterious, or quasi-mystical Eastern – meaning. And so if the word is basically 'ISIS', but in Arabic, why are the people it describes in such a fury about it? Because they hear it, quite rightly, as a challenge to their legitimacy: a dismissal of their aspirations to define Islamic practice, to be 'a state for all Muslims’ and – crucially – as a refusal to acknowledge and address them as such. They want to be addressed as exactly what they claim to be, by people so in awe of them that they use the pompous, long and delusional name created by the group, not some funny-sounding made-up word. And here is the very simple key point that has been overlooked in all the anglophone press coverage I’ve seen: in Arabic, acronyms are not anything like as widely used as they are in English, and so arabophones are not as used to hearing them as anglophones are. Thus, the creation and use of a title that stands out as a nonsense neologism for an organisation like this one is inherently funny, disrespectful, and ultimately threatening of the organisation’s status. Khaled al-Haj Salih, the Syrian activist who coined the term back in 2013, says that initially even many of his fellow activists, resisting Daesh alongside him, were shocked by the idea of an Arabic acronym, and he had to justify it to them by referencing the tradition of acronyms being used as names by Palestinian organisations (such as Fatah). So saturated in acronyms are we in English that we struggle to imagine this, but it’s true. All of this means that the name lends itself well to satire, and for the arabophones trying to resist Daesh, humour and satire are essential weapons in their nightmarish struggle. But the satirical weight of the word as a weapon, in the hands of the Syrian activists who have hewn it from the rock of their nightmare reality, does not just consist of the weirdness of acronyms. As well as being an acronym, it is also only one letter different from the word 'daes داعس' , meaning someone or something that crushes or tramples. Of course that doesn’t mean, as many articles have claimed, that 'daesh' is 'another conjugation' of the verb ‘to crush or trample’, nor that that is 'a rough translation of one of the words in the acronym' – it’s simply one letter different from this other word. Imagine if the acronym of 'Islamic State in Iraq and Syria' spelt out ‘S.H.I.D’ in English: activists and critics would certainly seize the opportunity to refer to the organisation as ‘shit’ – but I think it’s safe to say that no serious foreign media outlet would claim that 'shit' was another conjugation of the verb 'shid', nor a rough translation of it. Of course, that analogy is an unfair one, given the hegemonic global linguistic position of English, not to mention the heightened currency of scatological words; but there is a serious point to be made here about the anglophone media’s tendency to give up before it’s begun understanding non-European languages. And obviously understanding things outside of English, and explaining them to each other via our (social) media hive mind is hugely important on many levels: in the broadest sense, it allows us to attempt to take our place as global citizens, and feeds our connection to other humans on planet Earth. Sadly, the story of the word 'Daesh' is neither the only nor even the worst example of anglophone media failing us in this regard. But there’s something specifically important in this particular story which is being overlooked as a result of all the lazy journalism around it: the use of this word is part of a multi-pronged, diverse range of efforts by Arabs and Muslims to reject the terrorists’ linguistic posturing, their pseudo-classical use of Arabic, their claims to Quranic authority and an absolute foundation in sacred scripture, as reflected in their pompous name. This ridiculous claim has of course been masterfully and witheringlydeconstructed at the Islamic level, but at the secular level, satire is a crucial weapon in the fight against these maniacs: there is a fertile tradition of Syrian and satire as not only defiance but coping strategy, and which has been quite under-reported. In satirical Arabic media (and conversation) various diminutives of the word have also gone viral – elegantly diminishing their subject, belittling them, patronising and relegating them to a zone beyond any formal naming in a single sweep. Whether the word Daesh is insulting to its subject because it sounds ridiculous, or because it actually sounds sinister, depends slightly on who you ask. Some Syrians I’ve talked to rate the satirical value of the word very highly; for others, such as al-Haj Salih himself, however, the main weight of the word is not around humour, but around two very serious points he and others make. First of these is that both the shape of the word and the combination of letters in it are redolent of words from al-jahaliyya, the pre-Islamic dark ages or ‘age of ignorance’ that – as well as being a time rich in poetry and narrative heritage – has huge connotations