

**Paper Presented at:
The AMSS 33rd Annual Conference
George Mason University
Arlington Campus – Virginia**

Sept. 24 - 6, 2004

**“Knowledge/Power Regime: The Global Politics of
Development and Governance”
By: Md. Saidul Islam, Ph.D. Candidate
(York University, Canada)**

Abstract

One of the post-modern critiques of development and governance is that development proceeds by creating different discourses and practices and thereby extends its power over different realms of society. It is constantly expanding its power and governance by constructing new domains of thought and creating abnormalities that subsequently justify certain interventions. Escobar (1995), for example, very nicely delineates how ‘poverty’ was discovered and ‘problematized’ and the ‘Third World’ was constructed in the discourse of development after Second World War, and how two-third of the world population was put under a regime of control and governance by discursive practices. The conspicuous process is *problematization*: creating knowledge in a very efficient way, *institutionalization*: bureaucratization and managerialism, and finally *normalization of power and governance*. This is what Michel Foucault (1979, 1986) discovers and explicates the relation and exercise of power and governance in modern society. One of the apparent implications of this extension of power and governance is that it privileges certain actors, and marginalizes others who are supposed to be privileged. This paper is a vigorous attempt to explicate and uncover the recent construction and labelling of Muslims as a *patient to be treated* through the creation of “new body of knowledge” in the discourse of development and governance by the center of power; how Muslims have been put under severe surveillance and control by different discursive practices; and how that serves the lucrative interests of different corporations and thereby the power of capitalism is extended in a normalized manner.

I: Development and Governance: A Post-Modern Critique

Historically, development, though conventionally understood as a lucrative concept, notoriously became a governing tool for the dominating groups over the dominated. The notion of 'development' was introduced and popularized during the time of colonization as colonial empires were seeking for legitimacy for governance. This introduction was nothing new, but an integral part of capitalist expansion in which colonization *per se* was a necessary condition (Singh 1998). After the end of Second World War, the notion of development embraced numerous transformations and meanings; however, the issue of power and governance remained inherent in the discourse of development.

A close examination of capitalist mode of development explicates that its inherent nature is 'accumulation' and 'legitimization' (Panitch 1977). It has a tendency of 'ruthless expansion' by constantly revolutionizing its mode of production, as without it, capitalism will die (Black Star North Zine). History witnessed this scenario of expansion again and again.

McMichael (2000), for example, elaborates how capitalism created the 'international food regime' by introducing 'Public Law 480 (PL-480) Programme' in the USA to increase consumption of US agricultural commodities in the foreign countries, and thereby change the dietary of the so called Third World population. The centerpiece of this new revolution of capitalism was the US government strategy of 'green power', a strategy of aggressive agro-exporting to consolidate America's role as the 'bread-basket' of the world. The constant expansion of capitalism in the domain of food and thereby gaining more power is remarkable: it led the so-called Third World population, including Muslim societies, to shift their traditional food to wheat-based diet. Gradually the dietary shifted one step further,

as some consumers shifted up the food chain to animal protein (beef, poultry, and pork). The fast-food industries like KFC, McDonalds, Pizza Hut and many others mushroomed all over the world. Consumption of these new diets, resulted by the capitalist expansion, became identified with 'American Way of Life', and 'Modernization' that captured the imagination of millions of people and went on unchallenged. The same scenario can be found in other sectors of development including fashion and sex industries.

An indispensable part of this capitalist expansion and thereby extension of its power is to constantly create and re-create discursively new domains of thought that subsequently justify governance and interventions. Prominent scholars of post-structuralism and post-modern perspective brilliantly explain how imperial power is extended through discursively creation and re-creation of different domains of thought in the discourse of development in order to justify certain actions and interventions. Escobar (1995), for example, nicely delineates how poverty was 'discovered' and 'problematized', and the 'Third World' was constructed in the discourse of development, and how two-third of the world population was put under a regime of control by discursive practices. 'The poor increasingly appeared as a social problem requiring a new ways of intervention in society' (p. 22), and 'the treatment of poverty allowed society to conquer new domains' (p. 23).

The management of poverty then called for interventions in education, health, hygiene, morality, and employment, and the instilment of good habits of association, savings, child rearing and so on. The result was a panoply of interventions that accounted for a domain of knowledge and intervention. Not only poverty, but also health, education, hygiene, employment, and poor quality of life in towns and cities were constructed as social problems, requiring extensive

knowledge about the population and appropriate modes of social planning (Escobar 1992). 'The most significant aspect of this phenomenon was the setting into place of apparatuses of knowledge and power that took upon themselves to optimize life by producing it under modern, "scientific" conditions' (Escobar 1995, p. 23). By constructing the discourse of 'sustainable development', and problematizing 'global survival', capitalism conquered 'nature', in which the exploitation of nature becomes legitimate (Escobar 1995; Brosius 1999; McMichael 2000).

If we delve deeply into this construction and discursive practices, we will find an inherent power relation. The Third World is constructed by *distancing* it away from the "civilized" and developed West. Due to the construction of the Third World, the power relation between the agency who constructs, and constructed subjects becomes "father-child" or "doctor-patient" (Escobar 1995, p. 159). This akin to what Edward Said sees in Orientalism:

[Orientalism] can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient- dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, setting it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient... My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse we can not possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage- and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post enlightenment period (1979, p. 3).

Thinking North-South relations, or more precisely, governing one by the other, in terms of *representation*, as elaborated by Doty (1996), reorients and complicates the way we understand this particular aspect of global politics. North-South relations become more than an area of theory and practice in which various policies have been enacted and theories formulated. "They become a realm of

politics wherein the very identities of peoples, states, and regions are constructed through representational practices” (p. 2). Thinking in terms of representational practices calls our attention to an economy of abstract binary oppositions that we routinely draw upon and frame our thinking. Doty reminds:

Developed/under-developed, “first world”/“third world”, core/periphery, metropolis/satellite, advanced industrialized/less-developed, modern/traditional, and real states/quasi states are just a few that readily come to mind. While there is nothing natural, inevitable, or arguably even useful about these divisions, they remain widely circulated and accepted as legitimate ways to categorize regions and peoples of the world. Thinking in terms of representational practices highlights the arbitrary, constructed, and political nature of these and many other oppositions through which we have come to “know” the world and its inhabitants and that have enabled and justified certain practices and policies (1996, pp. 2-3).

