

Noura kaddour

The Concept of the Rogue State and Democracy in American Politics according to Noam Chomsky

The Concept of the Rogue State and Democracy in American Politics according to Noam Chomsky

Dr. Noura kaddour

*Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, "Nour el-Bachir University
Center el-Bayadh, Algeria*

E-mail corresponding: n.kaddour@cu-elbayadh.dz

Received: 15/02/2023; Accepted: 23/08/2023; Published: 02/09/2023

Abstract

Noam Chomsky is considered one of the pioneers of contemporary Western thought and one of the symbols of American leftist thought. He tried to talk about linguistics and then turned to politics, but this does not prevent him from being the biggest critic of American foreign policy, trying during many years to show the basic features of this destructive policy that the United States of America tried Spreading it all over the world, taking advantage of the weakness of states, as well as trying to clarify the reasons for that by practicing dual democracy that serves the interests of America and tends to wards terrorism, control and hegemony by all means and at all levels, and between a democracy that calls for its slogans of

constitution, freedom and law at the theoretical level that weak countries are seeking Herslogans.

Keywords: Democracy, terrorism, rogue state, hegemony, power, armaments.

Tob Regul Sci. TM 2023;9(1): 5203 - 5219

DOI: doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.361

Introduction

The contemporary political thinking aims to establish human foundations and values such as: democracy, justice and freedom, and seeks to achieve them. Numerous modern and contemporary philosophers studied them from a philosophical point of view, through the concepts they provided bearing how to build and implement them in practice within the state.

In the midst of the stunning technological development that contemporary society suffers from, human issues and values have receded, and a crisis of moral values appeared. This arose questions about the fate of man in a world in which the realization of global peace, security and international stability is absent, on the one hand; on the other hand, with the demise of the communist Eastern camp, the emergence of unipolarity and the American hegemony, the

movement of democratic societies towards achieving their independence and freedom remained impeded by USA political practices, whether internally or externally.

Several contemporary philosophical names that oppose human and moral values, freedom, democracy, world peace, liberation movements, as well as American politics have appeared through the position of the greatest contemporary philosophers and intellectuals of the twentieth century, whose political practices were characterized by the struggle for the principles of humanity. He is known by his contributions to Modern linguistics, then his digression into politics, namely Noam Chomsky (1928).

The American linguist, political theorist, and philosopher (Chomsky) dealt with many philosophical topics and problems which attracted his attention, such as democracy, human rights, and domination over the peoples of the world. Up to now, he still defends them, works to see these values embodied on the ground and is more objective in exposing American and social practices. This is what sparked a controversy between the nature of American political practice, which is run by the elite and social practice, bearing the right to represent human values, universal rights, and the principles of democracy. Based on the above, this research paper handles a new concept, that is the rogue state, and aims to answer the following questions: What does Chomsky mean by the rogue state? What are its specificities? How does USA try to justify violence, or so-called terrorism to be used against the states that hinder its geopolitical practices and economic interests? How did USA change the concept of democracy in a way that would contribute to maintain its control, hegemony and leadership over the world?

Since democracy represents an obsession and a political demand sought by different peoples and individuals, despite the diversity of ideas and perceptions about the concept from one philosophy to another, and from one thinker to another, it remains a paramount political principle and demand, still imposing itself in the geopolitical, cultural and social scope.

The philosophical problem of democracy appears through its theoretical concept, the political philosophical action and the actual practice. It aims to search for the legitimacy of the political life of individuals characterized by moral values that are an inherent characteristic of the individual. The latter, without values, behaves aggressively through violence, terrorism, force, and love of control and domination.

1/ Rogue states:

Chomsky points out that the term “rogue states”, likewise other terms in political discourse, has two significations: the first is propaganda, applied to classified enemies, and the second is objective, applied to states that do not consider themselves bound to international norms. However, logic says that the most powerful states should be classified in the category of states that are not bound to international norms, unless this is prohibited at the internal level. This is

an expectation confirmed by history¹, and this means that the term “brand states” is similar to the concept of political discourse: the first is propaganda applied to states classified within the bloc of enemies, while the second relates to great states which have the right to violate and breach the laws.

Chomsky points out that international norms are not strictly defined; however, there are broad lines lying to agreement. During World War II, these norms were included in the Charter of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, as well as many international charters and agreements. Nevertheless, the United States of America (USA) were exempt from these conditions, especially with the Cold War and the increase of American hegemony. This is confirmed by the Newsletter of the American Society of International Law (1999): (International law is today, most likely, less respected in our state than ever before). According to Chomsky, this is a clear disdain for international treaties and agreements.

Chomsky confirms this by defending the opinion of Dean Acheson in 1963 saying that USA is not bound to them and that: (International law is useful for camouflaging our positions with a distinctive characteristic derived from very general moral principles that have influenced legal doctrines). Chomsky considers it a clear indication of the blockade imposed on Cuba, and this is American terrorism according to him. Cuba was one of its main goals before even the 1960 resolution regarding the overthrow of the government, under the pretext that the Soviet Union was hovering around the region. With its disappearance, The US began moving in all directions to strengthen the principle of the rogue state.

