

Enemy Images and Cultural Racist Discourse

**How and Why the West Creates
Enemy Images and the Social
Consequences Thereof**

Michael Hagos

© Michael Hagos 2006, 2007, 2008
All rights reserved

Abbreviations

CIA = Central Intelligence Agency
ICJ = International Court of Justice
IMF = International Monetary Fund
PPS23 = Policy Planning Study 23
UDHR = Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN = United Nations
UNSC = United Nations Security Council
US = The United States
USG = United States Government
WB = World Bank
WTC = World Trade Center
WWII = World War Two

Contents

Introduction	2
Chapter 2	4
1.1. The Myth about Race.....	4
1.2. A Working Definition of Cultural Racism.....	4
1.3. How Enemies Are Constructed in a Cultural Racist Discourse.....	5
Chapter 3	8
1.1. The Utility of Enemy Images – Psychosocial Factors.....	8
1.2. The Institutional Imperatives of Enemy Fabrications.....	8
1.3. The Meaning of the Cold War.....	9
1.4. Parade of Enemies.....	9
1.5. A Critical Examination of a Bush Anti-Terror Speech.....	11
1.6. Final Remarks.....	14
Conclusion	15
Endnotes	18
Bibliography	27

Introduction

For the how part of enemy constructions by Western powers, a theoretical framework is set up in the next chapter in order to identify some of the ways through which enemy images are constructed by the ideological system: the media, scholarship, the schools, etc. Which mostly use cultural racist discourse, since traditional racism has by and large become politically incorrect (without being non-prevalent at least in attitudes) throughout most parts of the “civilized” West. The utility of enemy images for Western elites is discussed mostly in Chapter 3. By so doing, thereby demonstrating that enemy images are almost always constructed dishonestly, for ideological purposes (to fuel the military industrial machine), based on stereotypical images and other parochial concerns, to sustain the interests of power and privilege, rather than due to real threats to national security, *broadly and seriously defined*. The entirely predictable social consequences that will be discussed have to do with spelling out the implications of the dishonest practice of enemy fabrications, so that elite values can be revealed for what they are, and challenged.

In Chapter 2, I start by denouncing traditional racism, after which a working definition of cultural racism is given, followed by attempts at dismantling popular constructs of “the enemy.”[1] Then I proceed to a discussion of how enemy images are constructed generally, after which a discussion of enemy images in the context of cultural racist discourse follows (by using Huntington’s “The Clash of Civilizations” as my framework). Partly in chapter 2 and partly in chapter 3, a number of uncontroversial sources will be used to challenge certain Western assumptions so far as Soviet (during the Cold War) and Islamic (since the 1993 terror attempt against the US) enemy images are concerned, both international and domestic, but I put at least as much emphasis on why enemy images are constructed, since, again, the constructions have *virtually* nothing to do with real threats. This will be done by examining the Cold War period, in the sense of what the Cold War really meant historically, after which the newest threat to the West: radical Islamic fundamentalism[2] and its root causes, will be critically examined, thereby shedding light on the hidden, fraudulent mechanisms through which enemy images are generally constructed.

One of the sources used in Chapter 3 is, for practical purposes, the most relevant parts of a post-9/11 speech by President George W. Bush, since those parts epitomize how stereotypical enemy images (since 1993: “crazed Arabs”) are constructed by the West, in total disregard of historical, political and cultural contexts. The type of theory adopted is Critical Theory; the method/approach is unconventional; and the material used is eclectic, drawing on both primary and secondary sources.

At the general level, the purpose of this paper is to raise matters of human significance in a coherent way, and to shed light on the clandestine machinations of power, thereby providing some crucial insight into the hidden, rotten dynamics of statecraft and the private power interests it enthusiastically serves and protects. Specifically, the main thrust of this work is that power centers in general cannot sustain themselves except by fabricating an endless series of enemies, to control the domestic population, which has always been perceived by the powerful as the *primary* enemy, since the traditional structures of power and privilege are in fact illegitimate (as will be demonstrated). Which, I would contend, many political and business leaders are aware of, at some level. Ultimately, it is hoped that the human consequences of *realpolitik* will be

appreciated, so that the West's Pyrrhic victory can be challenged and denounced by those who care about truth, social justice, and long-term survival.

Finally, the reason *a greater part* of the efforts in this work are dedicated to criticizing/challenging Occidental policies and practices, rather than (or more than) Oriental ones, is because as a Westerner I (just like every other citizen in the West, regardless of ethnic and cultural background) share responsibility for the crimes that my self-appointed leaders^[3] commit in my name. In other words, more than anything I am acting as a moral agent in this work, which is my right and my duty.

Chapter 2

With exceptions so rare that they are regarded as miracles and freaks of nature, successful...politicians are insecure and intimidated men. They advance politically only as they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle or otherwise manage to manipulate the demanding and threatening elements in their constituencies. (Walter Lippmann)[1]

1.1. The Myth about Race

Fortunately, there seems to be a recognition, however tenuous, in scholarship that most modern nations, perhaps all, are a product of a far-reaching racial mixture. This view has been captured and elaborated in the most compelling terms by Dr. Charles Quist-Adade, who observed that “there is no pure ‘race’ and all groups are ‘racially’ mixed... Race...does not exist, at least in the scientific sense. It is a chimera, a phantom,” while racism “is a powerful reality, an invention that is absurd, illogical, irrational, and nonsensical. One is a figment of the collective imagination. The other manifests itself in a destructively powerful way. Yet together the two are interdependent, feeding upon each other. Yes, the twin notions of race and racism combine to make a powerful concoction, poisoning human relations, maiming, killing, and destroying people everywhere in both hidden and open ways... What has been called ‘race’ has no genetic basis. Not one characteristic, trait or even gene distinguishes all the members of one so-called race from all the members of another so-called race. Beneath the skin, and beyond the few physical features such as skin colour, eye and nose shape, we all – Aborigines, Asians, Africans, Europeans and Native Americans – are the same, genetically speaking.” The ultimate proof for this hypothesis or claim lies in the fact that “a crab does not begat a bird. The crab and the bird cannot cross breed, because they belong to entirely different gene pools, unlike all humans, of whatever ‘race,’ who all belong to the same gene pool.”[2]

1.2. A Working Definition of Cultural Racism

Cultural racism is characterized by values, and it politicizes, which is done irrespective of physical traits, since culture means in its broadest sense socially transferred habits and fundamental values, which are relatively stable over time. According to cultural racists, culture is essentialist. On the other hand, cultural optimists contend that culture is a social construction. In any event, the differences between traditional and cultural racism are not substantially significant, because both types of racism provide ideological justifications for belligerent or otherwise dishonest policies. Apropos of the former claim, Marianne Gullestad has duly observed that “‘culture’ now replaces the notion of ‘race’ in the rhetoric of the political right,” a view justifiably endorsed by Peter Hervik.[3] In this spirit, “Elie Kedourie hesitates whether it is possible to make a distinction between cultural racism and ordinary racism.” (Ibid., p. 10) Since it would be too embarrassing for most power-holders to openly espouse traditional racist attitudes, they conveniently resort to insidious, Huntington-style cultural racist discourse...,[4] understandably.

1.3. How Enemies are Constructed in a Cultural Racist Discourse

At the most general level, enemies are constructed by dehumanizing the “other side.” In abnormal psychology, this phenomenon is called ‘objectification,’ a process through which the human subject becomes an object of contempt or hatred because he or she fails to meet certain established norms or criteria, of whatever nature. These norms or criteria can fall along gender lines, class differences, racial, ethnic and/or cultural dichotomies, sexually “aberrant” behavior (like homosexuality, bisexuality, trans-sexuality, etc.), physical and/or mental handicaps, dissenting political convictions and opinions, etc. In brief, when the person’s personality trait, socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity or cultural identity, age, gender, sexual orientation, etc., are perceived as *defining* characteristics, then the person’s humanity becomes secondary, thereby enabling the discriminator to rationalize his or her hostility toward the “aberrant” subject on grounds that the subject is not fully human at best or the very personification of evil at worst, meaning, at least in effect, that the person in question becomes expendable. In other words, the enemy is always the person or group of people who, for reasons outside their control or due to willful and more or less purposeful resistance, fail to conform to the norms established by those who *choose* to dehumanize/demonize the person or group of people in question, i.e., the “other(s),” the threats posed by the latter being, of course, almost always imaginary or due to social-ideological constructs, rather than due to immutable laws of nature.

The construction of enemy images in a cultural racist discourse takes place by associating the “other side” with cultural backwardness, by attributing to the Islamic or non-Judaeo-Christian religions generally things like aversion for gender equality, religious pluralism, universal suffrage, democratic governance,[5] tolerance towards sexual minorities, etc. In its most extreme form, cultural racist discourse epitomizes itself in the manner advocated by people like Huntington, who insists, almost against all reason, that “Islam has bloody borders,” when in fact it’s the opposite that holds far more true.[6] In his highly propagandistic work, Huntington[7] puts forward the notion that the West (including the Jewish state of Israel) stands for everything that is scientific, modern, progressive and good. Contrariwise, he caricatures Islam and Arabism as standing for everything that is unscientific, backward and unregenerate. This clash is, according to him, intractable, due to “Islam’s” inability to be a part of “modernity.”[8] It’s astonishing how the very people who contribute to the brutal oppression of Arabs and Muslims should blame the ‘victims’ for resisting oppression, in the most extreme case, through suicide bombings. Of course, the taking of another life should never be condoned, but to explain and understand is *not* to condone. It’s incumbent upon us to ask why a relatively small number of Muslims and/or Arabs are driven to such extremes. But first, it should be made clear that religious fundamentalism, regardless of any denomination, epitomizes a world of inane abstractions and ideological distortions, caused largely by objective realities, specifically, in this context, US Middle East policies, meaning the political, social and economic *grievances* that *underlie* the desperate and retaliatory measures resorted to by suicide bombers and killers are legitimate, even if the measures (the actual killings) are illegitimate and should be condemned in the *strongest* terms. But if the condemnation is based on legitimate concerns, it should be coupled with *addressing* those grievances, regardless of any threats, crucially by excluding the majority of Muslims.[9] At any rate, Huntington’s aim is clear and single-minded: to discredit Muslims and Arabs no matter what, regardless of the historical and documentary evidence. By peddling such cheap propaganda and mendacious lies, he polarizes the world as if it can be

polarized in terms of one civilization being inferior due to its allegedly regenerate culture and religion. For him, everything that the West stands for is pure: ‘we’re inherently good no matter what we do, *they*’re inherently bad no matter what they do. *We*’re the enlightened civiliziers of mankind, and *they*’re bent on atavism for its own sake:’ a sort of parody of Hitlerian science. Of course, his vulgar propaganda is highly serviceable ideologically, because it conveniently justifies the perpetual inflation of Western military budgets, so that the very narrow concentration of power and wealth can be further accelerated, under the guise of “national security.” Which, as Rune Ottosen duly points out in his *Enemy Images and the Journalistic Process*, has nothing to do with national security in the true sense of the expression. As he notes, “...the authority of the state [is] linked to a collective understanding of the border towards the ‘other.’ If the ruling class w[ere] unable to keep this division alive its authority could then be challenged [...]. Heiki Luostarinen [...] has identified enemy images both as a reflection of the actual tension and conflict between states and as a way of creating unity in a state and legitimizing its rulers. There is no reason to believe that human beings feel a natural hostility towards people from other ethnic backgrounds.” (Ottosen, 1995: 98) Not only that, but “the Islamic threat has little to do with the supposed threat itself—Islam—and more to do with Western thinking, with a lacuna in our identity due to the end of the Cold War.” (Hippler and Lueg, p. 1) An even more frank statement by a high ranking USG official pertaining to the fact that the primacy of the war machine renders actual or potential threats irrelevant: “The new [military preparedness] standard is to maintain military superiority over all potential rivals and to prepare now for future military rivalries even if they can not yet be identified and their eventual arrival is only speculative... Military requirements have become detached from net assessments of actual security threats. Generic wars and generic capabilities are proffered as the basis of planning. Particularities of real threat scenarios have become secondary to the generalized need to show raw U.S. power across the globe.”[10]