of hideous barbarity in the popular imagination, being the realm of jinns and monsters and evil spirits and marauding freaks. This has also been overlooked in anglophone coverage, or been confused with an idea of the word having a previous set meaning in and of itself: as we know, it doesn’t. But given the connotations of this type of word, it sounds (to many an arabophone ear) very clearly like it must denote some crazed, bloodthirsty avatar belching back out from the guts of history. As al-Haj Salih very gently and firmly expresses to me by phone when I interview him for this piece, 'If an organisation wants to call itself ‘the light’, but in fact they are ‘the darkness’, would you comply and call them ‘the light’?' The second, and equally important, point that al-Haj Salih stresses to me is another take on why a neologism is insulting: it’s an obviously fictitious name, for an obviously fictional concept. Once again, the movement’s claim to legitimacy as a state and to rule is being rejected as nonsense, reflected in a fabricated nonsense name for them. So the insult picked up on by Daesh is not just that the name makes them sound little, silly, and powerless, but that it implies they are monsters, and that they are made-up. All of this is why some Syrian activists therefore see it as so important that use of the word 'Daesh' spreads, and have been working hard to make that happen – so effectively in fact, as we know, that the word has been taken on by several global heads of state and their associated media, who have a limited grasp of the specifics behind the term. Originally hailing from the city of Raqqa, Daesh’s current Syrian headquarters, al-Haj Salih says his main goal in making a new name for Daesh was to avoid people getting used to referring to a tyrannical and despotic movement as a ‘state’. Although he regretted his efforts when the word was used by Assad, and although he was the victim of death threats and assassination attempts in Raqqa (he is now based abroad), on the whole he has been pleased to see the word widely adopted by the Arabic media since summer 2013. In terms of its use by global heads of state and media, he feels that this is only natural, and right, as ‘The people who suffer most at the hands of Daesh should decide what they are called’. There is surely an interesting parallel between the refusal to use the name Daesh prefer, and our anglophone media’s misreading of the word itself – every article that recycles the same confused notions about the word denies the concrete meaning of Arabic, and relegates it to being a fluid and shifting language, inherently unintelligible. It was noted in the Arabic press that the Spanish Secretary of State for Security, Francisco Martínez, correctly explained the link between the words 'daesh' and 'daes' in November when he made a speech requesting that Spanish media adopt the new term, and it’s easy enough to find that explanation in the mainstream Spanish press. Although the French media is not entirely free of confusion around the word’s meaning and origins – with some press articles clearly based on the same misreading of one or two sources as their anglophone counterparts are, or throwing in bizarre new angles such as that 'Daesh' is pejorative 'in Lebanon' – the crucial difference is that a quick search reveals articles in major French broadsheets that explain it without any problems. If other dominant European languages can get it right in their media, why can’t the anglophone media manage this little linguistic research task? Do we really live up to our stereotype of monolingual insularity this much, even at major broadsheet fact-checking level? It seems there might actually be a systemic unwillingness to explain, on the part of the mainstream anglophone media – or, at best, an assumption that these things will not be explicable. How else can one interpret this total disregard that has been shown for the easy research avenues available to anyone setting out to investigate the story of a name? There is a vast community of bilingual arabophone people in the anglophone world, not to mention all the academics and people like me with a good acquired command of Arabic, very easily found and contacted. Even if that somehow proved too difficult, what about all the resourceful tech-savvy young researchers capable of, well, copy-pasting words into an online dictionary? More worryingly, this cannot fail to raise questions about the attitude to ‘them’ all this might reflect: is there something uniquely challenging for our media about Arabs and Muslims? Would we accept this kind of journalistic linguistic fog about, say, Greece? Have you heard that Syriza is a ‘rough translation’ of a Greek verb meaning ‘to wrest back power from a neoliberal global economic conspiracy of elite cronyism and structural inequality, and start a programme of radical resource redistribution and social justice, while wondering whether you will soon be ousted by a CIA-sponsored coup’? Well, just take my word for it, it is.