It is also evidenced by the Indonesian war on East Timor and how The US played a prominent role in it. Then in the end, Washington indicated to the Indonesian generals that the war was over, so they changed their approach and announced their withdrawal. This is an indication of the permanent hidden power. Chomsky confirms that the United Nations (was incompletely effective, and it was a routine procedure since the organization got out of control with the decolonization)². One of the indicators was the use of veto in the Security Council, which included many issues, as USA, then Britain, then France topped the right to decisions in the United Nations.

Chomsky claims that the rogue state doctrine remained in effect when the Democrats returned to the White House. This is shown through what President Clinton announced: (The US would act multilaterally, when possible, but unilaterally, when necessary). The US Ambassador to the

¹Chomsky. N. Rogue States (The Use of Force in World Affairs), Trans. Osama Asber, Al-Obeikat Library, Saudi Arabia, 2004, p. 9.

² Chomsky, N. *ibid.* p. 15.

United Nations and the Secretary of Defense reiterated in 1999 that the US is committed to the individual use of military force to defend vital interests¹.

Chomsky believes that for a rogue superpower to ensure its administration to the law, it must maintain (credibility), but failing to respect its power involves harsh penalties, and it is a justification for state's violence. Resorting to credibility was an argument presented as a means of preferring war over peaceful solutions in (Kosovo) (1999), as an affirmation of (the credibility of NATO). In a study conducted in 1995 by the American Strategic Command (Deterrence after the Cold War), the US deterrence policy must be convincing. It considers that the US has the right and freedom in responses, especially in the use of nuclear weapons. It says that biological terrorism is the weapon of the weak, while the rogue states separate terrorism from intimidation and from effective means of destruction. The US is always trying to exercise its hegemony even if under the pretext of possessing nuclear weapons for states in order to get rid of their power that may match its own one day (no first use of nuclear weapons policy). It must clarify to the opponents the reaction (response or preventive action) under the pretext of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons².

Chomsky believes that Churchill summarized the shape of the world after World War II: (The rule of the world should be entrusted to nations that are self-sufficient, who do not desire anything for themselves, but if the government of the world is in the wrong hands, there will always be danger. None of us has any reason to seek more, peace will be preserved by people who live in their own way and are not ambitious. Our strength has placed us above everyone else. We were rich men living in peace in their colonies). This confirms that these superpowers seek to control and search for areas for investment and to plunder their wealth, and that those who will maintain peace in the world are nations that are not ambitious and live only from their wealth.³

Chomsky confirms that the arguments of the Cold War have always been available, even if they are less credible. The examiner of the political situation sees that there are major factors behind the policy of rogue states, whether in Indochina, Cuba or Indonesia. This is a fact that was recognized after the end of the Cold War.

Chomsky enumerates American terrorist crimes, whether in Lebanon by killing 80 people in 1985 in the worst terrorist act, or through the CIA who bombed a car that targeted an Islamic leader, or the destruction of half of the medical supplies of an African country like Sudan in 1998 under the pretext of nuclear weapons, claiming that USA has the right to use military force against laboratories and training camps. Chomsky sees the matter differently if Islamic terrorists

¹Ibid. p. 18.

² Ibid. p. 24

³ Ibid. p. 23

are the ones who attacked half of the medical supplies in USA or Israel. These examples and many others from rogue American terrorism can be included in (creative deterrence).

Chomsky considers the human tax so huge that it defies estimation, but crimes do not matter to rogue states that possess enormous power. They are deleted from history or transformed into good intentions that sometimes go awry. Rogue states that enjoy internal freedom must depend on the will of the elite classes to produce medals, to allow or deny horrific crimes.

The concept of the rogue state plays a prominent role in politics planning and analysis, the most important of which is the Iraq crisis (April 1998), where both the US and Britain declared the guardian of the world order, and that (Iraq is a rogue state), (as it poses a threat to its neighbors and the entire world, as it is a lawless state).¹

The rogue state is not only criminal, but also a state that defies the orders of the powerful, who are naturally excluded. Within the same context, Cuba merited this description by USA due to its support to Angola's forces against the attacks of South Africa, which are supported themselves by the USA. While South Africa witnessed a great number of victims, it was not a rogue state.

Chomsky believes that in the late years of Clinton, it became clear to the greater part of the world that the United States of America is (on its way to become the rogue superpower) and is seen as the greatest external threat to their societies. The first rogue state in the eyes of the majority of the world today is, in fact, the United States of America. Chomsky confirms that: (since 1947, USA has been the largest perpetrator of pre-emptive state terrorism and countless other rogue acts causing serious harm in the name of democracy, freedom and justice)².

2/ Iraq crisis:

Chomsky believes that the debate over Iraq crisis never happened, but rather it was a few words, and there was debate about how to proceed. The correct answer was not possible in light of this debate, using both The US and Britain's United Nations Charter: (The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or any act of aggression, and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42)³ which favor (measures not involving armed force) allowing the UN Security Council to undertake further investigations if it discovers that the procedures are incorrect. Article (51) allows the right to individual or collective self-defense.