“An important element in war-reporting is to ‘demonize’ the enemy and to portray him as ‘an animal in human disguise.’ Enemy images can thus be linked to the journalistic process itself,” leading to a more or less paradigmatic creation of “stereotypes through which violent actions can be legitimized.” (Ottosen, 1995: 99; paraphrased) All this makes perfect sense, given the fact that Western industrial economies are highly militarized. “This reflects the power and interests that benefit the uncontrolled arms race, the status quo of domestic economic arrangements, and the external system of multinational expansion and collaboration with the Shahs, Suhartos, Marcoses in the contemporary “development” and sacking of the Third World.”[11] In brief, the measures resorted to by discriminators and oppressors against the aberrant persons or groups of people is always punitive at best (in the form of exclusion/ostracism/marginalization/disenfranchisement or other forms of social sanctions) and destructive at worst (in the form of physical violence, terrorism, aggression, genocide, etc.).

Consistent with the norms of “democratorship,” the way power hungry leaders hold on to power is through fear-mongering. Fear is, after all, the most effective standard device for population control, so that the “bewildered herd” doesn’t depart from its spectator role and apathy.[12] The owners and managers of US and other Western societies are, in fact, fighting a bitter class war against the general population—often adopting vulgar Marxist rhetoric and concepts, resorting to jingoist hysteria, fear and terror, awe of great leaders and the other standard devices of population control (the contempt for ordinary citizens among elites is almost unbelievable!) Suffice it to say that the inner workings of Western intellectual and moral culture

is something that we should all come to understand, so that the intellectually barren and morally bankrupt foundation of elitist culture in the West can be challenged, including the “pathology of normalcy,”[13] under which the truth of the matter, almost any matter, is buried under edifice after edifice of lies upon lies.[14]

Finally, the enemy image is, in fact, usually a mirror image of the very persons or institutional forces creating that enemy image, which is called *projection* in abnormal psychology. What you know, at some level, you are guilty of yourself, you blame others for, in order to reduce anxiety about your own depravity. The enemy, whether real or imagined, does the same thing, thereby creating a vicious cycle of hatred on both sides, typically escalating the familiar dynamics of violence from both sides, while innocent civilians typically bear the brunt of that violence, by paying for the cynical power play of their self-appointed leaders and their real or imagined enemies in blood and tears, since 90 percent of victims of wars and armed conflicts are indeed innocent civilians. In the words of Ottosen, “Do we apply the same yardstick to our own standards as we do to our ‘enemy’? Do we question the motives of our own acts as well as those of our allies in the same way we do with our enemy?” If not, then we are total hypocrites! Suffice it to say that “enemy images are an obstacle to analytical journalism” (Ottosen, 1995: 97), to a proper understanding of world affairs, to democratic goals and aspirations, and ultimately to survival itself. And the question of religious fanaticism is, of course, treated as dishonestly as almost any other issue in the West, since Christian fanatics pose a much greater threat to world peace than so-called Jihadists.[15]

Chapter 3

There is no doubt that a prince's greatness depends on his triumphing over difficulties and opposition. So fortune, especially when she wants to build up the greatness of a new prince, whose need to acquire standing is more pressing than that of a hereditary ruler, finds enemies for him and encourages them to take the field against him, so that he may have cause to triumph over them and ascend higher on the ladder his foes have provided. Many, therefore, believe that when he has the chance an able prince should cunningly foster some opposition to himself so that by overcoming it he can enhance his own stature. (Niccolò Machiavelli)[1]

1.1. The Utility of Enemy Images – Psychosocial Factors

The fabrication of enemies by the powerful spuriously legitimizes discrimination and violence against weak and powerless groups, the underlying dynamics of which emanating from the fact that *the roots of discrimination, oppression and aggression are to be found in our own irrational fears.*[2]

1.2. The Institutional Imperatives of Enemy Fabrications

“The U.S. military serves the strategic interests of property in the corporate form.”[3] This means that the so-called ‘capitalist’ system must rely on violence to keep it in place, and Western societies have created a global empire in which military and economic interests are inextricably intertwined. Which is conceded even by mainstream analysts and media pundits, like Thomas Friedman for example, who said: “The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. McDonald’s cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas... And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley’s technologies to flourish is called the US Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. And these fighting forces and institutions are paid for by American taxpayer dollars.”[4] This is why it is misleading to call the prevailing politico-economic system ‘capitalist,’ because in a pure capitalist system investors and lenders must subsidize their own risks and costs, as opposed to relying on massive public subsidies through the nanny state. Having a massively destructive military apparatus at their disposal to protect their economic interests globally is a radical violation of free-market principles and democratic norms.[5] The status quo of domestic economic arrangements should be traced to one of the founding fathers of American democracy, James Madison, who said: “the primary task of the government is to protect the minority of the opulent against the majority.” This is done essentially by socializing risk and cost while privatizing power and profit, meaning the military-industrial complex (the Pentagon system) plays a crucial role by coercively transferring resources from the poor to the rich. As the American social critic H. L. Mencken succinctly put it: “The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.” This is why the US has been fabricating an endless series of enemy since WWII, in order to force the public to subsidize high tech industry, thereby enabling the concentration of power and wealth to very narrow sectors. So the Pentagon is really a subsidy system for the rich and the powerful, and the universities (particularly the Ivey Leagues) are nothing more than a funnel for high tech R & D under the aegis of the Pentagon. In other words, “the massive increase in the state sector of the economy in the traditional American way, through the Pentagon system, [is] a device to force the public to invest in high technology industry by means of the state-guaranteed market for the production of high technology waste (armaments) and thus to contribute to the program of public subsidy, private profit, called ‘free enterprise’; and a substantial increase in

the US role in intervention, subversion, and international terrorism (in the true sense of the expression). Such policies cannot be presented to the public in the terms in which they are intended. They can be implemented only if the general population is properly frightened by monsters against whom we must defend ourselves. The standard device is an appeal to the threat of the Great Satan, John F. Kennedy's 'monolithic and ruthless conspiracy' bent on world conquest, Reagan's 'Evil Empire'." [6]

In brief, the corrupt practice of war profiteering[7] reflects an institutional need rather than evilness per se on the part of the profiteers, an important distinction, in order to avoid dehumanizing the ruling class.

1.3. The Meaning of the Cold War

According to one of the leading figures in the post-revisionist school, John Lewis Gaddis, the origin of the Cold War should be traced to 1917, because that's when the communist powers began to express their unwillingness and inability to complement the Western industrial economies, which was perceived as the *primary* threat of communism. In other words, the primary threat was never a military threat (since on average the missile gap was about 10-1 in favor of the US, a well-known fact[8]) but an *economic* one.

1.4. Parade of Enemies

As a matter of fact, states cannot survive without domestic and international enemies. But the primary enemy of *every* state is its own population, for which purpose external enemies are necessary as a pretext for legitimating state power domestically, while all along waging a bitter class war against the domestic enemy, for, as Emma Goldman put it: "the war of classes underlies all wars among nations." The reference here is, of course, to the more powerful states, since less powerful ones tend to be relatively less belligerent, hence less prone to concoct external enemies to legitimate domestic status quo arrangements, due to the fact that they are less constrained in their power to resort to force domestically to control the population, whereas the more affluent societies compensate for their more limited capacity to coerce their population by force with propaganda. To illustrate, if there are growing domestic social and economic problems (perhaps catastrophes) in any given country, more so in the more affluent and powerful countries, no one in power will have any intention of doing anything about them, typically (since states are profoundly anti-human institutions, with leaders typically interested primarily in maximizing their own power and status). In the US, for example, if one looks at the domestic programs of officials in power, including the programs of the "democratic opposition," there is no serious proposal about what to do about the severe problems of health, education, joblessness, homelessness, crime, soaring criminal population, jails, deterioration in the inner cities, etc. In fact, there is a deep social crisis in the US (and, to a lesser extent perhaps, throughout Western Europe). There are about 40 million poor people there, 1/3 of which are children, none of whom have health care plans. Educational standards are declining, the debt is zooming, real wages have been steadily declining for the past 3 decades; they are now back to the level of about the late 1950s for most of the population, with nobody doing anything about it. In circumstances such as these, the "bewildered herd" have to be diverted, because if they start to notice what's being *done to them*, they are not likely to tolerate it, since they're the ones suffering from it. Having them watch professional sports and sitcoms is not enough. They have to be whipped up into fear of enemies. It's a well-established technique. As Hermann Goering put it, "Naturally, the common people don't want war... [But] it is always a simple matter to drag the people along... All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."

