6

Jihadist Globalism versus Imperial Globalism: The Great Ideological Struggle of the Twenty-First Century?

> The war we fight today is more than a military conflict; it is the decisive ideological struggle of the twenty-first century. On one side are those who believe in the values of freedom and moderation—the right of all people to speak, and worship, and live in liberty. On the other side are those driven by the values of tyranny and extremism—the right of a self-appointed few to impose their fanatical views on the all the rest.... They're successors to Fascists, to Nazis, to Communists, and other totalitarians of the twentieth century.
>
> George W. Bush (2006)

> The current Zionist-Crusader campaign against the *umma* is the most dangerous and rabid ever, since it threatens the entire *umma*, its religion, and presence. Did Bush not say that it is a Crusader War? Did he not say that the war will continue for many years and target 60 states? Is the Islamic world not around 60 states? Do you not realize this? Did they not say that they want to change the region's ideology, which vents hatred against the Americans? What they mean is Islam and its peak.
>
> Osama Bin Laden (2004)

> One World, One Dream.
>
> Official Slogan of the Beijing Olympic Games (2008)

6.1. Globalism and Populism

Although justice globalists made up the vast majority of those millions who protested worldwide against "corporate-led globalization," they were

not the only political camp opposed to it. Patrick Buchanan, for example, an American TV commentator and three-time presidential candidate, emerged in the 1990s as a prominent right-wing champion of economic and cultural isolationism. Urging "the American people" to "put their country first," Buchanan enthusiastically threw his support behind the anti-WTO demonstrators in Seattle.[1] Similarly, hard-nosed soldiers of the extreme racist right, like Illinois-based World Church of the Creator founder Matt Hale, encouraged their followers to come to the Pacific Northwest and "throw a monkey wrench into the gears of the enemy's machine." Even the American neo-Nazi group, National Alliance, took part in the Battle of Seattle. White supremacist leader Louis Beam, too, praised the demonstrators, claiming that the "police state goons" who come down on them were paid by international capital to protect "the slimy corporate interests of 'free trade' at the expense of free people." Thus, amid a sea of signs bearing justice-globalist slogans, one could find occasional posters denouncing the "Jewish Media Plus Big Capital" or the "UN-sponsored New World Order."[2] As the Roaring Nineties drew to a close, market globalism had become the principal target not only for justice globalists but also for a growing number of national-populists.[3]

Deriving from the Latin *populus*—"the people"—populism has been associated with a variety of phenomena including "an ideology," "a social movement," "a strategy of political mobilization," "a political outlook," "a mentality," "a political syndrome," and "an emotional appeal."[4] But none of these definitions has achieved universal acceptance. Margaret Canovan, perhaps the world's foremost authority on the subject, reminds us that the meaning of populism varies from context to context, thus demanding different kinds of analysis.[5] Others have argued that populism and democracy refer to virtually synonymous "modes of articulation" that divide the social into two camps: "power and the underdog."[6] Still, even a cursory perusal of modern political history reveals that populists have been reluctant to endorse the rules of representative democracy. In fact, their hostility to representative politics could be seen as one of populism's most prominent features.[7] In addition, the fundamental democratic notion of political power residing in the people can be made to fit the temperaments of both radical egalitarians in favor of people's direct, unmediated rule and staunch authoritarians claiming to speak and act on behalf of the entire *populus*. Juan Peron or Hugo Chavez, for example, portrayed their repeated violations of basic constitutional liberties as necessary measures to carry out "the will of the people" against

the power interests of corrupt social elites. Seizing upon emotionally charged issues that are modified or even disavowed according to changing political conditions, populists have been called political chameleons that routinely change their colors in searching for prey. To be sure, populism is not the only political discourse that thrives on passions, but, perhaps more than others, it relies on an extra emotional ingredient to attract normally apolitical people to its vision of society's great renewal.[8] Although populism cuts across the ideological spectrum, its latest manifestations have been skewed toward the right. Indeed, the alleged concern of contemporary national-populists with the "corrupt party system" or the "liberal media" mixes all too easily with the fondness of right-wing authoritarians for paternalist policies, their aversion to participatory and critical debate, pluralism, compromise between conflicting interests, and their hostility toward the political agenda of feminists, gays and lesbians, and multiculturalists.[9]