In this way, capitalist development, which has an imperial character, is constantly expanding its power by constructing new domains of knowledge and policies. The conspicuous process is *problematization*: creating knowledge in a very efficient way to represent that domain, *institutionalization*: bureaucratization and managerialism, and finally *normalization of power*: the effects of power is rationalized, and go on uncontested. This is what Michel Foucault (1979, 1986) discovers and explicates the relation and exercise of power in the modern society. One of the apparent implications of this extension of power is that it ‘privilege[s] certain actors, and marginalize[s] others’ (Brosius 1999, p. 38). As Doty (1996) puts, in case of North-South relations, “one entity has been able to construct ‘realities’ that were taken seriously and acted upon and the other entity has been denied equal degrees or kinds of agency” (p. 3). The process is going on undefeated and unchallenged. The central character of capitalist development is not merely an economic one, but rather a whole package of power, production, governance and

social relations. One of the recent domains of capitalist construction and expansion is the “Muslims”.

II: ‘MUSLIMS’ AS A NEW ‘DOMAIN OF THOUGHT’ IN THE DISCOURSE OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

After the horrific event of September 11, 2001, scholars and policy-makers in the North are preoccupied with issues like security and emerging relations between Muslims and center of capitalist power. The relations have focused on international terrorism, change of regimes, economic and political development, and the promotion of Western democracy and human rights. To suggest that these issues exhaust the content of the relations, however, obscures the *productivity* of the governing practices that have been important aspects of these relations. In other words, the various issues that have been central to the relations between Muslims and center of capitalist power have been characterized by practices that have been implicated in the production of meanings and identities. These meanings and identities cannot be separated from the relations that have developed between the Muslims and center of capitalist power. In contrast of the traditional orientations, I suggest that the relations have been more than these issues, rather the practices of *representation* of Muslims by the center of capitalist power. By representation, I mean the ways in which Muslims have been discursively represented by policy-makers, scholars, journalists, and the others in the United States and its close allies. This does not refer to the “truth” and “knowledge” that the center of capitalist power has discovered and accumulated about Muslims, but rather to the ways in which regimes of “truth” and

“knowledge” have been produced and constructed in order to justify governance and certain interventions.

Although the construction and representation of Muslims in the discourse of development and governance started long before, it became quite apparent after the Cold War, and more intense after September 11, 2001. After the end of Cold War, the center of capitalist power did not have any common enemy, and hence a new domain of thought was necessary to construct. Different intellectuals emerged in the USA to construct this ‘new enemy’. Not only that, they also constructed the world as “Unipolar” in which the USA is the only superpower to dominate the world politics. This kind of construction has two dreadful consequences. First, it gives an unprecedented status to the USA, and instigates to strengthen its domination over the globe at any cost. Secondly, it overlooks and questions the legitimacy and compatibility of other civilizations, especially Islamic civilization, alongside the American one. For instance, Samuel Huntington (1996), in his theory, “the clash of civilization”, constructs a future clash between civilizations, and he suggests the USA to dismantle and emasculate any kind of military as well as economic build-up in other countries especially in the East. Huntington (1996) has pointed out to its long-term and short-term implications for Western policy and suggested followings to sustain global hegemony and governance:

- It is the interest of the West to promote grater co-operation and unity within its own civilization, particularly between its European and North American components.
- To incorporate into the West societies in Eastern Europe and Latin America, whose cultures are close to those of the West.
- To promote and maintain co-operative relations with Russia and Japan.
- To prevent escalation of local inter civilization conflicts into major inter civilizations wars.

- To limit the expansion of the military strength of Confucian and Islamic states.
- To moderate the reduction of Western military capabilities and maintain military superiority in East and South West Asia.
- To exploit differences and conflicts among Confucian and Islamic states.
- To support in other civilization groups sympathetic to Western values and interests.
- To strengthen international institution that reflects and legitimizes Western interest and values and promotes the involvement of non-western states in those institutions.

Two other prominent figures, who pioneered in bringing Muslims to the imperial 'domain of thought' and making them as a 'new enemy' of the center of capitalist power, were Bernard Lewis and Fouad Azmi.¹ Lewis, who came to the USA from UK some thirty years ago to teach at Princeton, became prominent figure in the Zionist lobby because of his fervent anti-communism, disapproval of everything about contemporary Arabs and Islam, portrayal of Arab backwardness as viable route to truth. Samuel Huntington derived his lucrative concept from one of Lewis's essays about the 'Return of Islam'. What made Lewis's work so damaging was its appeal - in the absence of any counter-argument - to American policy-makers. That, together with the superciliousness of his manner, turned him into an 'authority' even though he had not entered, much less lived in, the Arab world in decades. His last book, *What Went Wrong?* became a post-11 September best-seller and, required reading for the US military, despite its unsupported and often factually incorrect statements about the history of the Arabs over the past five hundred years². Reading the book, one gets the idea that the Arabs are a

¹ It also immediately reminds us of issues raised in different theoretical fashions by David Campbell (*Writing Security*) and Ken Booth (*Cold Wars of the Mind*) about the discursive and ideational perpetuation of dangers that are said to threaten the Western body politic in order to imbue notions of security, politics, and the state itself with purposes and meanings that make particular types of policy possible.

² We can easily find a pattern here. Many members of the Clinton administration (including Clinton himself) admitted to reading Robert Kaplan's book on the former Yugoslavia (*Balkan Ghosts*) which made the argument that the ethnic violence was long-standing, inevitable, and impossible to stop. These

useless bunch of primitives, easier to attack and destroy than ever before (Said 2003).