Correspondingly, in the 1930s Hitler whipped up his people into fear of the Jews and Gypsies. They had to be crushed in the name of “national security.” American leaders regularly resort to this technique. With increasing regularity, some major ogre is constructed that Americans have to defend themselves against. Now that the Russians are no longer a threat, now that they have lost their attractiveness as an enemy, some new ones have to be conjured up, to sustain America’s “permanent war economy,”[9] without which the economy cannot be kept afloat for elites. The importance of this fact cannot be over-emphasized. WWII taught US business leaders a very important lesson: WWII is precisely what enabled the US to come out of the Great Depression—war is, after all, very good for big business; it’s still a racket. So once the public relations industry realized that the Soviet threat could no longer be used for Machiavellian purposes, the tune changed to Hispanic “narco-traffickers,”[10] “crazed Arabs,” “international terrorists,” and Satan Hussein,[11] who are going to conquer the world. The population has to be frightened, terrorized, and intimidated, too afraid to travel and so on. Then, predictably, the self-appointed leaders of the Free World achieve magnificent victories over defenseless Third World armies that can be vaporized in no time. Then Americans feel relieved, because they were saved in the last minute. It works like a charm every time. Governments are willing to do everything, and go to any length, to engender fear in the masses, by building up a chimerical monster, then campaign to have it crushed, thereby disingenuously keeping the bewildered herd from paying attention to what’s *really* going on around them (i.e., to what’s being done to them by their own leaders), keep them diverted and controlled, while all along fraudulently sustaining the interests of power: con artistry at its best, always under the deceitful guise of threats to national security.[12]

Perhaps the greatest irony in all of these is how yesterday’s enemies become today’s friends, and vice versa, how the boundaries and definitions of Good and Evil not only blur but bleed into each other to the point of becoming interchangeable, and, worse yet, feed off of each other, symbiotically, both for the sake of expediency and unwittingly. Case in point: “What would Good be without Evil? It’s not just religious fanatics who need enemies to justify their madness. The arms industry and the gigantic war machine of the US also needs enemies to justify its existence. Good and Evil, evil and good; the actors change masks, the heroes become monsters and the monsters become heroes, in accord with the demands of the theatre’s playwrights. This is nothing new. The German scientist Werner von Braun was evil when he invented the V-2 bombers that Hitler used against London, but became good when he used his talents in the service of the United States. Stalin was good during WWII and evil afterwards, when he became the leader of the Evil Empire... Saddam Hussein was good, and so were the chemical weapons he used against the Iranians and the Kurds. Afterwards, he became evil.”[13]

Finally, power-holders cannot hold on to power unless they deceive, frighten, marginalize and make their subjects feel hopeless, because power is very fragile. If the state were truly an organic entity, if it were necessarily the natural form of human or social organization, then leaders would not need to hide behind statutory laws, and they most certainly would not need to resort to fear and other Machiavellian tactics.[14] If states, churches and multinationals were legitimate structures, they would be vindicated by the laws of nature, crucially without fabricating enemies.

1.5. A Critical Examination of a Bush Anti-Terror Speech[15]

“Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice, or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.” *There is no evidence that the US is the*

defender of freedom. Quite the contrary: It is a leading agent of international criminal violence.[16]

“On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country... freedom itself is under attack... Al Qaeda is to terror what the mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money; its goal is remaking the world – and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.” *It should be made clear that the 9/11 attacks were horrifying terrorist crimes. There should be no disagreement about that. But the right way to deal with 9/11 is to follow Nicaragua’s example, which, after all, did not set off bombs in Washington! Instead, it took its case to the World Court (which, after carefully studying the case, ruled out any Cold War connections and ruled in favor of Nicaragua), but to no avail. Then it took its case to the Security Council at the UN, also to no avail. So Bush’s statement is outrageously dishonest, since he is conveniently albeit cunningly concealing the fact that the US government’s terror network is far more extensive and destructive than Al-Qaeda’s, including the fact that the US is an empire that is imposing its radically anti-democratic political and economic arrangements on the entire world.[17]*

“The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans, and make no distinction among military and civilians, including women and children.” *To the extent that this statement is true, every accusation in it applies perfectly to the US as well, since it has not made any distinction among military and civilian targets, including women and children, in its terror wars and wars of aggression since at least WWII. So the very same pathological ambition and actions can be attributed to the US and its mercenary client states,[18] typically.*

“There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries. They are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan, where they are trained in the tactics of terror. They are sent back to their homes or sent to hide in countries around the world to plot evil and destruction.” *There are very crucial omissions here. Who recruited Islamic Jihadists to begin with, during the 80s, if not the CIA and its clients? And doesn’t the US leadership plot evil and destruction around the world, as it has done for decades, in its pursuit of economic interests? (see works cited in note 15)*

“The leadership of al Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country.” *That was not a problem before 9/11. In fact, the US also supported the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country before 9/11.[19] To make matters worse, President Reagan even praised the mujahideen as freedom fighters while he was in office.[20] So this type of toxic omission reflects the height of hypocrisy.*

“The United States respects the people of Afghanistan...” *To the point that it murdered even more civilians than were murdered in New York on 9/11, while deliberately driving millions to starvation![21]*

“-- after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid...” *Doublespeak. There are 40 million poor people in the US who the Administration could not care less about, 1/3 of which are children. These people go to bed every night with an empty stomach and have no health care plan. Charity always begins at home!*

“tonight, the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban: Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of al Qaeda who hide in your land.” *Glaring double standard, since the US would never do so if India, for example, were to demand the extradition of Warren Anderson of the US (chairman of Union Carbide), responsible for the Bhopal gas leak that killed 16,000 people in 1984, which was not likely to have been accidental. In the words of Arundhati Roy, “The Taliban’s response to U.S. demands for the extradition of bin Laden has been uncharacteristically reasonable: produce the evidence, then we’ll hand him over.”*

“These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act, and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.” *Threatening to use force and retaliation are barred by international law, according to the UN Charter.*[22]

...The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them. *The US leadership and its clients constitute a radical network of terrorists, and the USG supports and provides haven to many known terrorists within the US.*[23]

Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated. *Doublespeak for “the permanent war economy will perpetuate itself ad infinitum,” since feeding the never-ending war machine is of paramount importance for the West, meaning human rights are subordinated to the over-riding need for profit: that’s the real meaning of ‘neo-liberalism.’*

Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this chamber -- a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms -- our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. *“This is a comforting picture, and the general stance is not unfamiliar in intellectual history; in fact, it is close to the norm. It...has all the merits of self-adulation and uncritical support for power. And it has the flaw that adopting it contributes significantly to the likelihood of further atrocities, including atrocities directed against us, perhaps even more horrendous ones than those of 9-11.”*[24]

They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa. *Such claims and accusations should be substantiated by the Boss Man. But even to the extent that they are true, which is questionable, this extremist view by Al Qaeda is certainly not representative of Islamic and Arab societies in general, not by a long shot.*[25]

We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions -- by abandoning every value except the will to power -- they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way, to where it ends: in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies. *Every accusation above applies perfectly to the Boss Man and his predecessors, as evidenced above.*

Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. *A rare moment of honesty, since the Boss Man is admitting that striking Afghanistan is an act of retaliation, which, again, is barred by international law. The second claim is proof that the US targets civilians as indiscriminately if not more so than Al Qaeda.*

...Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. *This is a classical case of spin, of emotional blackmail.*

From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime. *The UK has a long history of supporting terrorism.[26] So how come it's not regarded as a hostile regime or government?*

Our nation has been put on notice: We are not immune from attack. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans. *This is a very good example of how enemies are constructed. "We will take defensive measures...to protect Americans," while the historical and documentary evidence proves the exact opposite, i.e., the US has taken in the past, and is now taking, very offensive measures in its pursuit of economic interests around the world. And the part having to do with protecting Americans is nothing but lip service, since within the framework of the reigning ideological institutions, hegemony, with its short-term benefits to elite interests, is ranked above survival in the scale of operative values, meaning security is at most a marginal concern of security planners, because of the obsession with short-term interests, like power and profit.*

...what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. *Huntington's paradigm.*

This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom. *Pure rhetoric, since these things are merely slogans in the West, as evidenced above.*

The civilized world is rallying to America's side. *Huntington's paradigm again.*

They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. *Fear-mongering and deceit, since Western state terrorism has gone completely unpunished so far. Such skillful manipulation of fear is to be expected from power-mongers, but it shouldn't be tolerated. It's our duty as citizens to countermand our leaders' sharpened skills in the rhetoric of fear, because living under fear is highly inimical to social health and substantive democracy.*

Terror, unanswered, can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. *Question-begging, since governments are legitimate only if they truly represent the will of the majority, only if they promote human welfare through socially and morally desirable means and ends, clearly not the case in the West, or virtually anywhere else, since corporate capitalism, which dominates most of the domestic and international economy, is a zero-sum game.*

I will not forget this wound to our country or those who inflicted it. I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people. *Doublespeak for slavery and insecurity for the American people, per Orwell's inverted definitions.*

The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them. *Archetypical example of “we vs. them” dichotomy. Automatic assumption that God is on the side of the US – such pretense to piety is something that the Boss Man accused the “other” side of earlier. Of course, both sides have such pretenses, but the struggle of Good against Evil can only lead to disaster. What’s at stake is nothing less than the survival of the species.*

1.6. Final Remarks

Cultural racist discourse or ‘New Racism’ is highly functional for power interests. “It has to do with conquest, with oppression. If you’re robbing somebody, oppressing them, dictating their lives, it’s a very rare person who can say: ‘Look, I’m a monster. I’m doing this for my own good.’ Even Himmler didn’t say that. A standard technique of belief formation goes along with oppression, whether it’s throwing them in gas chambers or charging them too much at a corner store, or anything in between. The standard reaction is to say: ‘It’s their depravity. That’s why I’m doing it. Maybe I’m even doing them good.’”[27] Suffice it to say that the secret of great propaganda is that it is never seen as propaganda, which is why President Bush (and leaders generally) can deceive the majority of Americans (or other peoples) so easily and with impunity, coupled with fear-mongering techniques, the latter being an integral part of propaganda. In other words, one should never “underestimate the capacity of well-run propaganda systems to drive people to irrational, murderous, and suicidal behavior,”[28] since propaganda is to a formal democracy what violence is to a totalitarian state. And “the resort to fear by systems of power to discipline the domestic population has left a long and terrible trail of bloodshed and suffering, which we ignore at our peril.”[29] If we want to significantly diminish the threat of terror, the easiest way is for Western powers to stop participating in terrorism, but also to allow the Third World to pursue *independent* development, since poverty (much of it a by-product of Western hegemony) provides fertile ground for religious fundamentalism. Which is on the rise everywhere, to the point of undermining moderate, progressive secular movements.[30]

Finally, the theory of enemy images should be traced to Tambiah’s accurate observation that “the other side of the Western model of the secular nation-state is its aggressive nationalism, and its imperialist expansion and penetration into what became its colonial dependencies. So it would seem that the liberal democracy at home in Western Europe and the United States could assume the fierce shape of authoritarian rule abroad, the exploitation of native labor and resources, and the inferiorization, if not erosion, of the cultures of the colonized. Marxists explained these processes in terms of capitalism gaining a new lease on life through colonial exploitation. This inferiorization and threat of culture extinction in large part impels the rise of Islamic fundamentalism or Buddhist nationalism or Hindu nationalism and other such reactions, and their taking a retaliatory attitude to the West – its exercise of economic affluence and domination, its political supremacy, its alleged consumerist values, its celebration of sexual eroticism, its erosion of family values, and so on.”[31]

Conclusion

In the struggle of Good against Evil, it's always the people who get killed. (Eduardo Galeano)[1]