In spite of its rhetorical power, populism lacks the developed ideational structure that enables comprehensive political belief systems to translate the largely prereflexive social imaginary into concrete political terms and programs. As Paul Taggart points out, its "empty heart" is responsible for both its ideational weakness and its potential ubiquity.[10] Incapable of standing on its own ideological feet, populism attaches itself to various host vessels in the form of a "persistent yet mutable style of political rhetoric."[11] Populists perform at least four mutually reinforcing rhetorical maneuvers with great regularity. The first involves the construction of unbridgeable political differences. Fond of airtight Manichean divisions between Good and Evil, populists divide the population into the vast majority of ordinary people ("us") and a small but powerful elite ("them"). The people are idealized as decent, good-natured folk susceptible to the corrupt machinations of the privileged few. Thus, they require protection and guidance from a personalized leader or a dedicated vanguard of moral warriors fighting "intellectuals," "capitalists," "speculators," "politicians," "city-dwellers," "Jews," "international financiers," and other "enemies of the people." Domestic political elites are frequently taken to task for allowing "our community" to be infiltrated by immigrants, guest-workers, ethnic minorities, or foreign radicals—allegedly for material gain and other self-serving reasons. Hence, "the Establishment" stands for corruption, abuse of power, parasitism, arbitrariness, and treachery, whereas the people radiate honesty, purity, piety, resourcefulness, resilience, quiet wisdom, willingness to play by the rules, attachment to tradition, and hard work.

Second, populists attack their enemies from a moralistic high ground rather than facing them on a political level playing field. Reluctant to form traditional political parties, they spark short-lived movements against moral corruption and the alleged abuse of power. Couched in absolutist terms, the battle is never just about political and cultural differences but over fundamental moral disagreements. Casting themselves as the defenders of the people's collective traditions, populists blame an ominous "them" for the alleged moral decay of the community. Keen to awaken "the common man" from his perilous slumber, they construct emotional charges armored in deep-seated stereotypes and prejudices. As Chip Berlet observes, such techniques include demonizing, scapegoating, and the spinning of conspiracy tales. And yet, in the end it is the victim who stands accused of hatching some insidious plot against the people while the scapegoater is valorized as a paragon of virtue for sounding the alarm.[12]

Pat Buchanan, for example, routinely demonizes his country's "liberal advocates of multiculturalism" for opening the doors to millions of legal and illegal immigrants. In his view, trade with other nations should be reevaluated on the basis of common-sense criteria that reflect the interests of ordinary people: US sovereignty, the protection of the nation's vital economic interests, and ordinary people's standard of living. During the acrimonious 2007 public debate over immigration reform in the United States, Buchanan accused Latinos of Mexican extraction of promoting the cultural and political *reconquista* of the US Southwest. He insisted that most of "them" lacked a passionate attachment to the core of America—its land, people, its past, its heroes, literature, language, traditions, culture, and customs.[13] Such a retroactive construction of a homogenous heartland based on an idealized picture of the past represents a common theme in populist narratives.[14] Moreover, populist moralism lends itself to the easy incorporation of religious and mystical themes that resonate particularly well with conservative or anti-intellectual audiences. Still, the evocation of faith and tradition does not necessarily result in an endorsement of the religious establishment. As we shall see in our ensuing ideological analysis of jihadist globalism, religiously inspired populist rhetoric often favors militant sectarianism. Apocalyptic narratives and millennial visions, generally downplayed in mainstream religions, loom large in such discourses.[15]

The third rhetorical maneuver routinely performed by populists involves the evocation of an extreme crisis which requires an immediate and forceful response. Usually directed to segments of the population

most threatened by the forces of modernization, such appeals thrive on the alleged discrepancy between the idealized values of the heartland and existing political practices.[16] The American People's Party, for example, emerged in the 1890s as an unstable alliance of small indebted farmers; urban workers hit by inflation; prohibitionist and moral crusaders outraged by the cultural decay of society; currency reformers opposed to Big Money; and various socialist revolutionaries railing against the power of finance capital. Built on intense emotions of fear and resentment, this short-lived political coalition demanded governmental protection from the economic and cultural consequences of advancing industrial capitalism. At the Party's founding rally in St. Louis, speaker after speaker evoked the specter of extreme crisis gripping the country: "We meet in the midst of a nation brought to the verge of moral, political, and material ruin."[17]

Likewise, today's populists focus on the challenges and dislocations brought about by globalization to appeal to those segments of the population most in danger of losing their status in the conventional social hierarchies of the nation-state. Responding to people's growing sense of fragmentation and alienation, national-populists present themselves to "globalization losers" as strong leaders capable of halting the erosion of conventional social bonds and familiar cultural environments. Lending an authoritarian voice to their audiences' longing for the receding world of cultural uniformity, moral certainty, and national parochialism, they refuse to rethink community in light of the rising global imaginary. Their critique of market globalism is reactionary in that it seeks to retain the national at any cost. Thus, they are quite unlike early nineteenth-century conservatives. As we have seen, even ultraroyalists like Maistre and Bonald recognized the need to correspond constructively to the new imperatives and aspirations contained in the rising national imaginary. Likewise, radical French conservatives like Drumont employed a populist style of rhetoric that helped articulate the dominant social imaginary of their time in extremist anti-Semitic terms. Conversely, contemporary national-populists, stuck in the declining background understanding, fail to provide their audiences with an alternative globalist vision.