Chomsky claims that there are many ways for Iraq's neighbors to take in case they feel threatened, such as resorting to the UN Security Council to take possible measures to deter the

¹ Ibid. p. 33

² Chomsky, N. Failed States (The Abuse of Power and the Attack on Democracy), Trans.: Sami Al-Kaaki, Arab Book House, Beirut, 2007, p. 136.

³ Ibid. p. 34

threat. In the same way Britain and The US can resort to it, but without using force and keep their hands clean rather. Though, the matter rarely goes in such a way.

Chomsky believes that the US position was clear from the beginning, and this is what the US Secretary of State announced when she claimed in the Security Council that the United States will work (jointly when possible and unilaterally when necessary, as we recognize that this region is vital to the American national interests).¹ He confirms that even Kofi Annan's visit to Iraq and the diplomatic negotiations with the Iraqis were not pleasant to Americans, who considered Iraq a threat to their national interests and did not pass the compliance test as set by Washington.

On the other hand, Kofi Annan succeeded in his agreement with Iraq, and the Security Council supported the said agreement, rejecting British and American military intervention in Iraq. The one who has the right to decide is the UN Security Council (it is the Security Council that must determine when force shall be used)².

We point out to Iraq's violation of United Nations resolutions, and that the two states fighting Iraq began to play the role of "policemen of the world". This was an insult to the police principle of justice and law. These states tore it into fragments, but the war continued and Iraq eventually declared compliance with international laws, withdrawal, negotiation with Kuwait, acceptance of inspection, and destruction of weapons.

3/ Open contempt:

Contempt for the rule of law is deeply rooted in the American politics. The best evidence is the reaction to the ruling of the International Court of Justice in 1986, which denounced the USA for its (illegal use of force) against (Nicaragua) requesting it to stop and pay huge compensation. It declared that any American aid to the Contras is military aid, not humanitarian one, and was denounced by the Court as it disgraced itself.

The Congress, with the control of the Democrats, authorized new funding to double the illegal use of force, and Washington reversed a Security Council resolution calling on all states to respect international law, without mentioning any state, although the intent was clear. When the General Assembly issued a similar resolution, the US voted against it, similarly did Israel and El Salvador. It effectively overruled it in the following year and only got the Israeli automatic vote.

Chomsky mentions that bombing Libyan cities by USA in 1986 was officially justified as a (self-defense against a future attack). The New York Times praised it and said in the words of its legal specialist: (violence in this case is justified as an act of self-defense). By resorting to Article 51: (It

¹ Ibid. p. 35

² Ibid. p. 37

stipulates the use of armed force to defend a state and our interests, our people...)¹, and authorizes the US to invade (Panama) in order to prevent the use of its territory as a base for smuggling drugs to the USA).

Chomsky claims that bombing Iraq delighted the Congress and the press, as they saw the attack necessary, reasonable and appropriate. They considered it self-defense against an armed attack, under the pretext of an attempt to assassinate President Bush two months before the attack. The Americans believe that it is the duty of the President to use military force in order to protect the interests of the nation, as Article (51) authorizes a state to use force in case of self-defense against threats affecting its citizens. In this regard Hard said: (There will be a serious state of paralysis in the world, if required by the USA to obtain UN approval before firing missiles at an enemy that attempted - or did not - attempt to assassinate a former president two months ago. The record supports the widely expressed concern of rogue states devoted to rule by force and to act in accordance with the national interest, as defined by local power. More ominous are the rogue states that dedicate themselves as global rulers and executioners².

4/ Limited interpretation (rogue state):

As mentioned above, the debate over the Iraqi crisis did not take place at all, but rather few words uttered. Chomsky sees the need to review some issues that are not involved in the (non-controversial) issue on the Iraqi issue. He stresses the fact that the concept of the rogue state is a basic concept, and that despite the end of the Cold War, USA still bears the responsibility of protecting the world, but from what, Chomsky wonders? It is unreasonable to protect the world from the threat of "extreme nationalism," that is, the refusal to submit to the will of the strongest. Chomsky asserts that these ideas are consistent with internal planning records, and are not for the general public, despite the techniques used to mobilize the masses, whether during Kennedy's or Reagan's ruling period.

There were incentives that confirmed the fear of crime, especially drugs, exploited by media, press, and government...as well as hidden racial tension as a new apartheid system, in addition to the high percentage of black prisoners in USA, where the culprits are whites through their exploitation of the black in drug trafficking³.