As we have seen, enemy images are almost always created dishonestly, based on stereotypes, biases, irrational fears, power lust, greed, etc. Generally, enemy images are created in order to mobilize domestic populations against a common enemy (almost always concocted and surely always embellished, in those cases when the enemies are real enough without constituting as serious a threat as elites would like us to believe[2]), thereby enabling elites to craftily sustain the structural interests of power and privilege with which they have long been allied. This practice has been honed to a fine art in the contemporary period. Crucially and consequentially, this is always done by tearing the purported enemies from their historical, cultural, and political contexts and placing them within ideological systems supporting Western belligerence and fraud, so that ethical concerns among Western populations may not be activated, and so that the purported enemies are perceived as not quite fully human at best and as the very personification of evil at worst. To accept matter-of-factly the official, propagandistic line spewed out by power centers regarding the supposed enemies of the West (or any other issue for that matter) is not only dangerous, but could very well have absolutely devastating consequences in the not-too-distant future, since the threats that Western elite programs pose to humanity cannot be exaggerated. One such threat is that states have acquired the capacity to obliterate humanity, a capacity that they will exercise, sooner or later, if the current social order evolves along its present paths (that's inherent in the perverted logic of the system, since it's profoundly anti-human, particularly in relation to the Third World). In point of fact, the most ominous threat is the militarization of space (outlawed by international law), which is being accelerated jointly by the US, Western Europe, Israel and Japan under the cover of 9/11.[3] The type of weapons in question are laser weapons, probably nuclear-powered, which will be on hair-trigger alert and be used, without forewarning, against countries that refuse to obey or misunderstand Western orders. In other words, these weapons will be used to force Third World countries to provide unfettered access to cheap energy supplies, raw materials, key markets and cheap labor, but also to threaten countries that might entertain the idea of breaking ideological ties with Western elites, by striking an independent course.[4]

It is still not too late for constructive action by those who are interested in survival, but the time to act is *now*, and the need of the hour is much more than just dissent, it is denazification. Case in point: putting aside the outrageously criminal fact that Hitler and his war machine were propped up and supported by a clique of US industrialists to begin with,[5] there was "a massive recruitment of Nazi war criminals [by the CIA] at the war's end,"[6] in order to adopt Nazi counterinsurgency programs: doublespeak for 'international terrorism,' in the true sense of the expression. This fact is highly relevant for understanding international affairs, and bears quite a lot on how and why enemy images are constructed the way they are in the West. The point is that in politics there are no permanent friends or permanent enemies; there is only permanent power lust and greed. To illustrate, let's take the "war on terror." What are the criteria for this so-called war? Is it really identifying the perpetrators and holding them accountable? Certainly not. If that were the case, the US would have followed Nicaragua's honorable example

and taken its case to the ICJ and UNSC (as Nicaragua did in 1986 after the US-directed terror war through the contras that left the country utterly devastated, perhaps beyond recovery, all in the name of fighting a “war against terror,” with over 20,000 innocent civilians slaughtered and many more displaced, traumatized and driven to the razor edge of survival, in Nicaragua alone, simply because the revolutionary Sandinista government had instituted meaningful social and agrarian reforms in the service of the poor majority, with very impressive results), since retaliation is outlawed by international law. So what are the criteria? The criteria are subordination and service to power, which makes a lot of sense, because those who have power are interested in one thing alone: *more* power, for which purpose the skillful manipulation of fear becomes an indispensable political instrument for holding on to power, since power is very fragile, due to its illegitimate nature. To construe the fetish of elections as democracy is a grave mistake, since the few people who do vote do not even know what they are voting for.[7] Their consent is manufactured, in accordance with the diktats of *realpolitik*. So, dare we challenge and disprove Walter Lippmann’s (“The manufacture of consent was supposed to have died out with the appearance of democracy. But died out it has not... Under the impact of propaganda, it is no longer possible to believe in the original dogma of democracy”), Edward Bernays’s (“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country... [C]learly it is the intelligent minorities which need to make use of propaganda continuously and systematically...”), and Harold Lasswell’s (“More can be won by illusion than by coercion... Democracy has proclaimed the dictatorship of [debate], and the technique of dictating is named propaganda... We must not succumb to democratic dogmatisms about people being the best judges of their own interests”) deeply anti-human and amoral contributions, to mention just a handful of skillful manipulators? Given the fact that the stakes so far as information inequality and its attendant, ever-widening and ever-deepening social decay among the vast majority of the world’s population are concerned simply cannot be exaggerated, the answer to this question will surely determine the fate of the human race, probably sooner than later, since subjecting humanity to the dictatorship of capital cannot lead to any other outcome but a cataclysmic one, given the fact that *virtually* a hundred percent of our enemies are chimeras. But the greatest irony about fabricating enemies is what’s called ‘self-fulfilling prophesy,’ meaning in due time the fabrications can become real enough. Case in point: the 9/11 nightmare was a legacy and debris of the Cold War, during which time the most fanatical killers were recruited, armed, trained and financed by the CIA and its allies, to drive the Russians out of Afghanistan, a fact duly noted by Peter Hervik.[8] Indeed, as one would expect, “...the whole history of terrorism has a pedigree in the policies of imperialists.”[9]

In sum, the extent to which denazification is allowed and *encouraged* in Western industrial economies will also determine the extent to which Western elites are seriously committed to their idealistic slogans: ‘freedom,’ ‘democracy,’ and ‘human rights.’ Equally important, the Manichean worldview sold to us by our insecure and immature leaders should be challenged seriously if there’s going to be a chance of survival, because the struggle of Good against Evil squeezes out the real debates necessary for a vigorous democracy, the end result of which can only be disastrous, as if the century behind us wasn’t horrible enough, one soaked in blood and untold human suffering (largely as a result of unprovoked terror and aggression by Western powers and their clients), but one that’s very likely to fade into comparison given the

ominous prospects that we face as a species. It should be our primary task not only to fight all forms of racism (so that Western leaders can no longer implicitly insist “on reserving the right to bomb niggers,”[10] which has always been the bottom line in North-South relations), but to create strong bonds of solidarity across the board, so that this profoundly anti-human system that’s oppressing *all of us*, ‘Blacks’ and ‘Whites’ alike, can be dissolved, even if the degree of oppression is obviously not the same for the two groups.

In this work, many compelling reasons have been given to justify the need for challenging and trying to undermine military-based state capitalism and the world system it mercilessly exploits and dominates. Power being inherently corrupting, it’s highly incumbent upon us to stop letting ourselves be mobilized by the traditional and well-practiced device of fear, to stop granting authority to centers of power as a result of induced fear. Suffice it to say that the worst enemy of all is not the “other” but the insecure and immature part of the *self*, the part that’s filled with fears of powerlessness.

Endnotes

Introduction

[1] Which, as Hippler and Lueg point out in “The Next Threat,” is the prerequisite for serious critique (p. 2).

[2] The phrase “fundamentalist religious zealotry...is a code word for a particular form of ‘radical nationalism’ that threatens ‘stability.’ And we have to understand ‘stability’ to mean maintenance of specific forms of domination and control, and easy access to resources and profits.” (Noam Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle*, MA: SEP, 1999, p. xiii.)

[3] I say ‘self-appointed leaders,’ because the ballot box is not about whether or not people want to be ruled but who will rule over them. So basically it’s a sham, since consent is manufactured, as we’ll see below.

Chapter 2

[1] In Clinton Rossiter and James Lare (eds.), *The Essential Lippmann: A Political Philosophy for Liberal Democracy*, Harvard University Press, 1963, p. 465.

[2] *New African*, December 2005, No 446, pp. 52, 55.

[3] “The core of this new racism is the shift of rhetoric from ‘race’ to a focus on ‘culture’ – first uttered by the political right but now used widely on the political spectrum. Rather than metaphorically extending ‘biological’ markers to the intellectual and moral capacity, the ideologies of the new racism deny this view and unfold its rhetoric in terms of ‘culture’ and ‘the national order of things’ (Malkii 1992). People of diverse cultural backgrounds are explicitly acknowledged as being of equal worth. The world is divided into national territories to which ‘cultures’ belong ‘naturally.’ If members of a certain ‘culture’ are found outside its ‘natural’ place, the relations between native and newcomers (locals and migrants or refugees) will be antagonistic. Racist discrimination is increasingly justified by means of exclusive cultural differences.” (Hervik, “Anthropological Perspectives on the New Racism in Europe, p. 151; see also his *The Danish Cultural World of Unbridgeable Differences*,” p. 263, where he acknowledges the fact that subtle forms of discrimination are still racist, as does Andre Gingrich in “Concepts of Race Vanishing,” p. 174)

[4] ...which is not as brazen and discernible to the uncritical eye, hence less susceptible to public denunciation by culturally sensitive citizens or otherwise conscientious objectors, whether actual or potential.

[5] See note 15 in chapter 3 of this work.

[6] Case in point: “between them, Europe and the US account for by far the largest number of violent deaths during the 20th century, the Islamic world hardly a fraction of it” (Edward Said, “The Meaning of Rachel Corrie”) In brief, the institutional dynamics of the West can be summarized in geo-strategic terms on the grounds that the so-called capitalist system cannot survive except through force and fraud. Case in point: “Because a capitalist society cannot change, in its dealings with the underdeveloped countries it can only dominate and exploit. It cannot emancipate and help.” (Rossiter and Lare, op. cit., p. 81) Philip Agee, a former CIA case officer, has expressed a similar fact: “American capitalism, based as it is on exploitation of the poor, with its fundamental motivation in personal greed, simply cannot survive without force – without a secret police force... Increasingly, the impoverished masses are understanding that the prosperity of the developed countries and of the privileged minorities in their own countries is founded on their poverty.” (*Inside the Company: A CIA Diary*, Penguin Books, 1975, pp. 595, 96.) Ergo “it is the structure of Western society and the rules of power in it that create poverty” (Danaher, *Ten Reasons to Abolish the IMF and WB*, NY: Seven Stories, 2001, pp. 17-18), a fact that Huntington conveniently glosses over.

[7] See note 8 in *ibid*.

[8] This was Berlusconi’s idiotic declaration shortly after 9/11. What he, Huntington and others silently pass over is that historically “the West drew on the humanism, science, philosophy, sociology and historiography of Islam, which had already interposed itself between Charlemagne’s world and classical antiquity. Islam is inside from the start, as even Dante, great enemy of Mohammed, had to concede when he placed the Prophet at the very heart of his *Inferno*.” (Edward Said, “The Clash of Ignorance”) It’s true that Islamic countries have lagged behind in many ways in the contemporary period, but this observation shouldn’t be de-contextualized, since the US and UK have a *great* deal to do with Islamic countries’ industrial and social backwardness.