Fouad Ajami is a Lebanese Shia educated in the US who made his name as a pro-Palestinian commentator. But by the mid-1980s, he was teaching at Johns Hopkins; he had become a fervent anti-Arab ideologue and had been taken up by the right-wing Zionist lobby. The author of two or three books, he has become influential as a 'native informant' - the Arab 'expert' is a rare species on American networks. Ten years ago, he started deploying 'we' as an imperial collectivity which, along with Israel, never does anything wrong. Arabs are to blame for everything and therefore deserve 'our' contempt and hostility. Like Lewis, Ajami has not been a resident of the Arab world for years, although he is rumored to be close to the Saudis, of whom he has recently spoken as models for the Arab world's future governance (Said 2003).

By bringing the 'Muslims' into the 'domain of thought' of imperial capitalist discourse, some critics think, these intellectuals committed "homicidal blunder", and "intellectual atrocities". Apart from adding fuel to the expansion of capitalist imperialism, it suspends the room for possible peaceful coexistence, and, instead, it instigates cultural, economic, military means to suppress other nations. Ironically, American foreign policy has been designed accordingly, and the recent actions of the center of the capitalist power are enough proof of their legacy.

assumptions unfortunately could be seen in later US policy towards the region. It is a similar situation with Lewis and Huntington, which made the Bush Doctrine's Middle East policy possible.

III: REPRESENTING AND GOVERNING MUSLIMS

As the 'Muslims' appeared as a 'domain of thought' in imperial capitalist discourse, Muslim societies witnessed a massive landing of experts, mostly Western, each in charge of investigating, measuring, and theorizing about this or that little aspect of the Muslim societies. The proliferation of experts on the 'Muslims Subjects' in the West became more intense after the event of September 11, 2001, and Muslims became an 'object of knowledge' and a 'new problematization' in the Western discourse. It is interesting, yet an irony, to see how 'various problems' were gradually and suddenly discovered in Muslims societies and Muslims were 'problematized' and constructed with various negative images in the discourse of development, and how one-fifth of the world population was put under the regime of control and intervention by discursive practices, as it was done on the so-called Third World population after World War II.

It is remarkable to see how Muslims were treated as a homogeneous mass or a monolithic entity despite their political, religious and cultural diversity, and how the horrific actions of a handful of fundamentalists, a tiny deviated fraction of whole Muslim spectrum, are made a representation of the whole community, in other word, how Muslims are often judged *en masse* by the standards of their worst representatives. In the Western media and academia, Muslims are discursively constructed as 'other'. Many of these constructions equate Islam with evil through portrayals of Muslims as an irrational, uncivilized, threatening and uniquely fundamentalist "other". "Islam Has Attacked Us", said Franklin Graham in North Carolina shortly after the September 11 attacks (NBC Nightly News, 16 November 2001). Like his father, the Revered Billy Graham, Franklin Graham is

one of America's most powerful evangelical leaders. He delivered the benediction at George W. Bush's inauguration, and is heir to his father's extensive ministry. Americans of all faiths were asked to embrace one another and unite against terrorism. Mr. Graham's words, however, dismiss any interfaith dialogue: "The God of Islam is not the same God", he alleged. "Islam", Mr. Graham concluded, "is a very evil and wicked religion".

Mr. Graham's perception of Islam as an "evil" religion strikes a familiar tone in the United States. Here, hostilities with elements within the Muslim world are commonly constructed and presented as a conflict between good and evil. President Bush responded to the September 11 attacks by launching a "crusade" against terrorism.³ He promises to "rid the world of evil"⁴, to "fight the evil ones"⁵, and has inventoried an "axis of evil"⁶ constituted primarily of Muslim nations. His rhetoric fits a pattern. His father, in the crisis leading up to the 1991 Gulf War, implored Americans to "confront evil for the sake of good"⁷. Their predecessor, President Reagan, in 1986 referred to Libya's Colonel Gaddafi as an "evil man" (Slevin 2002) before bombing his country.

The discursive construction of Muslims in the imperial discourse is very painful, yet interesting. Muslims have been constructed with negativity as opposed to the positivity of the West. "American was targeted for attack", said President Bush, "because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the

³ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *Remarks by the President upon Arrival*, The South Lawn, Washington DC, 16 September 2001.

⁴ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *President's Remark at the National Day of Prayers and Remembrance*, the National Cathedral, Washington, DC, 14 September 2001.

⁵ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *Remarks by the President to the NYPD Command and Control Center Personnel*, NYPD Command and control Centre, New York, 6 February 2002.

⁶ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *the President's State of the Union Address*, United States Capitol, Washington, DC, 19 January 2002.

world”⁸. “This conflict”, he continues, “is a fight to save the civilized world”, because the terrorists hate freedom and democracy⁹. He is joined by other politicians. Newt Gingrich, speaker of the House of the House of Representatives, insists that “civilization must win” in this conflict¹⁰. US Secretary of State Collin Powel adds that the terrorists hate “civilization”¹¹. From the outset, we were told that this is a war in defence of freedom, democracy and civilization itself, even before we knew who the terrorists were or what motivated them to act. The rhetoric is vague and obscure. All that is clear in this haze of ambiguity is that it is something to do with Islam and the Middle East that we are fighting. The President’s declaration, “you are with us or you are with the terrorists”¹² implies a binary construction of spaces. The social production of space implicit in these terms is bound with the production of difference, subjectivities, and social order. This distance, which is not a simple marker of cultural diversity, is branded with inferiority and negativity (terrorist, evil, militant, backward, underdeveloped, poor, lacking, traditional and so forth). When these kinds of negative images are constructed on a group of people, they automatically become preamble to certain treatments and interventions, and thus, the former justifies the latter.

The construction does not stop there; rather, permeates in the arena of psychology. One example of a negative construction of Muslim comes from Ann

⁷ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *the President’s State of the Union Address*, United States Capitol, Washington, DC, 29 January 1991.