Even more dangerous than drug trafficking is the rogue state. A study entitled: (Fundamentals of Post-Cold War Deterrence) was conducted and published within the context of the Freedom of Information Act:(shows how the United States of America loaned its deterrence strategy from the

¹ Ibid. p. 46

² Ibid. p. 48

³ Donziger, S. ed., The Real War on Crime, Criminal Justice Commission Report (Harper Collins, 1996, Niels Christie, Crime as an Industry (Routledge, 1993).

dead Soviet Union to the so-called rogue states like Iraq, Libya, Cuba and North Korea, according to the Associated Press. The study supports the US exploitation of its nuclear arsenal in order to portray itself as (irrational and vindictive in case its vital interests were attacked).¹

Libya was a preferred option as a rogue state from the old days of Reagan's administration. In 1986, the first bombing in history was synthesized, at a time when the reinforcement of support for Washington's terrorist forces attacking Nicaragua was witnessed, under the pretext that Gaddafi is the chief terrorist. After the collapse of Berlin House, which ended any resort to the Soviet threat, Bush's administration called Congress for a huge budget for the Pentagon. Reagan claimed to search for a global environment pervaded by peace, freedom and progress within which the desired democracy can flourish by Americans and other free nations, and that the threat facing USA is (the growth of technical superiority of third world countries).

This will necessitate strengthening the defense industrial base (high-tech industry) by creating incentives for investment in new facilities and equipment, as in research and development. The Americans expressed their concern about the Iraqi attack on Kuwait: (It is clear that USA agreed to sponsor British oil interests, especially in Kuwait²...with the impossibility of tolerating any Iraqi move against Kuwait, exposing Britain's interests to danger, and this was what USA had hoped for).

According to Chomsky, the historical representations were not accurate and absolute. When USA partially withdrew from Panama and appointed its internal agent, there was anger that swept the hemisphere, so USA had nothing but to use the right of veto twice (for its flagrant violation of international law, independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of states).³ It was necessary to withdraw its forces from Panama, while the issue of invading Iraq was different.

Ronald Steel claims that USA faced a puzzling problem: (Since the most powerful nation in the world faces more restrictions on its freedom to use force than any other country)⁴. According to him, this explains the success of Saddam Hussein in Kuwait compared to its failure in Panama. The Iraqi invasion came in conflict with a number of crucial interests of the USA, which made it outrageous and a violation of the highest principles of international law and morals⁵.

Since then, Iraq replaced Libya and Iran as a major rogue state. Chomsky believes that Indonesia is a rogue state as well, but USA unclassified it and gained its fellow ship after General Suharto coming to power in 1965 and committing heinous crimes, although the International Security Council requested the exit of the Indonesian forces from East Timor. In the meantime, The US

¹ Ibid. p. 50

² Chomsky, N. *Deterring Democracy*, Trans.: FadelGutker, Kanaan Publishing and Distribution House, Damascus, 1st edition, 1992, p. 12.

³ Chomsky, N. *The Rogue State*, p. 55.

⁴ Ibid. p. 55

⁵ Chomsky, N. *Deterring Democracy*, p. 185.

provided Indonesia with weapons, this is what made the American authority happy with its ally, Indonesia, especially when an American company settled in it to steal East Timor's oil. Comparing to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, there is symmetry, but the America's brutality in East Timor is unlike Saddam's Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Analysts tended to: (describe the actions of Bush in Panama by sending the armed forces to Saudi Arabia, not by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, just as Grenada, Vietnam and Lebanon were mentioned regularly as precedents confirming our commitment to defend the principle of non-interference¹.

Victims of the 1982 invasion of Lebanon by the American-backed Israel outnumber the victims of the Iraqi invasion. It remains a violation of the UN Security Council resolutions issued in 1978, calling for withdrawal from Lebanon and Golan, in addition to resolutions related to Jerusalem. Were it not for the American veto, Israel and its government would have violated UN Resolution (242) and the Oslo Accords. It is clearly incorrect to claim that (Israel does not clearly violate Security Council resolutions)² which calls for the necessity of examining the reasons presented.

Chomsky presents many demonstrations showing Saddam's relationship with American presidents when he was serving their interests. How good relations were, through loans and increased American exports. This made him in a better position, forgetting his record in human rights, compared to works related to American shipments related to weapons of mass destruction, as well as British shipments. The use of biological and chemical nuclear weapons against civilians related to the Iraqi president was unknown to media to accuse Saddam of being a war criminal, although Kuwaiti media referred to the use of chemical weapons by USA in its war against Russia against the Bolsheviks (1919), against Vietnam (1961/1962), as well as against Cuba in 1977. What is the difference between it and Iraq? According to Chomsky, this is a small element of American terrorism.

Chomsky considers the United States and Britain to be allies in the biological war on Iraq, with the disadvantages and damage they caused to the infrastructure, the ban on exports, epidemics and diseases... In this regard, Western diplomats say: (The United States directly benefited from the humanitarian operation as much as the Russians and the French did. If not, more than that)³.

5/ American democracy:

USA is a state of dreams in terms of freedom, democracy, and human rights. This is the greatness of USA, which is based on its doctrine and politics. According to Hegel, (USA is the state of the future in which the importance of world history will become clear to us, in the coming ages. It is

¹ Chomsky, N. *Deterring Democracy*, p. 187.

² Schmemmann, S. and Gehl, D. *New York Times*, February 27, 1998.