[9] When I say ‘crucially by excluding the majority of Muslims,’ I mean that only those who are demonstrably guilty of terrorism and crimes should be condemned with terrorism and crimes. This should be an obvious truism, but it’s barely recognized as such by many media pundits in the West. Case in point: “...enemy images of Muslims do not distinguish between the individual Muslims behind [...] condemnable

incidents and Muslims in general. On the contrary, they tend to link all such actions with Islam and create oversimplified cause and effect models based on prejudice.” (Ottosen, 1995: 98)

[10] Charles Knight, Project on Defense Alternatives, panel presentation at the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 14 June 2000, on “U.S. Military-Strategic Ambitions: Expanding to Fill the post-Soviet Vacuum.” The reason security is at most a marginal concern of security planners is that it is highly irrational in the scale of operative values for elite interests, since it doesn’t contribute to power and profit.

[11] Chomsky and Herman, “After the Cataclysm.”

[12] If it does, that’s not democracy but a *crisis of democracy* in proper technical usage, a threat that has to be overcome in one or another way: in the Third World, by death squads – at home, by more subtle and indirect means, through propaganda and the fabrication of enemies and the ensuing fear in the masses, which all provide a Keynesian stimulus to the economy, thereby forcing the public to subsidize high tech R & D (since people will not only give up their most basic rights but even support the most reactionary and oppressive programs when they are properly frightened), in order to protect and advance private power interests under the wings of the nanny state (so much for free enterprise!).

[13] One last illustration (for this chapter) of how dishonest Western leaders are: In contemporary cultural racism, the so-called original or national culture is said to be of paramount importance, the values that are ostensibly cherished being democracy, the low level of conflict, honesty, loyalty, equality, tolerance and the welfare state. First, it’s not possible to talk seriously about democracy as long as there’s private control over the economic system (John Dewey) Internally, yes, the level of conflict so far as direct violence is concerned is low, even if structural violence is rather high in the West (as Johan Galtung has compellingly demonstrated in his “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” 1969). Honesty? Fat chance! Loyalty? To elite interests, surely, but certainly not to the national interest, broadly and seriously defined. Equality? Western societies have always been extremely hierarchical, not based on meritocracy but on racial and cultural supremacist notions and class power (case in point: “in practice [local Gruvbo people] experience the workings of inequality and differences in terms of class, political power and local belonging... the social good is not evenly, or fairly, distributed between different categories of persons. Belonging and equality are scarce resources.” Karin Norman, “Equality and Exclusion,” 2004: 224, 225). Tolerance? Certainly not towards ethnic minorities, and hardly so towards sexual minorities, who experience discrimination and direct violence often enough. Welfare state? For the rich, certainly, since virtually every dynamic component of high tech industry relies on public subsidy. Welfare state for the poor and defenseless? In the past, yes, to a degree, but the neoliberal project demands that the state significantly cuts back on social spending while expanding military budgets and maximizing power and profit for the private sector.

[14] Erich Fromm proposed that not just individuals, but entire societies “may be lacking in sanity.” He argued that one of the most deceptive features of social life involves “consensual validation.” “It is naively assumed that the fact that the majority of people share certain ideas or feelings proves the validity of these ideas and feelings. Nothing is further from the truth... Just as there is a ‘folie a deux’ there is a ‘folie a millions.’ The fact that millions of people share the same vices does not make these vices virtues, the fact that they share so many errors does not make the errors to be truths, and the fact that millions of people share the same form of mental pathology does not make these people sane.” (*The Sane Society*, Routledge, 1955, pp. 14-15). He concluded that modern Western society was indeed insane and that this insanity threatens the survival of the species.

[15] E.g., it’s no secret that in the US “Christian demagogues...fan the flames of race and sectarian hatred on television and, illegally, pour church money into political campaigns,” (Gore Vidal, *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, Forest Row: Clairview, 2002, p. 60), a phenomenon that should cause alarm among conscientious people who care about freedom and democracy, at home and abroad, because it is Christian fundamentalists who provide the ultra-right with the rationale for punishing evil and condemning whole populations to submission and poverty in the 3rd World, claiming to do God’s will and to fight his battles in his name, indeed, a pervasive force in the world (see note16), the leaders of which contribute in no small measure to the concoction of enemies, while feasting and fattening on the misfortunes of ordinary folks.

[16] As Edward Said has noted, at 60 million strong, they represent the single most powerful voting block in US history. Surely, religious fundamentalism in the US compares with that of certain West and Central Asian states, including Iran, Saudi Arabia and the toppled Taliban regime in Afghanistan (the latter being an offshoot of the former), that is, culture-wise, since the separation between state and church seems to be intact in the US, despite the comical insanity of “under God.” To make matters worse, the Christian coalition in the US is among the two or three strongest special interest groups and lobbyists, which partly explains why US fundamentalism is so powerful, so much so that every politician pretends to be a fervent religious whatever. To

state the obvious and elemental, none of these facts bode well for human rights and freedom. But none of this should be construed to mean that the criterion for the “war against terror” is religion; it is not. The criteria are subordination and service to power. That is why the re-declared “war on terrorism” (which is over 20 years old) is sacrosanct, because it has so far yielded significant ideological, sociopolitical and economic benefits, primarily for the US (but, contrary to the fringe views in the White House, it won’t do so for much longer, since we are living close to if not within the margins); because it is a violent perpetuation of neo-colonialism under the deceitful guise of “Holy Justice”: another testimony to “the sacralization of war” (i.e., the merger of militarism and the Church), which is nothing new; it dates back to the Old Testament era and is alive and well even today, readily and effectively applied by the major powers whenever they desperately seek to justify self-serving fraud. Therefore, we should strongly resent and condemn the alacrity with which the West tries to rationalize and prettify its cowardly monstrosities. In any event, if the West is genuinely concerned with mitigating religious fanaticism in all its ugly forms, at home and abroad, then the way to go about it is to raise the level of hope at home and abroad, by seeing to it that prevailing anti-human (cultural and institutional) structures are replaced with viable, libertarian structures that meet human needs through socially desirable means and ends, on an egalitarian basis, based on inalienable rights for all, without distinctions as to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, class, religion, creed, or other social-ideological constructs.

In regard to militant Islamic terrorism (which in reality is not religiously motivated), we do well to bear in mind that “Terrorism is the logical consequence of American and British “foreign policy” whose infinitely greater terrorism we need to recognize, and debate, as a matter of urgency.” (John Pilger, “The Rise of the Democratic Police State”; see note 17). No less crucially, the former heads of Israeli military intelligence, Shin Beth, have said: “until you treat the Palestinians with respect, until you grant them their elementary rights, you’re never going to stop terrorism. That’s the way to do it – they have grievances, the grievances are real, we’re treating them with contempt and humiliation and destruction, we’re stealing their land and resources.” (Chomsky, “Civilization versus Barbarism?” See note 18) In brief, “Violence is a powerful instrument of control, as history demonstrates. But the dilemmas of dominance are not slight.” (Chomsky, “Dominance and its Dilemmas”) And our apathy certainly compounds this dilemma (see note 19).

[17] Pilger cites the extensive study of Robert Pape of the University of Chicago, which reveals that most suicide bombers are not mainly driven by “an evil ideology independent of other circumstances,” since “Half of them are not religious fanatics at all,” and, “In fact, over 95 per cent of suicide attacks around the world [are not about] religion, but a specific strategic purpose – to compel the US and other western countries to abandon military commitments on the Arabian Peninsula and in the countries they view as their homeland or prize greatly.” To gain valuable insight into some crucial aspects of Islamic fundamentalism and the way political Islam is misinterpreted as religious fundamentalism in the West, see Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim, America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror*.

[18] The situation is not substantially different when we turn to Afghanistan and Iraq, since both invasions (which were *unauthorized* by the UNSC) had a lot to do with the long-standing goal of controlling Central Asia and Iraq’s large energy supplies. For details, see Pilger, *The New Rulers of the World*, pp. 111-13; and Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival*, chapter 5.

[19] Of course, the shrewd can always argue, “Yes, but each component in the imperial system is merely acting in accordance with “Rational Choice Theory,” based on Stanley Milgram’s (specious) behavior study of obedience for example, due to the overbearing bureaucratic structure that demands obedience and conformity from all the active and passive individuals or members who, in one way or another, knowingly or unknowingly, constitute and serve the imperial system!” Well, international law has something to say about this: “Individuals have international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience... Therefore [individual citizens] have the duty to violate domestic laws to prevent crimes against peace and humanity from occurring” – Nuremberg War Crime Tribunal, 1950.

Chapter 3

[1] *The Prince*, London: Penguin Books, 1999, p. 67.

[2] Space does not allow me to pursue this matter. For an article that provides crucial insights into this question, see Anuradha Vittachi, “Roots of discrimination.” For an exhaustive treatment of this question, see Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*; Estelle Welldon, *Sadomasochism*; as well as Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* and *The Heart of Man*. In the former at least, Fromm presents very compelling facts and arguments to support his hypothesis that human destructiveness is neither innate nor

purposeless (in sharp contrast to Konrad Lorenz's faulty premises), but has a lot to do with shared interests among oligarchs or military plutocrats; and that human destructiveness is instrumental.

[3] Mike Ferner, "Why War? War, Incorporated."

[4] Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, London: HarperCollins, 2000, p. 464.

[5] In reality, what's called 'free-market' is a euphemism for industrial feudalism and economic colonialism.

[6] Edward Said and Christopher Hitchens (eds.), *Blaming the Victims*, pp. 136-37. To verify the seemingly outlandish claim that the US is a leading terrorist state, as are many of the countries that eagerly joined the re-declared "war on terror," see Chomsky, 9-11, and sources cited in the bibliography. Needless to say, the number of victims from direct assaults by Western powers and their clients is colossal, well into the tens of millions since 1945 alone, and this has everything to do with geo-strategic imperatives, meaning uninhibited access to strategic energy supplies, raw materials, key markets, and cheap labor, courtesy of corporate West. In this the IMF and WB play a crucial role, because the loans that they offer to underdeveloped countries have utterly destructive conditionalities attached to them, through what are called structural adjustment programs (SAPs). These invariably have the following elements: (1) "radically reduce government spending on health, education and welfare; (2) privatize and deregulate state enterprise; (3) devalue the currency; (4) liberalize imports and remove restrictions on foreign investment; and (5) cut or constrain wages and eliminate or weaken mechanisms protecting labor." (Kevin Danaher, *10 Reasons to Abolish the IMF and World Bank*, p. 11) Those countries that reasonably and honestly refuse to come under the sway of IMF's SAPs are punished severely with unilateral (meaning illegal) economic and trade sanctions by the US, Cuba and Nicaragua being the most obvious examples, but by no means the only ones. To verify the claim about sanctions, see Someshwar Singh, "Half The World Hit by US Unilateral Sanctions, Third World Economics" (Jan. 16-31, 2000.) See also Mark Sommers, "Sanctions are Becoming 'Weapon of Choice' " *CSM*, Aug. 3, 1993.