## 1NC - PIK

#### We advocate the entirety of the 1AC, replacing ISIS/ISIL with “Daesh.”

#### Referring to the group by its preferred name as ISIS or ISIL legitimizes the group and prevents the United States from crafting effective policy by associating the group with Islam that reinscribes discrimination against Muslims.

Khan 14 Khan, Zeba. "Words Matter in ‘ISIS’ War, so Use ‘Daesh’ - The Boston Globe." *BostonGlobe.com*. The Boston Globe, 9 Oct. 2014. Web. 04 Dec. 2015. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2014/10/09/words-matter-isis-war-use-daesh/V85GYEuasEEJgrUun0dMUP/story.html>. Writer and advocate for Muslim-American civic engagement is a writer and advocate for Muslim-American civic engagement. Born and raised in Ohio by devout Muslim parents, she attended Hebrew school for 9 years all while actively participating in her local Muslim community. In 2008, she launched Muslim-Americans for Obama, an online network to mobilize Muslim-American voters in support of the Obama presidential campaign. Since then, she continues to work on issues of Muslim-American civic engagement and was recognized for her work by the American Society for Muslim Advancement as a 2009 Muslim Leader of Tomorrow. // VS

THE MILITANTS who are killing civilians, raping and forcing captured women into sexual slavery, and beheading foreigners in Iraq and Syria are known by several names: the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham, or ISIS; the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL; and, more recently, the Islamic State, or IS. French officials recently declared that that country would stop using any of those names and instead refer to the group as “Daesh.” The Obama Administration should switch to this nomenclature, too, because how we talk about this group is central to defeating them. Whether referred to as ISIS, ISIL, or IS, all three names reflect aspirations that the United States and its allies unequivocally reject. Political and religious leaders all over the world have noted this. French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius said, “This is a terrorist group and not a state. . . the term Islamic State blurs the lines between Islam, Muslims, and Islamists.” President Obama made similar remarks saying, “ISIL is not Islamic . . . and [is] certainly not a state.” Muslim scholars around the world have denounced the group’s attempt to declare a caliphate. Egyptian Islamic theologian Yusuf al-Qaradawi published an open letter to Muslim scholars explaining, “A group simply announcing a caliphate is not enough to establish a caliphate.” The Syrian Sufi leader Muhammad al-Yacoubi called the group’s declaration “illegitimate” and that supporting it was “haram,” or forbidden. The term “Daesh” is strategically a better choice because it is still accurate in that it spells out the acronym of the group’s full Arabic name, al-Dawla al-Islamiya fi al-Iraq wa al-Sham. Yet, at the same time, “Daesh” can also be understood as a play on words — and an insult. Depending on how it is conjugated in Arabic, it can mean anything from “to trample down and crush” to “a bigot who imposes his view on others.” Already, the group has reportedly threatened to cut out the tongues of anyone who uses the term. Why do they care so much? The same reason the United States should. Language matters. With some 30,000 to 50,000 fighters, Daesh is a relatively small group, and propaganda is central to its growth strategy. Whether hijacking popular Twitter hashtags or using little known distribution channels to post videos to YouTube, their leadership knows that the war of words online is just as key to increasing its power and influence as the actual gruesome acts they commit on the ground. By using the militants’ preferred names, the US government implicitly gives them legitimacy. But referring to the group as Daesh doesn’t just withhold validity. It also might help the United States craft better policy. A number of studies suggest that the language we use affects the way we think and behave. By using a term that references the Arabic name and not an English translation, American policy makers can potentially inoculate themselves from inherent biases that could affect their decision making. A University of Chicago study last year showed that thinking in a foreign language actually reduces deep-seated, misleading biases and prevents emotional, unconscious thinking from interfering with systematic, analytical thinking. Changing what the United States calls this band of militants is not going to make them go away. Yet we also know from over a decade of war that military tactics do not stamp out extremism either. As the prominent Muslim sheikh Abdullah bin Bayyah recently said after issuing a fatwa against the group, “The problem is that even if you defeat these ideas militarily by killing people, if you don’t defeat the ideas intellectually, then the ideas will reemerge.” The State Department understands this and recently launched a more sophisticated digital war to combat the ideas espoused by the group on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. Building out a savvy online campaign is a step in the right direction, but the United States is weakening the potency of its own messaging if it continues to refer to the group as ISIL. American officials should not be in the business of telling Muslims at home or abroad who is or isn’t Muslim. Nonetheless, by reframing how we talk and think about these violent extremists, we can support the chorus of Muslim scholars who are intellectually pushing back on Daesh’s religious claims, the scores of Muslims around the world who have publicly rejected the group, and, ultimately, the silent majority of more than 1 billion Muslims who are as likely to reject the heinous actions of Daesh as we are.