³ Chomsky, N. *The Rogue State*, p. 68

the state which everyone longs for who is tired of the historical armament stores in old Europe.)¹ This suggests a new world through its military capabilities and foreign policy in which it exerts pressure on the Third World states that are trying to excel in the technological field. USA believes in freedom, constitution, law, democracy, individualism, cultural and political equality. These principles go back to the English philosophy of John Locke, which was declared in the Charter of the United Nations and Human Rights, in addition to the economic freedom guaranteed by capitalism, which was coupled with the belief in the absolute superiority of capitalism, freedom to shop, unlimited economic opportunities, and consumerism.² The beliefs of the American doctrine are no longer limited to its borders, but rather spread beyond them. The beliefs of democracy have become widespread among all the inhabitants of the world who call for it: (Democracy is part of the underworld of Western democratic countries, as is American capitalism, despite its special features that are entirely closely intertwined with the world order)³.

Chomsky presents democracy in USA through Bill Clinton, who won the presidential elections twice, then the state of Arkansas many times, declaring: (Our political system has failed, Washington is dominated by strong interests and bureaucracy, and this is about managers and presidents... employees and workers are commodities bought and sold in the labor market)⁴.

Chomsky presents Thomas Jefferson (1826) that he spoke with a mixture of anxiety and hope about what had been accomplished, and that was about fifty years after the Declaration of the American Independence, distinguishing between two groups: aristocracy and democracy. Democrats are (those who identify with people, trust and pamper them. They are the most honest and safest, and yet they are not the wisest repository of popular interest)⁵. They aspire to seek power and control people because they do not make correct decisions. Aristocrats are (those who fear people, suspicious of them, and desire to withdraw power from them to the hands of the higher classes)⁶. They assign ruling to classes worthy of it, but the result is the same despite the difference in the view.

Chomsky claims that (we rarely find a Western academic book on democracy, except that it mentions (often proudly) the ancient democracy of Athens, in which less than one-seventh of the population enjoyed the right to vote and participate in political life).⁷ Accordingly, Chomsky deals with democracy in USA as the greatest state that calls for democracy in the world; however,

¹ Hegel, F. J.W., *The Philosophy of History*, trans: Imam Abdel Fattah, Dar Al-Tanweer, Cairo, 1973, p. 114.

² Anatole, L. *America between Truth and Falsehood, Anatomy of National Democracy*, Trans.: Nasser Al-Saadoun, Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut 2008, p. 130.

³ Anatole, L. *ibid.* p. 131

⁴ Chomsky, N. *What Uncle Sam Wants*, Trans.: Adel Al-Muallem, Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo, 1998, 1st edition, p. 76.

⁵ Chomsky, N. *Controlling the Mob, Conversations with David Barsamian*, Trans. Ali Hijazi, Al-Ahlia Publishing House, Amman, 1997, ed., p. 229.

⁶ Chomsky, N. *Controlling the Mob. Ibid.* p. 229

⁷ Chomsky, N. *What Uncle Sam Wants*, p. 73/74.

American democracy is internally sick before exporting it abroad and searching for the consolidation of its rules and principles. (The inevitable irony is that the United States of America, which has been involved for a long time in the adventures of “establishing democracy” in all parts of the world, is in dire need to revive the democratic process in the homeland)¹. American democracy rushes through the dual relationship between it and other democracies in the world. It is a dual policy that exists within contradictory values through hegemony, control, force, and aggression; on the other hand, calling for peace and human rights. This always makes it the subject of accusation and condemnation, by the peoples of the world and human rights organizations.

Chomsky provides evidence of the failure of this democracy through the electoral campaign that indicates the democratic deficit in the greatest democratic state (Americans can choose candidates from a major party, who were born wealthy, and from political power, who attended the same elite universities, and joined the same secret society who teaches members about the style of government and their methods. They are able to run in elections because they receive funding from the same institutional forces).² From the reality of election campaigns in USA, Chomsky presents to us the (double democratic game) that Bush Jr. played using illegal and democratic means to win in front of Kerry: (Thanks to the gifts he bestows on the very wealthy and on the corporate sector, his excellent record of abolishing progressive legislation that resulted from strong popular struggle over the years)³. The American democratic game is just a charade. The second candidate Kerry is still an important personality in the United States of America, then Obama, a black man, succeeded President Bush Jr.; however, US's policy remains the same internally and externally, and his promises were in reality nothing but illusions and throwing ashes in the eyes with his attacks on civil liberties.

American democracy suffers from internal decay due to involving dangerous paradigms into American political equation, through the economic structure based on exploitation and profit, which calls for global imperialism, as well as the ideological structure based on ethnic-civilizational conflict. Adding to the law of victory based on the philosophy of global power and domination.

6/ Manufactured American terrorism:

The concept of terrorism was used for the first time during the French Revolution, that is, in Europe. In Arabic language إرهاب 'irhab' is a term derived from the verb رهب 'rahaba' يرهب 'yarhabu' رهبان 'rahbatan' رهابان 'rahaban' meaning “to terrify, to be terrified, terror”, أرهب 'arhaba'

¹ Chomsky, N. Introductions, Trans: Mahmoud Barhoum and Nawal Al-Qassar Al-Saryani, Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing, Amman, 2007, 1st edition, p. 93.