[7] Perhaps the following explanation can help us to resist the temptation to demonize Western elites: "Our economy is set on a wartime footing... We need wars. Without wars, the economy flakes and falls apart. Without wars, the trillions of dollars spent on weapons systems, military preparedness and a planetary army would dry up, dealing a deathblow to the economy as currently constituted. Without wars or the threat of wars, the populace is not so easily controlled and manipulated... The "we" I speak of is that overwhelmingly wealthy and powerful few who have wired their fortunes into the manufacture of weapons, the plumbing of oil, and the collection of spoils through political largesse. These are the people who need war. They need it to pile up the contracts from the Pentagon, to enrich the banking institutions that protect them, to pay the lawyers who defend them, to pay the lobbyists who sustain them, to purchase the politicians who champion them, and to buy up the media that hides them from sight... The economic need for war creates the required excuses for war... We build enemies with arms and money, and then we destroy them with arms and money, thus keeping our wartime economy afloat..." (William Rivers Pitt, "The Things We Don't Talk About")

[8] To quote from the Study Group of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and the National Planning Association, the primary threat of communism was described as the economic transformation of the communist powers "in ways which reduce their willingness and ability to complement the industrial economies of the West" (William Elliot, *The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy*, p. 42), "their refusal to play the game of comparative advantage and to rely primarily on foreign investment for development. If the 'developing nations' choose to use their resources for their own purposes, or to carry out internal social change in ways which will reduce their contribution to the industrial economies of the state capitalist world, these powers must be prepared to employ sufficient force to prevent such unreasonable behavior, which will no doubt be described as 'internal aggression' by agents of international communism." (Chomsky, "The Pentagon Papers and U.S. Imperialism in South East Asia") To verify the claim about the fraudulent missile gap, in the sense that it was claimed by many in the US that the Soviet Union was the one with the upper hand, see Raymond Garthoff, *Journeys through the Cold War*, Daniel Ellsberg, *Secrets* (Ellsberg was one of the high-level analysts who discovered the facts in 1960-61 by satellite imaging and that the actual ratio was 10-1 in favor of the US, demonstrating that Eisenhower was correct in his assertions, including his final State of the Union address, that the missile gap was a myth), and McGeorge Bundy, *Danger and Security*. In brief, "the Cold War provided the perfect excuse for Western governments to plunder and exploit the South in the name of freedom; to rig its elections, bribe its politicians, appoint its tyrants and, by every sophisticated means of persuasion and interference, stunt the emergence of young democracies in the name of democracy." (John le Carré, *The Nation magazine*, April 9, 2001, p.11) On the domestic front, the Cold War helped the Soviet Union entrench its military-bureaucratic ruling class in power, and it gave the US a way to compel its population to subsidize high-tech industry. It isn't easy to sell all that to the domestic

populations. The technique used was the old stand-by-fear of a great enemy.” (Chomsky, “How the Cold War Worked,” in *What Uncle Sam Really Wants*)

[9] “The term “permanent war economy” is attributed to Charles Wilson, CEO of General Electric, who warned at the end of WWII that the US must not return to a civilian economy, but must keep to a ‘permanent war economy’ of the kind that was so successful during the war; a semi-command economy, run mostly by corporate executives, geared to military production...” (Chomsky, “The Savage Extreme of a Narrow Policy Spectrum.” The link for this interview is given in the bibliography, which the reader is urged to check out for important details)

[10] This despite the fact that the US government is the biggest drug runner in the world. Actually, virtually the whole establishment pushes dope, including Bush Senior (at least in the past), the DEA and CIA, for whom drugs have long been a currency, just as they have been for Delta Force raids, US banks (including Wall Street and the IMF) and chemical companies. In brief, the drug war is causing more harm than drug abuse itself, except of course tobacco, which causes 400,000 deaths every year in the US, for example, and among Chinese children under 20 today, 50 million will die of cigarette-related diseases, courtesy of the US, whereas in 1997 a record 16,000 people succumbed to drug-related deaths in the US, that is, to hard drugs. (to verify this claim, see Chomsky, *Rogue States*, London: Pluto Press, 2000, pp. 80, 150-51). For a comprehensive account of CIA involvement in drug trafficking from Latin America to Southeast Asia to Afghanistan, from the 1950s up to at least the 1980s, see Alfred W. McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade*, NY: 1991, reprinted in 2003 (this is the major source on the CIA’s post-war reconstruction of the Mafia by the US as part of its campaign to destroy the European labor movement). Alexander Cockburn & Jeffrey St. Clair (eds.), *Whiteout: The CIA, Drugs and the Press*, London & NY: 1998 Peter Scott & J. Marshall, *Cocaine Politics: Drugs, Armies, and the CIA in Central America*, University of California Press, 1991; and sources cited in these works.

[11] Ottosen refers to Sam Keen’s analytical categorization of enemy images within certain archetypes, applying it to Saddam Hussein, per Western portrayals of him: “the enemy as a criminal,’ ‘the enemy as a torturer,’ ‘the enemy as death,’ ‘the enemy as rapist, desecrator of women and children’ and ‘the enemy as enemy of God’ (Ottosen, 1995:99). *Crucially with our support*, is the part that’s typically left out from Western political discourse, but one that Ottosen, much to his credit, does not leave out (ibid, p. 109-110), even if he understates the fact by saying “Ceausescu and Saddam [...] both were used by the Western world in a period when they were useful as allies in a bigger strategic game, even when their lack of respect for human rights was evident at that time as well.” (Ibid.) If he were very honest, he would have said explicitly: “...their gross, systematic violations of human rights and horrific crimes, which we happily supported because they were obedient.”

Regarding the Gulf crisis in 1991 (which is when Saddam turned into an enemy), it bears mention that “the whole dispute started because Kuwait was slant-drilling... It was pumping out some \$14-billion worth of oil from underneath Iraqi territory. Even the territory they were drilling *from* had originally been Iraq’s. Slant-drilling is enough to get you shot in Texas, and it’s certainly enough to start a war in the Mideast... It’s hard to *avoid* a war when what you’re doing is trying to *provoke* a war.” (Mark Zepezauer, *The CIA’s Greatest Hits*, p. 84) To make matters worse, there’s credible evidence that the US encouraged Saddam to invade Kuwait, before which all offers for withdrawal and a diplomatic settlement by Saddam were instantly and unqualifiedly rejected by the US. To verify the former claim, see Philip Agee, www.addictedtowar.com/agee.htm. To verify the latter claim, see Chomsky, *Powers and Prospects*, pp. 213-14.

[12] Parts of the facts and observations in this paragraph are an adaptation from “Vital Speeches of the Day: A Message From Noam Chomsky,” available at http://photoftp.universitet.us/docs/Noam_Chomsky.pdf

[13] Eduardo Galenano, “The Theatre of Good and Evil,” in Roger Burback and Ben Clarke (eds.), *September 11 and the U.S. War*, SF: City Lights, 2002, p. 9. Even Mandela was branded a terrorist when he fought against the Apartheid system in South Africa, which had full support from the UK, Israel and the US. When the system was finally brought down, Mandela was hailed as a hero in the West. As the saying goes: “One man’s freedom fighter is another man’s terrorist,” and vice versa. In point of fact, if you look at US counterinsurgency programs, they “drew quite explicitly from the Nazi model, which was treated with respect: Wehrmacht officers were consulted and their manuals were used in designing postwar counterinsurgency programs worldwide, typically called ‘counter-terrorism...’ Given these conventions, even the very same people and actions can quickly shift from “terrorists” to “freedom fighters” and back again.” (Chomsky, *9-11*, pp. 90-1) Ottosen expresses a similar thought (p. 104), where he says, “It is remarkable how quickly the image of Ceausescu in the Western world changed from ‘the favourite member of the Warsaw Pact’ to ‘Satan,’ ‘Dracula’ and ‘Hitler.’ For years Ceausescu enjoyed favourable loan and trading conditions, cultural exchange,

etc., with the USA and EC as well as other Western countries. The Norwegian government even awarded Ceausescu the order of St. Olav for honorable service to the ‘fatherland and mankind,’ despite his horrible human rights record. Ottosen goes on to say (p.109): “...the image of the enemy changed according to historical developments, and ... the image of the friend can change accordingly. Basically, you are not judged by your acts, but according to your place in the friend/enemy picture. Acts that the media accept or ignore when ‘friends’ are concerned are condemned when the ‘enemy’ is involved.” He concludes by saying that the “way...the personified enemy image influence the journalistic process” should be understood as “a scapegoat effect,” referring to Ceausescu, Khomeini and Saddam Hussein. To his credit, Ottosen also brings to surface “the hypocrisy of these enemy images [being] evident in the case of Ceausescu and Saddam Hussein since both were used by the Western world in a period when they were useful allies in a bigger strategic game, even when their lack of respect for human rights was evident at that time as well.” (Ottosen, 1995: 109-10) The implication is clear: *crimes are not of great consequence for the West, disobedience is!*

Finally, Ottosen suggests that enemy images, in light of the journalistic shortcomings emanating from ideological blunders, “weaken critical thinking among journalists in respect of choice of sources and in drawing conclusions too hastily” (Ottosen, 1995: 103), thereby surely causing elite biases to spill over onto the public mind, which in turn allows elites to manufacture consent for their radically anti-democratic programs.

[14] The fact that they do resort to such dishonest tactics is a strong indication, if not proof, that states are illegitimate structures. For example, Tambian duly points out that “Herder denounced every form of centralization of political power and the coercion and violence that went with it. ‘Nature’ creates nations, not states, and the basis of the state is conquest.” (Tambian, “The Nation-State in Crisis,” p. 133) Charles Tilly, too, made a similar observation in his classic *Coercion, Capital, and European States: “War Made States, and Vice Versa.”* The whole history of the pre- and post-nation-state system is one of force and fraud, of extreme violence and bloodshed. The nation-state system is pretty much a European invention. It was established by force, through centuries of extremely bloody warfare; and was later imposed on the rest of the world by extreme force. If it is necessarily the natural form of human or social organization, if it is an organic entity which is *vindicated by the laws of nature*, why so much terror and bloodshed? “This question has to be faced squarely, because any structure of hierarchy and authority carries a heavy burden of justification... If it cannot bear that burden—sometimes it can—then it is illegitimate and should be dismantled. When honestly posed and squarely faced, that challenge can rarely be sustained.” (Chomsky, *Powers and Prospects*, p. 73.)