⁸ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *Statement of President Bush in His Televised Address to the Nation*, 11 September, 2001.

⁹ USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *Remarks by the President to the CEO Summit*, Pundong Shangri-La Hotel, Shanghai, People’s Republic of China, 20 October 2001.

¹⁰ Remarks by Newt Gingrich, quoted by Mary Riddell, ‘Just What is This “Civilization”?’ *The Observer*, 28 October 2001.

¹¹ Remarks by Secretary of State Collin L. Powel on *the News Hour with Jim Lehrer*, PBS, 13 September 2001.

¹² USA, Office of the Press Secretary, *Remarks by the President in Announcement of Financial Aspects of Terrorism*, Financial Crime Enforcement Network, Vienna, VA, 7 November 2001.

Coulter, a best-selling author, prominent political analyst and columnist. One of her recent articles (6 September 2002) recounts an incident where a 'Muslim' passenger en route from Germany to Kosovo attacked a stewardess on the flight. In it, Ms Coulter bitterly complains about how few newspapers reported the story and how 'not one mentioned that the attacker was a Muslim'. At first glance, the basis for her complaint is confusing. It seems nonsensical that we should strive to identify the religion of any given criminal when reporting stories about their criminal acts. How is Islam relevant to this story? The relevance, sadly, is found in the minds of people like Ms Coulter who seem to believe that only Islam can serve as the motive for a Muslim's actions. For this reason, they find it necessary to condemn newspapers that do not identify this erroneous connection between Islam and violence, and that do not thereby further isolate Muslim communities and further instil dangerous anti-Muslim stereotypes among their readership.

Ms Coulter's views resurface in a subsequent article she wrote following the revelation that one of the suspects in the 2002 DC area sniper shootings was a Muslim convert. She ridicules attempts that were made to find psychological or other non- Islamic causes for the sniper's violent behaviour. 'He's a Muslim', Ms Coulter implores. 'That's his condition and his diagnosis' (31 October 2002). In this way, Ms Coulter presents Islam as a disease responsible for the alleged sniper's violence and the violence of countless other 'Muslim' criminals. There is no sense in blaming anything else. Not the US army, where the sniper developed his marksmanship skills, nor his chronic unemployment, nor any mental delusions he might be suffering from. As Mohamed Elmasry, president of the Canadian Islamic Congress put it: 'It should not be strange news to suggest that Muslims are prone to the same psychological conditions as the rest of humanity; that they

aren't immune to mental breakdown under stress or, for that matter, to psychopathic and other antisocial tendencies' (4 November 2002).

Even where the motives of these criminals have religious elements, why are their actions automatically attributed to Islam rather than to distortions of it? Other popular figures have joined in the attacks. Oriana Fallaci, one of Italy's most renowned journalists who has lectured at such respected institutions as Harvard, Columbia and Yale, published a book shortly after September 11 entitled *Rage and Pride* (2002). It quickly became a best-seller in Italy and elsewhere in Europe. In it, Ms Fallaci refers to Muslims as the peculiar 'sons of Allah'. She describes them as 'vile creatures' that like to 'urinate on baptisteries' and 'multiply like rats'. Freedom of expression arguments aside, one is left to question whether the publication of such hateful words about Jewish or other vulnerable religious minorities would today be tolerated in the West, let alone render an author a best-seller. Asks one commentator, Reza Ebrahimi (20 June 2002), 'does a cause need a Holocaust to be intellectualized?'

The construction of Muslims as "others" by different negative images has some obvious implications. First, it limits social space of Muslims in the West. Starting from their inner-self to the job market to the global arena, Muslims suffer from a considerable amount of agony, lack of a sense of belongings and massive insecurity. Second, the displacement of Muslims from the West becomes legitimate. As the general public starts viewing Muslims as a potential threat to the West, any form of physical and cultural violence on them goes on without any major challenge and protest. The oppression on Muslims does not create any sympathy in the minds of the Western people. Third, from the part of constructing agency, we find different ideologies justifying their claims and constructions. It leads the

Muslim subjects to react in various forms, ranging from death, through submission and internalization of inferiority, to a variety of resistances- from everyday forms through sporadic uprisings to mass political mobilization. Fourth, the construction deploys a regime of control and governance on them. As they are branded with negative images (such as terrorists, militants), they will need a form of treatment. As the patient needs treatment from the doctor, the USA, self-proclaimed as “Good”, and “Civilized” has automatic role and intervention on these “Muslim patients”. It signalled a significant shift in power relation between the USA and Muslims- the relations of domination and subordination.

With these constructions, and labelling different convenient images on Muslims, the war on terrorism was justified. Additional grounds like the construction of the “Weapons of Mass Destruction” (WMD), “Al-Qayeda Network”, were staged and promulgated. Many theories and models emerged to guide this ‘inevitable campaign’. The whole world witnessed a remarkable growth of interest in the Muslim world, what once had been an area, which only diplomats and pioneering scholars ventured to explore, became almost, overnight the center of attraction to government officials, as well as scholars. Several other problems like oppression on the women, repression by the government, ties to the terrorists, etc. were also discovered and discursively constructed to deploy a regime of control and intervention on the Muslim countries. A whole series of development activities becomes inevitable to address and treat the Muslim “patients”.

In this way, a whole range of new knowledge on Muslims was produced. To understand this, one must look not at the elements themselves, but at the system of relations established among them, as Escobar illustrates,

It is a system that allows the systematic creation of objects, concepts, and strategies... the system of relations establishes a discursive practices that sets the rule of the game: who can speak, from what point of view, with what authority, and according to what criteria of expertise. It sets the rules that must be followed for this or that problem, theory, or object to emerge and be named, analyzed, and eventually transformed into a policy plan (1995, pp. 40-41).