² Chomsky, N. Ibid. p. 93

³ Chomsky, N. Ibid. p. 95

and استرهب 'istarhaba' meaning to frighten sb, and رهبانية 'rahbaniya' monasticism from the noun راهب 'rahib' meaning a monk. ترهب 'tarahub' referring to the process of monasticism means worshipping in a hermitage.¹ It is mentioned in Al-Sihah's Dictionary of the Language as well أرهب 'arhaba' meaning to frighten sb².

However, with the emergence of globalization and the adoption of the new world order by the states, the concept took on other dimensions that were not known before. It referred to several meanings and developed according to the requirements and reality. What is striking is that the American politics made it possible to merge the concept with any political or ideological entity whose interests and strategy are not compatible with it. For instance, some states or groups or even a person are described as terrorists, this is simply either an attempt to distort their image for the general opinion or an attempt to give legitimacy to the practice of violence against them. Therefore, we can say that (the term terrorist is given to a meaning that is linked to circumstances, conditions, and events that are related to the psychological, intellectual, moral, social and political appearance, giving it a special definition that goes beyond the meaning of frightening, fear, and intimidation, which makes it difficult to define it accurately)³.

The phenomenon of terrorism is considered a form of political violence, and an acute crisis situation in society. It has serious repercussions that threaten the stability of the state and the infrastructure of society. It may be controlled by a group of political forces, either coming from society or from the state and the ruling regime. This is the hidden face of imperialist states. Chomsky considers it (the means used by American politics to preserve influence in order to survive, exercise power and control while pursuing desirable interests and utilitarian goals, using it as a threat and violence. All its manifestations were characterized by brutality and repression).⁴

Any impartial person notes that the term terrorism is associated with the new world order, which may be considered sometimes a pretext for the intervention of the United States of America and its influential institutions, especially after the events of the eleventh of September and its repercussions on the international level during the era of Bush the father. The concept of terrorism prevailed in the form of Al-Qaeda organization, but during the era of Barack Obama, the term referred to a new group called the Islamic State organization, leading to ISIS with the president Donald Trump. All this happened when USA imagined itself the international guardian of human rights under the penalty of fighting terrorism.

¹ Zadeh Al-Kurdi, I. The Problematic Definition of Terrorism, Center for Secular Studies and Research in the Arab World, Arab Center, Beirut, 2017, p. 10.

² Ozri, A. The Psychology of Violence, Journal of Educational Sciences (Institutional Violence and the Institutionalization of Violence, n° 36, p. 16.

³ Ozri, A. *ibid.* p. 18

⁴ Chomsky, N. Pirates and Emperors of International Terrorism in the Real World, Houran Publishing, Syria, Volume 1, p. 6.

Fukuyama emphasizes the need to regulate the American behavior, saying: (if the situation changed after the events of September 11th, 2001, it is morally necessary that the war against terrorism to be used appropriately and in a controlled manner in a number of specific cases, much more specifically than it is now)¹.

Therefore, we can say that the events of September 11th constitute a decisive and serious turning point for the American policy, especially in the issue of fighting terrorism, since these events were characterized by an undefined hostile nature and had repercussions at the international level. Regardless of the source of this act, the method of attacking the World Trade Center, with civilian deaths, material and human losses, predicted the existence of another kind of threat to world peace. It was the spark that created the term "War on Terrorism". Although the term had been adopted before, it did not take on the character of war.

Chomsky says: (Since 1981, when the Reagan administration took office, it hastily announced that its focus would be on combating terrorism, especially international terrorism carried out by states. President Reagan, his Secretary of State, George Shuttles, and other officials in the administration elaborated a detailed speech on the plague of the modern era, the return to barbarism in our time and the epidemic of terrorism)².

War on terrorism was not new on the international scene, but rather it prevailed in the Cold War, which makes it an American policy to put an end to the expansion of socialist and totalitarian regimes. It also indicates the political hypocrisy of USA, just like the term democracy of the false new world order, which is nothing more than propaganda. (Media propaganda) was prevalent in the Western media to cover up its undermining of the democracy of states, especially in the Third World.

USA uses its power to influence the behavior of other states within the framework of the world order. Every use of force in international relations is a form of political violence, and this is what we can call political terrorism. It is a (symbolic behavior based on the organized use of violence or the threat of its use, in a way that results in creating a psychological state of fear, dread, and insecurity among the targeted people in order to achieve political goals)³.