## Language Matters

#### Language matters when discussing the fight against terrorists – Obama proves**Hossain 15** Hossain, Anushay. "Barack Obama Isn't a Muslim and He Doesn't Hate America -- He's Just Trying to Lead." *Newsday*. Newsday, 19 Feb. 2015. Web. 04 Dec. 2015. <http://www.newsday.com/opinion/oped/barack-obama-doesn-t-hate-america-he-s-just-trying-to-lead-1.9956575>. Anushay Hossain is a Bangladeshi journalist based in Washington, DC. She launched Anushay’s Point in 2009, and her work is regularly featured on The New York Times/Women in the World, Forbes Woman, and The Huffington Post. Anushay spent a decade as a feminist policy analyst on Capitol Hill before going full-time with her writing in 2013. She has appeared as an expert on global women’s issues on CNN America, HuffPostLive, Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), Al-Jazeera English (AJE), Canada’s CBC, Russia Today (RT), BBC Radio, National Public Radio (NPR), and Sirius XM radio. Anushay guest-hosted AJE’s “The Stream” from 2012-2013, and is also a panelist on PBS’ “To The Contrary,” the network’s feminist news-analysis program. Anushay’s career in women’s rights began as an intern at the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) where she worked on micro-finance for women in her native country, Bangladesh. A University of Virginia graduate, Anushay joined the Feminist Majority Foundation’s Nobel Peace Prize nominated Campaign for Afghan Women prior to completing her MA in Gender and Development at the University of Sussex in England. After a year at the United Nations Development Fund for Women’s (UNIFEM UK) London office, Anushay returned to Washington, DC where she spent the past decade analyzing the impact of US foreign policy on the health and rights of women and girls around the world. Anushay frequently travels to leading colleges and universities across the country giving talks on global women’s rights movements, rape culture in America, social media, and how millennials are rebranding feminism. She has spoken at Yale Law School, the University of Michigan, Duke, University of Chicago, Georgetown University, American University, George Washington University (GWU), New York University (NYU), Oklahoma State University (OSU), Quinnipiac University, and her alma mater, the University of Virginia (UVA). A fervent lover of cultures, Anushay spent a year in Italy studying Italian and is fluent in six languages. She is married and lives in Washington, DC with her Iranian-American husband and their daughter. In 2014, Anushay was welcomed as a member of The National Press Club in Washington, DC, one of the most prestigious journalistic organizations in the world. // VS