[15] Since my theoretical model has already been empirically tested in preceding pages and in different contexts, this subchapter will expose and criticize only the most blatant and/or insidious cases of cultural racist diatribes by the Boss Man from Crawford, Texas. (The parts of the speeches that are boldfaced are the ones that are underpinned by cultural racist discourse or simply blatant cases of lies and hypocrisy. My comments are in italics) The Speech used here is from September 20, 2001, and can be found at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>

[16] Of course, the detailed evidence that the US is a leading terrorist state cannot be documented here, due to lack of space. So just a few words: The US is the only country in the world that was condemned for international terrorism by the World Court at the Hague, in 1986, for the proxy terror war through the Contras that left about 20,000 *innocent, unarmed* civilians slaughtered and many more displaced, traumatized and driven to the razor edge of survival (and that’s *just* in Nicaragua. The total death toll in Central America is about 200,000 in the 80s alone). Not surprisingly, when the ICJ ordered the US to immediately desist and pay substantial reparations to the country, the US reacted with *utter contempt*, even *escalating* the terror war against Nicaragua, which has still not recovered and may never do so.

[17] Case in point: “the primary task of the state is to protect the minority of the opulent against the majority.” (James Madison). Winton Churchill, too, has been kind enough to confirm this fact, albeit more descriptively, in a paper submitted to his Cabinet colleagues in January 1914, in which he observed: “we are not a young people with an *innocent record* and a scanty inheritance. We have engrossed to ourselves . . . an *altogether disproportionate* share of the wealth and traffic of the world. We have got all we want in territory, and our claim to be left in the unmolested enjoyment of vast and splendid possessions, *mainly acquired by violence, largely maintained by force*, often seems less reasonable to others than to us.” (Clive Pointing, *Churchill*, p. 132. The italicized phrases are Churchill’s own!) A more contemporary example of the ferocity of the anti-democratic thrust among Western elites: “Modern events have sharply reminded us that distribution depends on myth and violence (on faith and brigandage) as well as bargaining.” (Harold Lasswell, *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*, p. 8.) Another highly influential policymaker, George Kennan (whose view is from the *dovish, liberal, humane* end of the spectrum), who was the head of the State Department policy planning staff in the 1940s, responsible for shaping policy for the post-war period, outlined his basic thinking

in a document titled *PPS23* (a Top Secret Document from 1948): “We have about 50 percent of the world’s wealth, but only 6.3 percent of its population... In this situation, we cannot fail to be the object of envy and resentment. Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity... . We need not deceive ourselves that we can afford today the luxury of altruism and world-benefaction... . We should cease to talk about vague and ... unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of the living standards, and democratization. The day is not far off when we are going to have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealistic slogans, the better.” Of course, the idealistic slogans have to be constantly trumpeted by the ideological system: the media, scholarship, the schools, etc., in order to pacify the domestic population. For more (mainstream) evidence of contempt for democracy among elites, see Crozier, Huntington and Watanuki, *The Crisis of Democracy*; Edward Bernays, *Propaganda*; and William Elliot, *The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy*.

[18] To verify these claims, see Chalmers Johnson, *Sorrows of Empire*; William Blum, *Killing Hope* and *Rogue State*; Michael Mandel, *How America Gets Away with Murder*; Edward Herman, *Real Terror Network*; and Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival*.

[19] The best work on Al-Qaeda is Jason Burke, *Al-Qaeda: Casting a Shadow of Terror*. When it comes to the claim that the U.S, too, supported the Taliban, see Arundhati Roy, “War is Peace,” in Roger Burbach and Ben Clarke, *September 11 and the U.S. War*, City Lights, 2002, pp. 101-10. An excerpt (p. 107): “For some years now, an American oil giant called Unocal has been negotiating with the Taliban for permission to construct an oil pipeline through Afghanistan to Pakistan and out to the Arabian Sea. From here, Unocal hopes to access the lucrative “emerging markets” in South and Southeast Asia. In December 1997, a delegation of Taliban mullahs traveled to America and even met U.S. State Department officials and Unocal executives in Houston.” The facts in this quote bear very significantly on the policies of the current incumbents in Washington, since the most influential and hawkish figures are mostly recycled Reaganites.

[20] To verify this claim, see Robert Pear, “Arming Afghan Guerillas: A Huge Effort Led by U.S.,” *New York Times*, April 18, 1988, p. A1. See also Steve Coll, “Anatomy of a Victory: CIA’s Covert Afghan War,” *Washington Post*, July 19, 1992, p. A1. Steve Coll, in “CIA’s Covert Afghan War, Where to Draw the Line Was Key,” *Washington Post*, July 20, 1992, p. A1. Tim Weiner, “Blowback From the Afghan Battlefield,” *New York Times Magazine*, March 13, 1994, p. 6: 53; and Ahmed Rashid, “The Making of a Terrorist,” *Straits Times* (Singapore), September 23, 2001, p. 26.

[21] According to the UN, 7.5 million run a risk of starving to death during the course of the winter in 2001/2002. To make matters worse, Pakistan was ordered by the US to close off its borders to the millions of Afghan refugees who were fleeing for their lives. Moreover, relief agencies (the only life line for the refugees) were ordered to evacuate the country and Pakistan was ordered to interrupt all relief programs along its borders. To verify these claim, see UN documents and reports summarized in Center for Economic and Social Rights, “Afghanistan Fact Sheet 3: Key Human Vulnerabilities,” available at <http://www.cesr.org>. See also Chomsky, *9-11*, pp. 94-99.

[22] “When countries are attacked they try to defend themselves, if they can. According to the doctrine proposed [by the self-appointed enlightened leaders of the West], Nicaragua, S. Vietnam, Cuba, and numerous others should have been setting off bombs in Washington and other U.S. cities. Palestinians should be applauded for bombings in Tel Aviv, and on and on. It is because such doctrines had brought Europe to virtual self-annihilation after hundreds of years of savagery that the nations of the world forged a different compact after World War II, establishing—at least formally—the principle that the resort to force is barred except in the case of self-defense against armed attack until the Security Council acts to protect international peace and security. Specifically, retaliation is barred. Since the U.S. is not under armed attack, in the sense of Article 51 of the UN Charter, these considerations are irrelevant—at least, if we agree that the fundamental principles of international law should apply to ourselves, not only to those we dislike.” (Chomsky, *9-11*, p. 65-6)

[23] To verify this claim, see Chomsky, “How America Determines Friends and Foes.” See also Pilger, *The New Rulers of the World*, pp. 137-41.

[24] Chomsky, *9-11*, p. 31.

[25] This is important to point out because the Boss Man’s claim can be construed to imply that it is a general view. For a serious, honest and sober treatment of the Arab-Israeli conflict, see Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*; Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle*; Edward Said, *The End of the Peace Process*; Roane Carey, *The New Intifada*; and Tanya Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine: How to End the War of 1948*.

[26] For a comprehensive view of Britain’s real role in the world, including its support for terrorism, see Mark Curtis, *Web of Deceit*. There’s probably no other historian who has mined British foreign policy archives as devastatingly.

[27] Chomsky, “The Roots of Racism.”

[28] Chomsky, *9-11*, p. 69.

[29] Chomsky, “Resort to Fear.”

[30] Hippler and Lueg mention this fact in their *The Next Threat*, p. 3, in the quote by an Egyptian journalist (last sentence). But this should not be construed to mean that Jihadist terror is *necessarily* religiously motivated – it can be, but most of the time it isn’t, as we’ve seen Chapter 2, note 14, §2, and note 15 in the same chapter.

[31] Tambiah, “The Nation-State in Crisis,” pp. 126-7. Put more simply, the theory of enemy images should be understood in terms of the ‘out-group’ or the ‘other,’ those differing from the ‘in-group’ or the ‘us,’ in *insubstantial* ways, of course, since people in general have more commonalities than differences. So the dichotomization is often self-serving. But so far as the theory goes, the other side is perceived by the ‘in-group’ as embodying all the negative characteristics that one can expect enemies to embody (selfishness, stupidity, deceitfulness, hostility, aggressiveness, even evilness), while ‘we’ stand for everything that is virtuous. If or when the ‘we’ side *happens* to display vices, shortcomings, moral failings, etc., it is due to naivety, good intentions gone awry, honest mistakes, individual moral lapses and weaknesses, etc., rather than reflecting ‘our’ national culture or characteristic. The only way to solve the ‘inherent’ threat that ‘the other’ side poses is to eradicate it, since ‘Evil’ cannot be appeased—it is, after all, wrong and immoral to negotiate and compromise with ‘Evil,’ since the enemy is an “animal in human disguise” (Ottosen, 1995: 99).

Conclusion

[1] “The Theatre of Good and Evil,” in Burbuck and Clarke, op. cit.

[2] If the enemies do constitute a very serious threat, that’s not perceived as a problem for our leaders.

[3] For sober analyses of the ‘Star Wars II’ program, see Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance*, NY, 2003, chapters 6 & 9. Carl Boggs (ed.), *Masters of War: Militarism and Blowback in the Era of American Empire*, London & NY, 2003, chapter 3. For official government documents, see Air Force Space Command, *Strategic Master Plan FY04 and Beyond*, February 9, 2000, Executive Summary, www.thememoryhole.org/mil/space-command-plan-fy2004.pdf. US Space Command, *Vision for 2020*, http://www.middlepowers.org/gsi/docs/vision_2020.pdf. And Gordan Mitchell, “Japan-U.S. Missile Defense Collaboration: Rhetorically Delicious, Deceptively Dangerous,” *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol. 25:1 Winter 2001, www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/JapanTMD.pdf.

[4] According to self-serving American political theology, independent development is the mother of all evils. Lesson? In Paulo Freire’s words, “underdevelopment cannot be understood apart from the relationship of dependency.” (*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, NY: Penguin Books, 1972, p. 75)

[5] “A clique of U.S. industrialists is hell-bent to bring a fascist state to supplant our democratic government and is working closely with the fascist regime in Germany and Italy. I have had plenty of opportunity in my post in Berlin to witness how close some of our American ruling families are to the Nazi regime... Certain American industrialists had a great deal to do with bringing fascist regimes into being in both Germany and Italy. They extended aid to help Fascism occupy the seat of power, and they are helping to keep it there.” (William E. Dodd, U.S. Ambassador to Germany, 1937, quoted in George Seldes, *Facts and Fascism*, p. 122; as well as in Charles Higham, *Trading with the Enemy*, p. 167; this work documents the Bush family (that is, grandpa Prescott Bush’s) financial support for Hitler’s rise to power and the Nazi war machine). For more evidence of the unholy alliance between the West and Nazi Germany, see The National Security Archive; the link is provided in the Bibliography.

[6] Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry*, p. 73. For detailed evidence of this claim, see Chris Simpson, *Blowback* and Linda Hunt, *Secret Agenda*. These works reveal how over 1600 Nazi war criminals were brought to the US and strategically placed in military installations, universities and private corporations, aided by the Pope, the Vatican and various elements of the Catholic Church.