Finally, populists imagine the people as a homogenous unit welded together by a common will, a single interest, an ancestral heartland, shared cultural and religious traditions, and national unity. However, the common "we" applies only to those persons deemed to belong to the nation. The presumed identity of "our" people-nation—often conveyed in explicitly racist terminology—allows populists to fuel and exploit

existing hostilities against those whose very existence threatens their essentialist myth of homogeneity.[18] This long-standing populist projection of community as homogenous nation has led various commentators to draw the conclusion that "Populism was (and remains) inevitably nationalist."[19] Indeed, national-populist narratives still represent potent modes of political communication capable of mobilizing millions. One need not look much further than France's Jean-Marie Le Pen, Austria's Jörg Haider, Holland's late Pim Fortuyn, Switzerland's Christoph Blocher, Italy's Umberto Bossi, Australia's Pauline Hanson, New Zealand's Winston Peters, or America's Patrick Buchanan. Moreover, by definition, all forms of populism remain inescapably tied to some conceptualization of the people. Nevertheless, there is no compelling reason for why the concept should *always* and *necessarily* refer to a *national* community. As we noted previously, the more holistic imaginings of "the people" offered by justice globalists clearly transcend the national framework. The same is true for jihadist globalists like Osama Bin Laden who incorporate into their militant version of political Islam a populist style of rhetoric that decontests "the people" as the *umma* of *tawhid*—the *global* Islamic community of believers in the one and only God. Unlike national populism, however, this religiously inspired style of populist rhetoric merged with political Islam to create a comprehensive ideology capable of translating the rising global imaginary into concrete political terms and programs. Today, jihadist globalism represents market globalism's most formidable ideological challenger from the political Right.

6.2. Defending the *Umma* Against the Judeo–Crusader Alliance: Al-Qaeda's Jihadist Globalism

"The American people," the idealized subject of national-populists like Patrick Buchanan or CNN anchor Lou Dobbs, reacted to the al-Qaeda terror strikes of 9/11 with a mixture of horror and disbelief. Over time, their shock gave way to anger, fear, and a keen sense of vulnerability to a complex dynamic of political violence linking the local with the global. "Why do they hate us so much?" was the most frequently asked question attributed by the mainstream media to the American people. Associating globalization primarily with economic interdependencies, many Americans were surprisingly ignorant about their nation's political and cultural impact on the rest of the world, particularly the Islamic world. Several public intellectuals, however, had sounded the alarm long

before 9/11. One of them was Chalmers Johnson, a seasoned American political scientist with past connections to the CIA, who appropriated the long-standing intelligence term "Blowback" as the central metaphor for his discerning analysis of the unintended costs and consequences of America's globalizing military infrastructure.[20]

It is not difficult to identify as early as the mid-1990s some of the principal answers given by Islamist militants as to why they hated the United States and its allies so much that they would plan and execute high-profile attacks on civilian targets. These operations got underway in earnest in 1993 with the bombing of the World Trade Center in Manhattan, masterminded by Ramzi Yousef, a Pakistani militant with associative links to a jihadist organization eventually to be known as "al-Qaeda" ("the Base," "the Foundation"). The magnitude of Yousef's attack prompted FBI investigators to assemble elaborate profiles of hundreds of similar "Middle Eastern extremists . . . working together to further the cause of radical Islam."[21] As Jason Burke notes in his riveting account of al-Qaeda, a permanent association of this term with Osama Bin Laden's transnational network was only made after the 1993 detention of an Islamist militant at New York's JFK airport who was found in possession of a terrorist training manual entitled "al-Qaeda."[22]

But the origins of al-Qaeda can be traced back to the *Maktab al-Khidamat* (MAK; "Office of Services"), a Pakistan-based support organization for Arab *mujahideen* fighting invading Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Set up in 1980 by Bin Laden and his Palestinian teacher and mentor Abdullah Azzam, MAK received sizeable contributions from the government of Saudi Arabia as well as from private donors from other Islamic countries. It also enjoyed the protection of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency intent on replacing, with CIA support, the communist puppet regime in Kabul with an Islamist government friendly to Pakistan. Thus, al-Qaeda and other radical Islamist groups operating at the time in this region should be seen as creatures of the Cold War who eventually outlived the purpose assigned to them by their benefactors. Left without much support after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops in 1989, the multinational coalition of Arab–Afghani fighters found itself put out of business by its own success. Stranded in a country devastated by decades of continual warfare, the victorious *mujahideen* lacked a clear sense of purpose or mission.