There are many days when I can say I would not want to trade places with President Barack Obama. That sentiment is particularly strong now given the controversy that is surrounding his speeches on Wednesday and Thursday over his decision to not call fighting the Islamic State group a war against Islam. Obama's critics relentlessly attack him, questioning everything from his leadership to his love of country. Some Americans and many of Obama's opponents may think he is too rhetorical when talking about the Islamic State, but in fact the president is being tactical. The Islamic State has an effective, powerful and active public relations machine -- ranging from YouTube videos to social media campaigns -- to spread its propaganda. By declaring a war on Islam, Obama would be playing right into the Islamic State's hands, because ultimately dragging the United States and our allies into an all-out religious war is exactly what it wants to do. Obama is being smart, and though that may anger critics at home, the president's speeches this week clearly call out the group's members as terrorists, and not religious leaders. This is very important for Obama's international audience to hear: The United States is not at war with Islam. This is the exact opposite of the message that the Islamic State is spreading. That Obama essentially called the group out deals a big blow to its propaganda machine and recruiting efforts. When analyzing Obama's remarks, we must also consider their timing. The president is seeking congressional authorization for military action against the Islamic State. Now more than ever he must make it clear that the wars are with terrorists and not Islam. This distinction is critical, and Obama is being responsible and constructive to keep religion out of the discussion. Obama's critics can afford to be more reckless with their commentary. For instance, former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, at a dinner Wednesday with 2016 presidential hopeful Gov. Scott Walker (R-Wis.), said he does not believe "that the president loves America." And, during a Fox News appearance earlier this week, the Rev. Franklin Graham said Obama has been influenced by Islam. "His mother was married to a Muslim. His father was a Muslim. Then she married a man from Indonesia. He was raised in Indonesia. Went to Islamic schools. I assume she was a Muslim." Those assertions went unchallenged. Obama has said that his father was raised a Muslim, but was not religious. From ages 6 to 10, Obama himself attended public and Catholic schools in Indonesia. Obama is in a perilously tricky position. He has to pitch going after the Islamic State to America and the world without alienating the Muslim world, Muslim communities and Muslim Americans -- all of whom are going to make up crucial components of the United States coalition to defeat the Islamic State group. The emphasis the president places on the role of Muslims in countering what has really become a cancer in our faith is key. He is reaching out to Muslims as partners in this campaign against terror. When discussing the fight against the Islamic State, language is everything. Obama knows this: The president has chosen to frame the group in careful and distinct terms without further isolating Muslims. Still, we will need more than speeches from the president to defeat the Islamic State. We all have a role to play, from the average Muslim to the media. Instead of investing more time analyzing what the president said, and whether we agree with his word choice, let's redirect our attention and efforts toward building a strong coalition against the Islamic State, an evil force we all agree needs to be eliminated.

#### Using “ISIL” is condemned by Muslim scholars.

Mandhai 14 Mandhai, Shafik. Journalist for *Al Jazeera*. "Muslim Leaders Reject Baghdadi's Caliphate." *- Al Jazeera English*. Al Jazeera, 7 July 2014. Web. 04 Dec. 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2014/07/muslim-leaders-reject-baghdadi-caliphate-20147744058773906.html>. // VS

Muslim scholars and movements from across the Sunni Islamic spectrum have rejected the caliphate declared by the Islamic State group, with the fighters receiving scathing criticism from both mainstream religious leaders, and those associated with their former allies, al-Qaeda. Assem Barqawi, also known as Abu Mohamed al-Maqdesi, who was released from a Jordanian prison in June after serving a sentence for recruiting volunteers to fight in Afghanistan, called fighters loyal to the Islamic State group's leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, "deviant". Maqdesi, a supporter of the al-Qaeda-affiliated Nusra Front, hit out at the Islamic State group for its brutal methods. "Is this caliphate a sanctuary for the vulnerable and a refuge for all Muslims, or a sword hanging over those Muslims who disagree with them," Maqdesi said. In rejecting the self-proclaimed caliphate, Maqdesi, a Salafi, has found himself on the same side as Sufi leaders, such as the Syrian Muhammad al-Yacoubi. In a post on his Twitter account, the Syrian exile similarly described the followers of the group, formerly known as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as "deviators". "[The] Khilafah state (ISIL) declared is illegitimate," Yacoubi said. Adding that supporting it is "haram", or forbidden. The view was echoed by Qatar-based Egyptian religious leader, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, who said the declaration was "void" according to Islamic law. "A group simply announcing a caliphate, is not enough to establish a caliphate," Qaradawi said in an open letter published on the website for the International Union of Muslim Scholars, which he heads. There was similar admonishment from the pan-Islamic political party Hizb ut-Tahrir, which believes it is a religious obligation for Muslims to work towards establishing a caliphate. "The issue of the Khilafah is too great for its image to be distorted or for its reality to be changed merely by an announcement here or an announcement there," the group said in a statement on its website. Speaking during Friday prayers, Rachid Ghannouchi, the founder of the Ennahda Party, Tunisia's main Islamist party, added to the chorus of criticism, calling the declaration of a caliphate by followers of Baghdadi a "reckless" act, which gave a "deceptive message". "Nations do not arise in this ridiculous way," he told his followers. Farid Senzai, a professor of Middle East politics at Santa Clara University, told Al Jazeera many Muslim groups felt the Islamic State group was hurting their cause. "The Baghdadi caliphate is rejected by most mainstream Islamists because they feel it damages their cause to establish an Islamic system through peaceful means," Senzai said. He added the fighters were further discredited by their "harsh implementation" of Islamic law. According to Senzai, that rejection was shared among ordinary believers. "Many Muslims would support a caliphate as an idea but not support ISIL because of its violent methodology," he said. Despite its sizeable list of critics, the disapproval is unlikely to have a big effect on Baghdadi’s followers. "They do not care about traditional and mainstream scholars, they have their own interpretation which they continue to insist gives them legitimacy," Senzai said.