USA also relies on intelligence and logistical means to provide secret support to terrorist groups. It is an American intelligence group characterized by secrecy to support world criminals, terrorist

¹Chomsky, N. American Hegemony or Survival to World Domination, Trans: Sami al-Kaaki, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Beirut, 2004, 1st edition

²Chomsky, N. The Dangerous Sultan (US Foreign Policy in the Middle East), trans: Gilbert Al-Shakar, Dar Al-Saqi, Beirut, 2007, p. 10

³Tawfiq al-Hakim, H. The Phenomenon of Political Violence in Arab Regimes, Doctoral Dissertation Series, Arab Unity Center, Beirut, 1992, 1st edition, p. 40

groups, or gangs within the states, to carry out acts of armed political violence, or what is known as foreign support, to support the rebellious mafia, with the aim of exerting pressure on the internal government, conspiring to kill, kidnap, and cause chaos in the states. Chomsky confirms this: (If we monitor USA actions in the world since World War II until today, we find out that it is the largest terrorist state in the world. The evidence is what happened in the Vietnam War in the mid-sixties when the CIA established terrorist groups whose mission is to terrorize the people. In 1981, an American general stated: In order to be able to control a political situation in a state, it is necessary to maintain secret communications with the terrorist organizations)¹. This means that USA supports terrorist groups in order to fight them legitimately, but rather to control an entire state, including the people, the government, and terrorist organizations. It is the only one that benefits from every intervention. Every support is to escalate violence, create chaos, and it is a soft, indirect method.

Chomsky believes that the term of terrorism is usually used by foreign armies to refer to actions against them, carried out by local populations who are considered an occupying force trying to impose a hateful political settlement based on foreign invasion. In this case, the new order of Israel, with the criteria and evidence used in the case of Libya, USA was once again the leading force of terrorism in the world in 1958, even if we exclude terrorism in general, which was declared not worthy of this name by the preaching regime².

It is clear that USA changed its foreign policy after the events of September 11th, 2001 and declared war on terrorism for the second time after Reagan did thirty years earlier. In the name of the right to self-defense and to respond to aggression, terrorism became legitimate, and the war on terrorism became a legitimate mechanism, using hegemony and force instead of moral values, as happened with the mercenary forces centered in Honduras, where John Negroponte was in charge at the time, preventing any efforts from either the International Court or Latin American states seeking to adopt legitimate, utopian means³.

Chomsky believes that the evidence of terrorism that the US endorses is the Palestinian issue, in which USA always uses its veto power to protect the interests of its spoiled son, Israel. All the crimes that occur against the Palestinians are not terrorism, but rather a right to self-defense. In addition to the forms of terrorism: invasion of Iraq and other previous crimes against Cuba, Vietnam, the Balkans, and Northern Ireland... USA remains the only cause of global hostility from peoples.

¹Chomsky, N. *Deterring Democracy*, p. 52

²Chomsky, N. *Pirates and Emperors*, p. 143

³Chomsky, N. *Illusions of the Middle East*, Trans: Shereen Fahmy, Al-Shorouk International Library, Cairo, 2003, p. 88

Chomsky predicts the demise of the American democracy as its source is not the American people, but rather a group of the rich and new masters of the world who buy all political rules and decisions, which leads to the collapse of this democracy with the fall of the fragile interests on which it is founded.

7/ Assessment of Chomsky's ideas:

Chomsky criticizes the West through their practice of plundering, exploitation, deception, and violation of values and laws, so Ali Harb sees everything that happens on the ground as an acknowledgment of the fragility of human conscience and the collapse of human and moral values: (What happens on the ground of tragedies, grievances and violations do not need proof, but rather it is a reason to recognize the fragility of human conscience and universal values)¹.

Some consider that Chomsky plays the role of a lawyer for the rights of peoples, because the societies whose rights he defends are delusional that the cause of their crisis is their relationship with the other, and become deficient in defending themselves, so the societies must get rid of guardianship over it and defend it: (Hence it seems that the task which Chomsky exercises as a lawyer for the rights of peoples, a special mission that makes the societies whose rights and issues he defends based on their flimsy convictions or cling to their deficient situations as much as they are delusional that their crisis is the result of their relations with the other and nothing else, of course there is a problem with the other outside)². (The beginning of liberation is for a person to get rid of those who exercise guardianship over him, even in the name of defending his freedom and interests).³ They believe that Chomsky's role as a lawyer has another side, which is to deceive the truth and protect rights. He dealt with the truth in a utopian manner through fragile ideals and paradoxical values, all of which led to failure.

Considering Chomsky as a prominent intellectual, he plays a master role in defending the issues of the oppressed, exposing and overthrowing his state's politics. This did not prevent USA from leading the world at all levels, whether military, technical, economic, intellectual and symbolic aspects in particular. Despite the objections that Chomsky announces, USA has now occupied the minds and became the master of symbols. This is through the confession of Chomsky's intellectual friend Ansacio Ramone: (it occupies the minds and is the master of symbols, as admitted Chomsky's partner in his struggle against the logic of conquest and domination. It is the most eloquent witness that the apostolic intellectual of the owner of the prophetic role does not improve anything but the loss of his issues)⁴.

¹ Harb, A. Varieties of Theory and Spectra of Freedom (Critique of Eordio and Chomsky), Arab Cultural Center, Beirut, p. 85

² Ibid. p. 85

³ Ibid. p. 86

⁴ Ibid. p. 86

Chomsky is also moving forward in order to defend the issues of the world and the oppressed peoples, through his convictions and firm positions face to changes and developments: (it is meaningfully and effectively possible to reconsider the policy of thought and the struggle strategy to reformulate the references and projects, whether on the cognitive, moral or political level)¹.