However, not all have authority to do that. Some clear principles of authority were in operation. They concern the role of experts, from whom certain criteria of knowledge and competence were asked; institutions, such as Think Tank, FBI, CIA and Homeland Security, which have the moral, professional, and legal authority to name subjects, and define strategies; and the US Administration, the White House, which carries the symbols of capital and power.

It is hegemonic because it blocks all other forms of knowledge and different other models of knowing. It completely suspends and erodes in a deeper manner Muslims' ability to define themselves, and to take care of their own lives. Muslims become the target of more sophisticated practices, of variety of programmes that seemed inescapable. In order to escape from the backwardness and 'problems', Muslim societies need whole transformation, sometimes by 'changing a regime'. But who has the ability and authority to do it? Certainly *the* USA! In this way, the whole social fabrics of the Muslim societies are put under the surveillance of the USA; everything is subjected to the eye of the new experts. The policies and programmes that originate from this vast field of knowledge inevitably carry with them strong normalizing components. The Iraq-War was not waged because of Iraq's possession of "weapons of mass destruction" but through imperialists' most lethal weapon- the "weapons of mass persuasion":

You could almost say this was a war invented and produced by Disney studios. It was monumental, it was full of slogans and images, it was like a

production. And it happened, and [they] got it over so fast, they got away with it too (Quoted in Rutherford, 2004, p. 3).

The imperial project produces a regime of truth and norms about Muslims, by passing judgement on the whole social group and forecasting their future. Different client groups are constructed even before interacting them. After formulating the 'problems', different lucrative policies and solutions (like 'taste of liberation' in case of Iraq, 'road map' for the Middle East) are presented. It does everything, but avoids responsibility for plan's implementation. If the policies eventually fail, the blame goes to the victims. In the war-torn Iraq, when the US failed to restore orders there, they evaded their responsibility by imposing the blames on the Iraqis by saying 'Iraqis are not ready for democracy'.

The power relation goes on unchallenged, though sometimes resisted. The continuous portrayal and display of pictures showing Muslims' deplorable situation (malnourishment, hunger, starvation, oppression of women by veiling...) on many covers of Western magazines is the most striking symbol of power of America over the Muslim world. Intentionally created with scientific evidence and calculations in order to make unquestioned-acceptance, these actions exert a 'symbolic violence' on Muslims, as they regulate the everyday going and coming of people. This scientific representation is extremely dehumanizing and objectifying. The power relation is not seen. It is not rational; but seen as rational. It privileges some, but marginalizes others who are supposed to be privileged.

Behind all these discursive constructions, wars and destruction lies the lucrative interest of capitalist corporations. Even in the center of capitalist power, this new scenario creates a huge job markets as 'terrorism and security' becomes a very profitable sector of investments. Society now requires new experts in

terrorism, new laws and lawyers, new policies, rules, regulations and interventions in order to save American citizens. This remarkable interest leads different universities to open a new discipline called 'terrorism and security study' to examine "Muslim patients". Institutions like Homeland Security emerge to justify actions and interventions. It creates and revolutionizes a series of new modes of productions and sectors of investments for the capitalists: finger-printing, numerous new technologies to detect terrorism, terrorism law firms, training and deployment of new and additional security personnel during emergency, reshaping of airport security, production and massive sale of masks and different other equipment and medicines in case of bio-terrorism, and a huge investment in military industry. The period becomes a hey-day for the print and electronic media. Different categories and levels of terrorist alerts have been introduced. For every national terrorist alert, people, out of fear, buy additional products for consumption during emergency situation that eventually stimulates national economy. Creating fear now becomes a new marketing strategy to sell products in a quick manner. Both in home and abroad, the ultimate remittances go to the corporate capitalists to the detriments of the Muslim subjects and civil rights of other citizens.

IV: THE RESURGENCE OF COLONIAL GOVERNANCE?

As we have seen, the event of September 11, 2001 provides a fertile ground for further expansion of capitalist imperialism and its power over the Muslim lands, as it supplies a valid justification for invading Afghanistan. "In wars, destruction, and numerous other abnormalities lies the lucrative interest of the corporations" (Escobar 1995, p. 41). American imperial expansion thus became

more aggressive. By using different rhetoric, (like “War on Terrorism”, “Liberating Iraq”, “Weapons of Mass Destruction”, and “Regime Change”), as we have seen before how imperialism expands by problematizing, the war was expanded to Iraq bulldozing world-wide resistance and protest¹³. Some more Muslim countries including Iran and Syria are assumed to be in the list of upcoming imperial invasion.

It has complicated the situation more than before, and poses more questions than answers with regard to the relation between the USA and Muslims. With the doctrine of ‘pre-emptive attack’, and ‘policy of instigation’ that America adopted, and thereafter actions and motives in Afghanistan and Iraq accordingly, one can find some obvious resemblance between the oppressive nature of British colonization and reified nature of American imperial aggression. Though the British does not have that much power to re-colonize the present world in its physical form, their colonial legacy in the form of colonizing the brains of the Muslim world is still prevalent, and most importantly they can be a great guiding partner of the USA to show and guide in colonizing the world. The British did it with their Zionist partners. All these three groups, America, British, and Zionists, are now working in a collaborative manner. Many may find it as a return of the colonial governance. Some inherent convergences between British colonization and American imperial aggression can be expounded here:

(a) Teaching/Spreading Civilization

Former colonial masters took the burden/responsibility to spread their so-called “superior” civilization all over the globe. This is called “white-men burden”,

¹³ There was in fact a massive protest and resistance within the United States too to oppose the war. Therefore, the imperial collectively does not include all population of the United States, rather it is

a concept in which the West viewed itself as the bearer of civilization to the darker races. French colonial historian Albert Sarraut claimed in 1923:

It should not be forgotten that *we* are centuries ahead of them, long centuries during which- slowly and painfully, through a lengthy effort of research, invention, meditation, and intellectual progress aided by the very influence of our temperate climate- a magnificent heritage of science, experience, and moral superiority has taken shape, which makes us eminently entitled to protect and lead the races lagging behind us (Rist 1997, p. 58).