## Islamophobia Impacts

### taken from skyview’s 1ac oops

#### **Islamophobia legitimizes the violation of human rights and oppression of the other—this causes the worst forms of structural violence**

Arinc, 2013

(Bulent is a Deputy Prime Minister. “Islamophobia is an attack against human dignity, says deputy PM.” http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/. Date Accessed- 07/14/15. Anshul Nanda)

Islamophobia is a violation of human rights, Deputy Prime Minister Bulent Arinc said on Thursday.¶ "Regardless of how we handle Islamophobia, it is a violation of human rights and an attack against human dignity. The communication strategies that trigger this violation won't contribute to world peace," Arinc said at the Grand Tarabya Hotel in Istanbul.¶ Speaking at The International Conference on Islamophobia: Law & Media, organized by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and the Office of the Prime Minister Directorate General of Press and Information (BYEGM), Arinc said that conflating Islam with terrorism and totalitarianism leads societies to approach each other with suspicion. He went on to stress that there are no religious principles that prevent Muslims from embracing democracy.¶ Arinc called Islamophobia, which he said is spreading like a virus, "a tool for oppressing Muslim societies." The goal of this oppression, pursued by those who believe that Islam and democracy are incompatible, is to turn countries that combine Islam and democracy into problematic states, he continued.¶ Saying that the ruling Justice and Development Party's (AK Party) unique example disproves the clash-of-civilizations theory, Arinc stressed the attention the party pays to multiculturalism and its adoption of a view that welcomes different cultures.¶ Islamist terrorist organizations are the only terror groups whose religion is taken into account, he said, adding that many nations perceive Islam as being behind terror attacks and deal with Muslim countries differently when it comes to terrorism issues.¶ "When Muslims are the matter of discussion, terms like 'militant, radical Islamist businessmen and Islamofascism are used in conversations. Though [it defends] freedom at every opportunity, the language the West uses is quite surprising on the Islam issue," Arinc said, arguing that Western prejudices impact discussions on the issue. Calling on the Muslim world to make more efforts to shatter the prejudices against it, Arinc demanded that Western societies take legal measures to prevent the escalation of Islamophobia.¶ Many superficial reports on Islam unnecessarily occupy the agenda, Arinc said, adding that Islamophobia in the media harms its reliability and objectivity. "The gray area between incitement and freedom of expression in international media should be clearer," he added.¶ Speaking at the same meeting, Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, the secretary-general of the OIC, described Islamophobia as one of the most challenging issues facing the international community and a threat to global peace and security. It stands in stark contradiction to universal values as well as to the international community's commitment to developing a culture of peace and harmony among different cultures, civilizations and faiths, according to Ihsanoglu.¶ Islamophobia is defined as "the dread, hatred and hostility towards Islam and Muslims perpetrated by a series of closed views that imply and attribute negative and derogatory stereotypes and beliefs to Muslims" in the Runnymede report, "Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All." The report added that Islamophobia is based on "an outlook or world-view involving an unfounded dread and dislike of Muslims, which results in practices of exclusion and discrimination."¶ A report by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) titled "Summary Report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001" documents acts of discrimination and racism against Muslims in 15 EU member countries. The report's findings show that "Islamic communities and other vulnerable groups have become targets of increased hostility since 11 September. A greater sense of fear among the general population has exacerbated already existing prejudices and fuelled acts of aggression and harassment in many European member states."