Conclusion

The contemporary man is a political who aspires to civil rights, freedom, justice, peace and tolerance... All of these values are found in theory filled with international covenants and treaties such as the Declaration of Human Rights after World War II; however, we find in reality a clear violation of human rights and principles of the United Nations, similarly to what is happening in the Palestinian territories and the violations in Latin America, Kosovo, Syria, Iraq and Iran...

The slogans of human rights of freedom, decent living and other values are always ignored by the United States of America. Its policy is doubled between the ebb and flow, calling for it on the one hand, and breaching it on the other hand, leaving behind poverty, aggression and disease in parts of the world. Similar to what happened in Iraq, through the economic blockade that it launched against it. Studies confirm the death of more than a million Iraqi children at the end of the twentieth century. This can be measured on its war against Vietnam, Cuba and Kosovo. This requires the protection of human humanity in order to achieve human rights with sincere intention of the superpowers. This is clear evidence of the democracy that USA seeks, in a way that is totally contradictory to reality. This makes it a confirmation of the non-democracy that USA calls for in the world.

Chomsky confirms the existence of political hypocrisy in international relations through terrorism, which does not have a unified definition. Though, there is a global agreement between the major international powers to fight terrorism with terrorism, as well as all countries in a state of war or preparing for war due to the lack of stability and insecurity that prevail over international relations. Some developing countries seek democracy with its true principles, but USA obstructs them by all means and methods by creating chaos, insecurity, civil wars, and internal disorder.

Terrorism is no longer linked to religion as much as it is linked to the extent of submission, obedience, and loyalty to the West in general and to USA in particular. The latter's approach lies in hegemony, force, and terrorism in its foreign policy, which confirms its contradictory aptitude towards human rights, morals and politics or alleged democracy, marketing it through propaganda using printed, audio, and written media, as well as social media. This systematic propaganda is a necessary condition for passing the political discourse that preserves the interests

¹Ibid. p. 87

and wealth of the rich. It is in the service of a certain elite that controls economically and politically, so it was necessary to serve it through media as well.

References:

- [1] Anatole, L. America between Truth and Falshood, Anatomy of National Democracy, See: Nasser Al-Saadoun, The Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut 2008.
- [2] Chomsky, N. American Hegemony or Survival to World Domination, Trans: Sami al-Kaaki, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Beirut, 2004, 1st edition.
- [3] Chomsky, N. Controlling the Mob, Conversations with David Barsamian, Trans: Ali Hijazi, Al-Ahlia Publishing, Amman, 1997, Dr.
- [4] Chomsky, N. Deterring Democracy, Trans: FadelJetkar, Dar Kanaan for Publishing and Distribution, Damascus, 1st Edition, 1992.
- [5] Chomsky, N. Failed States (The Abuse of Power and the Attack on Democracy), Trans: Sami Al-Kaaki, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, 2007.
- [6] Chomsky, N. Illusions of the Middle East, Trans: ShereenFahmy, Al-Shorouk International Library, Cairo, 2003
- [7] Chomsky, N. Introductions, Trans: Mahmoud Barhoum and Nawal Al-Qassar Al-Syriani, The Arab Institute for Studies and Publishing, Amman, 2007, 1st edition.
- [8] Chomsky, N. Pirates and Emperors of International Terrorism in the Real World, Houran Publishing, Syria, Volume 1
- [9] Chomsky, N. Rogue States (The Use of Force in World Affairs), Trans: Osama Esber, Obeikat Library, Saudi Arabia, 2004.
- [10] Chomsky,N. The Dangerous Sultan (US Foreign Policy in the Middle East), trans: Gilbert Al-Shakar, Dar Al-Saqi, Beirut, 2007.
- [11] Chomsky, N., What Uncle Sam Wants, Trans: Adel Al-Moallem, Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo, 1998, 1st edition.
- [12] Donziger. S. ed., The Real War on Crime, Criminal Justice Commission Report (Harper Collins, 1996), Niels Christie, Crime as an Industry (Routledge, 1993)
- [13] Harb, A. Varieties of Theory and Spectra of Freedom (Critique of Eordio and Chomsky), Arab Cultural Center, Beirut
- [14] Hegel, F. J.W., The Philosophy of History, Trans: Imam Abd al-Fattah, Dar al-Tanweer, Cairo, 1973.
- [15] Ozri, A. The Psychology of Violence, Journal of Educational Sciences (Institutional Violence and the Institutionalization of Violence, n° 36.
- [16] Schmemann, S. and Gehl, D. New York Times, February 27, 1998.
- [17] Tawfiq al-Hakim, H. The Phenomenon of Political Violence in Arab Regimes, Doctoral Dissertation Series, Arab Unity Center, Beirut, 1992, 1st edition.
- [18] Zadeh Al-Kurdi. I, The Problematic Definition of Terrorism, Centerfor Secular Studies and Research in the Arab World, The Arab Center, Beirut, 2017.