They justified their colonial invasion (removing the problem through extermination, suppression, and containment) over the globe with this ‘responsibility’. This notion of ‘white-men burden’ was ramified by theories of Darwin: the survival of the fittest, and the struggle for existence. The colonial invasion was presented as a law of nature that all species are in constant struggle and only the fittest, the whites, will survive and deserve to dominate and govern (McMichael 2000).

The colonial discourse, legacy, and savagery can also be found in the modern version language. Behind the construction of different categories like “Asians”, “Africans”, “People of Colour”, “People of the Third World”, “Moslem”- there are inherent connotations of racism, as we have seen before. As Lohmann (1999) says, “racism is a process of social control, not a set of beliefs and feelings” (p. 70). Muslims are constructed and hence viewed as ‘different’ from the West. Difference is not a simple marker of cultural diversity, but rather measured or constructed in terms of *distance* from the civilizing Euro-American Culture. Difference here is branded with inferiority and negativity. This is tantamount to the white racism to the non-white: “The colour of skin, facial and bodily features- all

comprised of the American elites with almost identical interest and their collaborators that include some

becomes signifiers of inferiority, composed of an inversion and a projection of what is considered ‘evil’ by the colonizing society” (Bannerji 1996, p. 117). Such visibility (of colour, and of minority in the West) indicates not only “difference”, and “inferiority”, but also preamble to “special treatment”, the treatment that the ‘superior’ colonizers showed to the colonized subjects: removing the problem through extermination, suppression, and containment. As part of visible minorities in the West, the bodies of Muslims ‘are used to construct for them some sort of social zone, or prison, since they cannot crawl out of their skins, and this signals what life has to offer them in the Western world. This special type of visibility is a social construction as well as political a statement’ (Bannerji 1996, p. 120).

America is now following the footsteps of the British. It has taken the responsibility to spread the American ‘superior’ culture, much of which has already been permeated over the globe by the process of globalization including media conglomerates. The USA has shouldered the responsibility to teach ‘democracy’ and offer ‘liberation’ throughout the world. And if hundreds or even thousands of people are killed by America because of that, it is, to America, “price for democracy”. This is an optimum form of deception, occlusion and reification, as this kind of statement shifts the responsibility from oppressor to the people who are oppressed or killed. Like the British colonial expansion and invasion, the USA adopted almost similar kind of methods in Afghanistan, and then in Iraq. And all have been done in the name of development, liberation or democracy.

(b) Economic Motive

Behind all rhetorical guises lies the real motive of economic interest. However, in the discourse of colonialism, this motive is hardly mentioned. Lured

Muslims as well. Imperialism and colonialism must be viewed in class terms as well as in national terms.

by the enormous wealth and property in the East and Africa, British started their colonial expansion. First they transferred only the invaluable goods like gold and silver. With the invention of steam engine, they revolutionized their exploitation. They now transferred all other goods, like agricultural products and other raw materials. Within few hundred years of exploitation and transfer of wealth, a huge resource gap occurred between the colonizers and the colonized territories. The former colonized countries are still suffering due to this huge resource gap.

It appears quite clear that lured by oil resource in the Middle East, and in Central Asia, the USA invaded Afghanistan and Iraq. It might be surprising to many to hear that the invasion on Afghanistan by the USA was designed around two months before the September 11 attack. Aijaz Ahmed, a visiting Professor at York University, mentioned in a seminar that a dispute occurred between the Taliban government and the USA in a meeting three months before the invasion of Afghanistan over the issue of the construction of oil pipe on the soil of Afghanistan. America wants oil from the Central Asia, which is known as “Second Kuwait” in terms of oil reserve, and Afghanistan is a strategical area in that regard. One Taliban general in a press conference, as Aijaz Ahmed quoted, mentioned, “We have been threatened to be attacked within three months if we do not comply with the USA”. And ironically exactly after three months, the USA attacked Afghanistan. By this time, September 11 happened, and becomes a valid justification for the invasion on Afghanistan. Aijaz Ahmed, hence, said, “September 11 is a great gift for the United States” (Ahmed 2002).

Eric Margolis, an editor of Toronto Sun, gives an estimation of oil imported by the USA that previously it had to import one-third of its demand, now it has to import around half of its demand, and after few years, it will have to import two-

third of its demand. Therefore, a great concern regarding future oil crisis permeated over the American administration. Moreover, oil is power, and Bush family has a long history of multi-billion-dollar-oil-business. Oil is one of the motivating forces for the USA to go for war on Iraq as Iraq has world's 14 percent oil reserve, the second largest of the world next to Saudi Arabia. If the USA can capture and control the oil resource of Iraq by assigning a puppet President there, who will be docile and subservient to the USA as it did in Afghanistan, the USA will be able to virtually dismantle the power of OPEC, and thereby hold the control of oil-pricing. Bush administration hence repeatedly urged the Iraqi people not to destroy the oil fields. It is because oil is the reason for which America invaded Iraq. It is assumed that the USA will perpetuate a permanent crisis in Iraq so as to manipulate and exploit better, and thereby the power of the country will be permanently diminished, so that it can never be a great threat to Israel, the "great" ally of the USA. As we know, Israel gets \$ 2.2 billion military aid from the USA per annum (Pilger 2002; Rutherford 2004).

The motive of the USA has become clear as the pipelines on the land of Afghanistan are in the process of building. Recently, the United States Army was criticised by an American Congressman for granting a multi-million dollar oil industry-related contract to Halliburton Co., run by Vice President Dick Cheney until 2000. The Army Corps of Engineers said that an oil fire-fighting contract had been given to Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg, Brown and Root (KBR) without being put out to tender (Al-Jazeera, April 5, 2003). The whole infrastructures of Iraq, including water, electricity, transportation and communication were deliberately destroyed, as the top 8 corporations were already given contract to rebuild Iraq by using Iraqi oil. "This is an absolute terrorism, not against terrorism"

said Baker (2003). Poverty, illiteracy, hunger, displacement, war-torn debris of infrastructures become the basis of lucrative industry for planners, experts and civil servants. This is a common feature of imperial expansion, as Escobar says, “development proceeded by creating ‘abnormalities’ (such as the ‘illiterate’, the ‘underdeveloped’, the ‘malnourished’, ‘small farmers’, or ‘landless peasants), which it would later treat and reform” (1995, p. 41).