[7] It’s not without good reason that Gilbert K. Chesterton wrote (in 1926): “You may have secret diplomacy; you cannot have secret democracy. Democracy is dead without information. If the people are misinformed about the main facts, we cannot even say that they are voting wrong, but rather that they do not vote at all. At best they are voting about something else; something that does not exist. The old defenders of democracy never dreamed of defending this sort of democracy. They assumed that public affairs would be public.” (Quoted in Geoff Price, “This War Is About So Much More”) So Montesquieu’s advocacy of the separation of the legislative, executive and judiciary, the traditional English belief in checks and balances, have

not contributed to substantive democracy, only to democratic forms, which are basically meaningless in the long run.

[8] See his “Anthropological Perspectives on the New Racism in Europe,” p. 154.

[9] Said, *Culture and Resistance*, p. 89. Not only that, but much like the Cold War, the ‘war on terror’ is being used as a pretext for destroying independent development in much of the Third World, and for destroying the last vestiges of democracy in the West. In other words, the Orwellian term ‘war on terrorism’ “...is the long-sought-after replacement for the ‘red scare,’ justifying a permanent war footing and paranoia.” (Pilger, *The New Rulers of the World*, p. 10)

[10] Statement by British Prime Minister Lloyd George in 1932, cited in V.G. Kiernan, *European empires from conquest to collapse, 1815-1960*, p. 200. The “niggers” George was referring to were Iraqis, whom England was then bombing with regular munitions as well as poison gas. Case in point: “I do not understand this squeamishness about the use of gas. We have definitely adopted the position at the Peace Conference of arguing in favour of the retention of gas a permanent method of warfare. It is sheer affectation to lacerate a man with the poisonous fragment of a bursting shell and to boggle at making his eyes water by means of lachrymatory gas. I am strongly in favour of using gas against uncivilized tribes. The moral effect should be so good that the loss of life should be reduced to a minimum. It is not necessary to use only the most deadly gasses: gasses can be used which cause great inconvenience and would spread a lively terror and yet would leave no serious permanent effects on most of those affected.” (Winston Churchill, 1919, at the time secretary of defense; statement lifted from “Winston Churchill’s Secret Poison Gas Memo”)

Bibliography

Books

- Agee, Philip, *Inside the Company: A CIA Diary*, Penguin Books, 1975.
- Bernays, Edward, *Propaganda*, NY: Horace Liveright, 1928; reprinted 2004.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel and the Palestinians*, MA: South End Press, 1999.
- _____ *9-11*, NY: Seven Stories Press, 2001.
- _____ *Powers and Prospects: Reflections on Human Nature and the Social Order*, London: Pluto Press, 1986.
- _____ *Rogue States: the Rule of Force in World Affairs*, London: Pluto Press, 2000.
- Danaher, Kevin, *10 Reasons to Abolish the IMF and World Bank*, NY: Seven Stories, 2001.
- Elliot, William Y., ed., *The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy*, NY, Henry Holt and Co., 1955.
- Finkelstein, Norman, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflection on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, London & NY: Verso, 2000.
- Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, NY: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Friedman, Thomas, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, London: HarperCollins, 2000.
- Fromm, Erich, *The Sane Society*, London: Routledge, 1955.
- Galenano, Eduardo, *The Theatre of Good and Evil*, in Roger Burbach and Ben Clarke (eds.), *September 11 and the U.S. War: Beyond the Curtain of Smoke*, San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 2002.
- Higham, Charles, *Trading with the Enemy: the Nazi-American Money Plot 1933-1949*, NY: Delacorte Press, 1983.
- Kiernan, V.G., *European empires from conquest to collapse, 1815-1960*, Fontana, 1982.
- Lasswell, Harold, *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*, NY: Meridian Books, 1958.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince*, London: Penguin Books, 1999.
- Pilger, John, *The New Rulers of the World*, London & NY: Verso, 2002.
- Pointing, Clive, *Churchill*, Sinclair-Stevenson 1994.
- Rossiter, Clinton, and James Lare (eds.), *The Essential Lippmann: A Political Philosophy for Liberal Democracy*, Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Roy, Arundhati, *War is Peace*, in Roger Burbach and Ben Clarke (ed.), *September 11 and the U.S. War: Beyond the -Curtain of Smoke*, San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2002.
- Said, Edward, interview with David Barsamian, *Culture and Resistance*, London: Pluto Press, 2003.
- Said, Edward and Hitchens, Christopher (eds.), *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question*, NY: Verso, 1988, updated edition: 2001.
- Seldes, George, *Facts and Fascism*, In Fact, Inc., 1943 – 7th edition, hard cover.
- Vidal, Gore, *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace: How We Got to be so Hated – Causes of Conflict in the Last Empire*, Forest Row: Clairview Books, 2002.
- Zepezauer, Mark, *The CIA's Greatest Hits*, Tuscon, AZ: Odonian Press, 1994.

Articles from Academic Databases

- Galtung, Johan, "Violence, Peace, Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1969), 167-191.
- Gingrich, Andre, "Concepts of Race Vanishing, Movements of Racism Rising? Global Issues and Austrian Ethnography," *Ethnos*, Vol. 69:2, June 2004.
- Hervik, Peter, "Anthropological Perspectives on the New Racism in Europe," *Ethnos*, Vol. 69:2, June 2004.
- _____ "The Danish Cultural World of Unbridgeable Differences," *Ethnos*, Vol. 69:2, June 2004.

- Hippler, Jochen, and Lueg, Andrea, "The Next Threat," *Ethnos*, n.d.
- Huntington, Samuel, "The Clash of Civilizations,"
<http://www.alamut.com/subj/economics/misc/clash.html>
- Norman, Karin, "Equality and Exclusion: 'Racism' in a Swedish Town," *Ethnos*, Vol. 69:2, June 2004.
- Ottosen, Rune, "Enemy Images and the Journalistic Process," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Feb., 1995), 97-112.
- Tambiah, Stanley J., "The Nation-State in Crisis and the Rise of Ethnonationalism, pp. 124-43, in *The Politics of Difference: Ethnic Premises in a World of Power*," *Ethnos*, n.d.

Internet Sources: Reports, Declassified State Documents, Legal Instruments, Articles, Essays, Brief Quotes, Online Books and Speech

- Bush, George W., Anti-Terror Speech, September 20, 2001,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>
- Chomsky, Noam, "Civilization versus Barbarism?"
<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=6925>
- _____ "Dominance and its Dilemmas: The Bush administration's Imperial Grand Strategy,"
<http://www.bostonreview.net/BR28.5/chomsky.html>
- _____ "How America Determines Friends and Foes," *The Toronto Star*, March 14, 2004,
<http://www.passant-ordinaire.com/revue/49-633-en.asp>
- _____ "The Pentagon Papers and U.S. Imperialism in South East Asia," *The Spokesman*, Winter 1972/1973, <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/1972----.htm>
- _____ *The Roots of Racism*, in *The Prosperous Few and the Restless Many*,
www.zmag.org/chomsky/pfrm/pfrm-09.html
- _____ *What Uncle Sam Really Wants*, <http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/sam/sam-3-1.html>
- Chomsky, Noam, and Herman, Edward S., *After the Cataclysm: Postwar Indochina and the Reconstruction of Imperial Ideology. The Political Economy of Human Rights*, Vol. II,
http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Book_Excerpts/AfterCataclysm_Chom.html
- Chowkwanyun, Merlin, "The Savage Extreme of a Narrow Policy Spectrum," Five Questions with Noam Chomsky, <http://counterpunch.org/merlin07312004.html>
- Congressional Reports On Drug Corruption And The Federal Government:
<http://www.druglibrary.org/SCHAFFER/govpubs/drugcorr.htm>
- *Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy*, a Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations, 1989:
http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/library/congress/1989_cr/s890516-drugs.htm
- Ferner, Mike, "Why War? War, Incorporated," *Counterpunch*, July 17, 2002,
<http://www.counterpunch.org/ferner0717.html>
- Kennan, George, *PPS23*, <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/2496/future/kennan/pps23.html> or
http://www.j-bradford-delong.net/movable_type/archives/000567.html
- Knight, Charles, Project on Defense Alternatives, panel presentation at the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 14 June 2000, on "U.S. Military-Strategic Ambitions: Expanding to Fill the post-Soviet Vacuum," <http://www.comw.org/pda/0006vacuum.html>.
- Pilger, John, "The Rise of the Democratic Police State,"
<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=8535>
- Pitt, William Rivers, "The Things We Don't Talk About," *Truthout/Perspective*, 23 June 2005,
http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/062305X.shtml
- Price, Geoff, "This War Is About So Much More," March 21, 2003-April 18, 2003,
<http://www.rationalrevolution.net/war/introduction.htm>
- Singh, Someshwar, "Half The World Hit by US Unilateral Sanctions," *Third World Economics* (Jan. 16-31, 2000), <http://www.twinside.org.sg/title/half-cn.html>
- "The CIA and the Nazis," The National Security Archive (Declassified USG Document),
<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB146/index.htm>.

- "The Nuremberg Principles," Nuremberg War Crime Tribunal, 1950, <http://deoxy.org/wc/wc-nurem.htm>
- "The Oliver North File: His Diaries, E-Mail, and Memos on the Kerry Report, Contras and Drugs," National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 113, February 26, 2004: <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB113/index.htm>
- UN documents and reports summarized in Center for Economic and Social Rights, "Afghanistan Fact Sheet 3: Key Human Vulnerabilities." Available on-line at <http://www.cesr.org>. Also in Chomsky, *9-11*, pp. 94-99.
- Vittachi, Anuradha, "MINORITY RIGHTS – A Majority Problem, Roots of discrimination": <http://www.newint.org/issue128/roots.htm>
- "Winston Churchill's Secret Poison Gas Memo," <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHU407A.html>

Journals

- Coll, Steve, "Anatomy of a Victory: CIA's Covert Afghan War," *Washington Post*, July 19, 1992, p. A1.
- Coll, Steve, in "CIA's Covert Afghan War, Where to Draw the Line Was Key," *Washington Post*, July 20, 1992, p. A1.
- *New African*, December 2005, No 446, pp. 52-55.
- le Carré, John, *The Nation magazine*, April 9, 2001.
- Pear, Robert, "Arming Afghan Guerillas: A Huge Effort Led by U.S.," *New York Times*, April 18, 1988, p. A1.
- Rashid, Ahmed, "The Making of a Terrorist," *Straits Times* (Singapore), September 23, 2001, p. 26.
- Sommers, Mark, "Sanctions are Becoming 'Weapon of Choice' " *CSM*, Aug. 3, 1993.
- Weiner, Tim, "Blowback From the Afghan Battlefield," *New York Times Magazine*, March 13, 1994, p. 6: 53.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.