#### This dehumanization of foreign populations establishes continuous cycles of violence---the way we discuss this issue matters, discourse is key to solve and reforming the state shapes peoples perception

Collins 2 (John Collins, Associate professor of Global Studies at St. Lawrence, Visiting Professor of Sociology at St. Lawrence University, Collateral Language, p. 6-7, The Real Effects of Language, 2002)

As any university student knows, theories about the “social con­struction” and social effects of language have become a common feature of academic scholarship. Conservative critics often argue that those who use these theories of language (e.g., deconstruc­tion) are “just” talking about language, as opposed to talking about the “real world.” The essays in this book, by contrast, begin from the premise that language matters in the most concrete, im­mediate way possible: its use, by political and military leaders, leads directly to violence in the form of war, mass murder (in­cluding genocide), the physical destruction of human commu­nities, and the devastation of the natural environment. Indeed, if the world ever witnesses a nuclear holocaust, it will probably be because leaders /in more than one country have succeeded in convincing their people, through the use of political language, that the use of nuclear weapons and, if necessary, the destruction of the earth itself, is justifiable. From our perspective, then, every act of political violence—from the horrors perpetrated against Native Americans to the murder of political dissidents in the So­viet Union to the destruction of the World Trade Center, and now the bombing of Afghanistan—is intimately linked with the use of language. Partly what we are talking about here, of course, are the processes of “manufacturing consent” and shaping people’s per­ception of the world around them; people are more likely to sup­port acts of violence committed in their name if the recipients of the violence have been defined as “terrorists,” or if the violence is presented as a defense of “freedom.” Media analysts such as Noam Chomsky have written eloquently about the corrosive ef­fects that this kind of process has on the political culture of sup­posedly democratic societies. At the risk of stating the obvious, however, the most fundamental effects of violence are those that are visited upon the objects of violence; the language that shapes public opinion is the same language that burns villages, besieges entire populations, kills and maims human bodies, and leaves the ground scarred with bomb craters and littered with land mines. As George Orwell so famously illustrated in his work, acts of vio­lence can easily be made more palatable through the use of eu­phemisms such as “pacification” or, to use an example discussed in this book, “targets.” It is important to point out, however, that the need for such language derives from the simple fact that the violence itself is abhorrent. Were it not for the abstract language of “vital interests” and “surgical strikes” and the flattering lan­guage of “civilization” and ‘just” wars, we would be less likely to avert our mental gaze from the physical effects of violence.

#### And prefer this impact- Systemic violence represent an ongoing nuclear war- o/w existential crisis

James Gilligan, Dept. of Psych. @ Harvard Med & Dir. of the Center for the Study of Violence 1996 “Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes” p. 191-196] [edited for ableist language]

You cannot work for one day with the violent people who fill our prisons and mental hospitals for the criminally insane without being forcibly and constantly reminded of the extreme poverty and discrimination that characterize their lives. Hearing about their lives, and about their families and friends, you are forced to recognize the truth in Gandhi’s observation that the deadliest form of violence is poverty. Not a day goes by without realizing that trying to understand them and their virulent behavior in purely individual terms is impossible and wrong-headed. Any theory of violence, especially a psychological theory, that evolves from the experience of men in maximum security prisons and hospitals for the criminally insane must begin with the recognition that these institutions are only microcosms. They are not where the major violence of our society takes place, and the perpetrators who fill them are far from being the main causes of most violent deaths. Any approach to a theory of violence needs to begin with a look at the structural violence of this country. Focusing merely on those relatively few men who commit what we define as murder could distract us from examining and learning from those structural causes of violent death that are far more significant from a numerical or public health, or human, standpoint By “structural violence” I mean the increased rates of death and ~~disability~~ suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstratably large portion of them) are a function of class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society’s collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting “structural” with “behavioral violence,” by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. Structural violence differs from behavioral violence in at least three major respects The lethal effects of structural violence operate continuously rather than sporadically, whereas murders, suicides, executions, wars, and other forms of behavioral violence occur one at a time. Structural violence operates more or less independently of individual acs; independent of individuals and groups (politicians, political parties, voters) whose decisions may nevertheless have lethal consequences for others. <Continues, page 195> The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those caused by genocide---or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000 deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical n uclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 deaths, and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetuated on the week and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.