(c) Divide and Rule policy

The most obvious policy adopted by the British colonizers to capture the political power and thereby control the colonized territories is the ‘divide and rule policy’. The policy includes constructing cultural, political, and geographical spaces and divisions. If the ruling government refused to co-operate with the British, they always supported the opposition by providing arms and money, and instigated to overthrow the ruling government. After overthrowing, the new administration used to become a real puppet of, and thereby facilitator to, the colonial administration. The real power remained in the hands of the colonial administration. During the colonial era, the development and organization of the European society was pursued by disorganizing the non-European colonies (McMichael 2000).

For long time, Pentagon, the American Army, as well as the CIA, adopted a policy known as the “policy of instigation”. It means, if the USA wants to ensure its presence, or to justify an invasion, it will, by the help of the CIA and Pentagon, create an artificial crisis by providing money and arms to a group who will subsequently commit some atrocities therein. Those atrocities become a valid justification and pretext for the USA to intervene and thereby strengthen its presence and governance there (Ahmed 2002; Albert and Shalom 2002). There are

proofs that Saddam Hussein, who was first installed in power by CIA, was instigated to attack Iran and also Kuwait. Even Osama bin Laden was also a creation of the USA. America supported Northern Alliance, the opposition to the ruling Taliban, in Afghanistan and installed CIA representative Hamid Karzai after occupation. All members of the new Iraqi administration are known to have long association with the CIA. The real power now lies in the hand of the US Army. The policy of instigation is, to some extent, tantamount to the British policy of “divide and rule” during the oppressive period of colonization. American aggression can be worse than the British colonization as a new doctrine has also been added to the US-policy, the “doctrine of pre-emptive attack”. It means, to attack a nation or a group of people assuming as a threat, before the actual threat comes or is detected clearly. This is the doctrine used by A. Hitler that led to the Second World War (Ahmed 2002).

(d) Christian Missionaries

Cross or Christian missionaries always followed and facilitated the colonial administration. The ensuing colonial exchange, however, was captured in the post colonial African saying: “When the white man came, he had the Bible and we had the land. When the white man left, we had the Bible and he had the land.” Under colonialism, when non-Europeans lost control of their land, their spiritual life was compromised insofar it was connected to their landscapes. It was difficult to sustain material and cultural integrity under these degrading conditions (McMichael 2000).

As an example, in 1757 the forces of British East India Company (the merchants had come to raise an army as well!) defeated the Muslim Ruler of Bengal, Nawab Siraju-d-Daulah, at the Battle of Plassey. By 1793, the famous

British missionary, William Carey, had arrived in Calcutta. Work started on rendering the Bible into Bengali language and preparing other literature, and the missionary-run schools began to set up all over Bengal, and the sub-continent. The policy of the most Christian NGOs is to 'employ Muslims last' and to favor those who convert. The idea is to create economically and educationally influential community of converts who would, in due course, like in many parts of Africa, control all the key sectors of power: education, economy, social policy, bureaucracy and military. The direct colonization began to over after Second World War, but the missionaries remained in the colonies (Nuruzzaman 1994; Khan 1981; Hussain 1981; Islam 2001).

In case of Iraq and in Afghanistan, many missionaries have already started their operations. They are there with aids, and there are reports that they favor those who convert. A systematic poverty or impoverishment has been created by the USA in Afghanistan and in Iraq, so that the long-afflicted and poverty-ridden people have no other option than to go to the missionaries for aids. Missionaries see this situation a golden opportunity to convert the people. This in fact implies another and worst form of subjugation, and this was how the colonial administration systematically exploit the people of the colonized lands in all forms. Missionaries are said to have a dream of establishing a universal Christian State. As John Henry Borrow's 01 said:

I might sketch Christian movement in Musalman land which has touched, with the radiance of the cross, the Lebanon and the Persian mountains as well as the waters of the Bosphorus and which will be sure harbinger of the day when the Cairo and Damascus and Tehran shall be the servants of Jesus and when even the solitudes of Arab will be pierced and the Christ in the person of his disciples, shall enter the 'Kaba' (Nuruzzaman 1994, p. 2).

V: CONCLUSION: ANY ROOM FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE?

If Islam/Muslim is juxtaposed with the USA, and the relation is constructed with such a way that the former is inimical/antithetical to the latter, then, the survival of each increasingly depends on the limiting autonomy (power) of the other. The USA had this inimical relation with the former USSR, and the end result is the collapse of one. However, after the demise of USSR, the new constructed enemy is Islam, and hence, the imperial project must go on to fight with Islam to emasculate its potential forces. With this struggle, making or remaking of new forces or enemies, sometimes by constructing the world as 'good vs. evil' sometimes as 'we vs. they', the imperial project will try its best to survive, restructure, expand its power, and in Marxist term 'revolutionize', for without it imperialism has to embrace death.

The inherent nature of imperial governance is exploitation of human and natural resources by the way of colonization, development projects, globalization, and so forth. The oppression will go on until there is a balance of power. As there was a balance of power, the center of capitalism's conflict with the former USSR was not in a physical form, and hence, it was known as Cold War. However, with the staging gulf war, and demise of USSR, the balance of power collapsed, and Muslims pose no balance of power with the USA. Whatever military power Muslims possess, are in a process of complete emasculation. This analysis shows, Muslims must face imperial exploitation, oppression, and hegemonic governance until the Muslim world is united with its cultural, moral, and physical forces and potentialities, and poses a powerful entity and equilibrium to the USA.

Muslims do not afford to ignore that the USA is a powerful reality. Muslims should always negotiate with the USA in a peaceful manner rather than with violence and terrorism as it will only justifies imperial governance and

interventions. The USA should also keep in mind, as one of the anti-war protesters in Toronto wrote in his placard, “War for peace is like sex for virginity”. Whatever is the outcome of the negotiation; the power relation can never be subverted, unless Muslims are in a position to pose an equitable balance of power. The Soviet Union’s Premier, Joseph Stalin’s proclamation is worth to mention: “We are fifty or hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or they crash us” (Hettne 1990, p. 3).

We should not, however, suspend a room for peaceful co-existence. It is not possible unless and until the USA changes its lopsided and hegemonic attitude towards the Muslim world and Muslim communities. It has to remember and act upon the fact that

Terrorism can not be fought through military war, but by bringing justice and eliminating the roots of depression. History, both old and new, is rampant with examples of great powers that wasted its resources, and hence lost its privileged position in the world, by improving war apparatuses and overlooking the system of justice (Safi 2001, p. 6).

Western intelligentsia needs to have a paradigm shift from a conflicting outlook to a prospect for peaceful coexistence. Muslims, on the other hand, also should put themselves in a critical scrutiny. They should bear in mind that materialism, which is the basis of Western civilization, is not an evil. Islam is a combination of materialism and spiritualism. They have to admit the tremendous achievements of the Western civilization especially in the fields of science and technology. Both Muslims and the USA have to find a common ground to minimize tensions and conflicts, and seek for all-encompassing global solidarity and security based on universal justice, mutual recognition and tolerance. Opening a door for a civilizational dialogue is of paramount need for that.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Aijaz (2002). "Uncovering Truth: The Issues of Iraq and Palestine" a paper presented in a *Seminar in the Graduate Programme in Sociology*, York University. November 21.
- Albert, Michael and Stephen Shalom (2002). "Intervention in General: Parr A of 45 Questions and Answers Regarding US Foreign Policy". October 8.
www.zmag.org
- Al-Jazeera (2003). "Cheney's former employer promised slice of Iraqi oil pie". Saturday, April 5
- Baker, William (2003). "Christianity and Islam: Collusion or Coalition?" paper presented in 15th Annual Conference, *Forum for Social Studies*, University of Toronto, Canada. July 12-13.
- Bannerji, Himani (1996). "On the dark Side of the Nation: Politics of Multiculturalism and the State of 'Canada'" in *the Journal of Canadian Studies*. Vol. 31, No. 3
- Brosius, Peter J. (1999). Green Dots, Pink Hearts: Displacing Politics from the Malaysian Rain Forest. In *American Anthropologist* 101 (1):36-57
- Coulter, Ann (31 October 2002). 'Media Muslim Makeovers!', available online at: TownHall: Conservative News and Information 3 <http://www.townhall.com> 3 (16 December 2002).
- Coulter, Ann (6 September 2002). 'Murder for Fun and Prophet', available online at: TownHall: Conservative News and Information 3 <http://www.townhall.com> 3 (16 December 2002).
- Doty, Roxanna Lynn (1996). *Imperial Encounters*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ebrahimi, Reza (20 June 2002). "The New "Islamophobia"", available online at: IranMania News 3 <http://www.iranmania.com> 3 (16 December 2002).
- Elmasry, Mohamed (4 November 2002). 'Are Muslims Treated Fairly?' Opinion, The Ottawa Citizen.
- Escobar, Arturo (1992). 'Reflections on "Development": Grassroots Approaches and Alternative Politics in the Third World. *Futures* 24 (5): 411-36.
- Escobar, Arturo (1995). *Encountering Development: the Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fallaci, Oriana (2002). *The Rage and the Pride*, New York: Rizzoli International

- Foucault, "The Subject and Power", 208-26.
- Foucault, Michel (1979). "On Governmentality", *Ideology and Consciousness* 6: 5-21
- Foucault, Michel (1986). *The Use of Pleasure*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hettne, B. (1990). *Development Theory and the Three Worlds*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilization and the Making of the World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hussain, A. (1981). *Birth of Bangladesh: The Political Role of Missions*. London: Islamic Foundation.
- Islam, Md. Saidul (2001). "The Role of NGOs in Promoting Christianity; The Case of Bangladesh". *Intellectual Discourse*. Vol. 9. No. 2, 2001. International Islamic University Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.
- Khan, Abdul Karim (1981). *Christian Missions in Bangladesh: A Survey*. London: Islamic Foundation.
- Lohmann, Larry (1999). Forest Cleansing: Racial Oppression in Scientific Nature Conservation. *The Corner House*. Briefing No. 13: Forest Cleansing.
- McMichael, Philip (2000). *Development and Social Change*. London: Pine Forge Press
- Nuruzzaman (1994). "NGOs- the Web of New Colonization: Aid Merchant Buying up Sonar Bangla". *Impact International* (London). July 1994
- Panitch, Leo (1977). (ed.). *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Pilger, John (2002). "American Bid for Global Dominance", in *The New Statesman*. December 12.
- Rist, Gilbert (1997). *The History of Development: From Western Origin to Global Faith*. London: Zed Books.
- Rutherford, Paul (2004). *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War against Iraq*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Safi, Louay M. (2001). "Global Justice, Not Global Revenge" in http://www.balanced-development.org/trends/global_justice.htm (October 9, 2001). Virginia: Center for Balanced Development

Said, Edward (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward (2003). "The Academy of Lagado" in *LRB (London Review of Books)*, Vol. 25 No. 8 dated 17 April.
http://www.lrb.co.uk/v25/n08/print/said01_.html

Singh, Hira (1998). *Colonial Hegemony and Popular Resistance: Princes, Peasants, and Paramount Power*. New Delhi/Thousands Oaks/London: Sage Publications

Slevin, Peter (2002). "Bush White House Reconsidering Reagan's 'Evil Man': Gaddafi's Gesture May Change policies" in *The Washington Post*, 11 March.