As can be gleaned from the burgeoning literature on the subject, the term "Islamism" has been used in many different ways by both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars to refer to various "movements" and "ideologies" dedicated to the revival of Islam and its full political realization.

Related terms currently in circulation include "political Islam," "Islamic fundamentalism," "Islamist purism," and "Islamofascism."[23] Our focus on al-Qaeda's jihadist globalism is neither meant to downplay the diversity of ideational currents within Islamism nor to present their brand as its most representative or authentic manifestation. Rather, our interest in Bin Laden's doctrine dovetails with a number of issues pertinent to our subject. First, it acknowledges the tremendous political and ideological influence of jihadist globalism around the world. Second, it highlights the rise of new political ideologies resulting from the ongoing deterritorialization of Islam. Third, it recognizes the most successful ideological attempt yet to articulate the rising global imaginary around the core concepts of *umma*, *jihad* (armed or unarmed "struggle" against unbelief purely for the sake of God and his *umma*), and *tawhid* (the absolute unity of God). However, before we embark on our analysis of the central ideological claims assembled in the writings of al-Qaeda's two principal leaders, it is necessary to consider some relevant biographical matters.

Osama Bin Laden was born in 1957 the seventeenth son of Muhammed Bin Laden, a migrant laborer from Yemen who created a multibillion dollar construction empire in his adopted Saudi Arabia. Osama's early experiments with libertarian Western lifestyles ended abruptly when he encountered political Islam in classes taught by Abdullah Azzam and Muhammad Qutb at King Abd al-Aziz University in Jeddah. After earning a graduate degree in business administration, the ambitious young man proved his managerial talent during a short stint in his father's corporation. But his professional successes were soon trumped by his fervent religious vocation, expressed in his support of Arab *mujahideen* in their struggle against the Soviet-backed Afghan regime. Acquiring extensive skill in setting up guerilla training camps and planning military operations, Bin Laden saw battle on several occasions and quickly acquired a stellar reputation for his martial valor. Euphoric at the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan but bitterly disappointed by the waning support of the United States and Arab countries, Bin Laden returned to Riyadh in 1990 as a popular hero, his close ties to the Saudi regime still intact.

At the time, Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait was threatening the balance of power in the Middle East. To counter the threat, the House of Saud invited half a million "infidels"—American and other foreign troops—into their country, ostensibly for a short period of time and solely for protective purposes. To ensure religious legitimacy for its decision, the government then pressured the Saudi *ulema* (learned interpreters of the sacred texts) to approve of the open-ended presence of foreign troops in

the Land of the Two Holy Sanctuaries (Mecca and Medina). The scholars complied, ultimately even granting permission for Muslims to join the US-led Operation Desert Storm against Iraq.

Stung by the royal families' rejection of his proposal to organize thousands of Arab–Afghan veterans, and outraged by their enlistment of foreign infidels in defense of the kingdom against a possible Iraqi attack, Bin Laden severed all ties with the Saudi regime. Like tens of thousands of angry religious dissenters, Bin Laden, too, denounced these acts of "religious heresy" and "moral corruption" and openly accused the rulers of selling out to the West. The Saudi government immediately responded to these accusations with political repression, arresting several opposition leaders and shutting down their organizations. Bin Laden and his closest associates fled to Sudan where the sympathetic Islamist government of Hassan al-Turabi offered them political exile and the opportunity to create dozens of new training camps for militants. Stripped of his Saudi citizenship in 1994, Bin Laden forged a lasting alliance with Ayman al-Zawahiri, the charismatic leader of the radical Egyptian group Islamic Jihad. This partnership would eventually lead to the formation of the World Islamic Front with main branches in Pakistan and Bangladesh and an unknown number of affiliated cells around the world.

Forced to leave Sudan in 1996 as a result of mounting US pressure on the Turabi regime, Bin Laden and his entourage returned to Afghanistan where they entered into an uneasy relationship with the Taliban. In the same year, the forces of Mullah Omar managed to capture Kabul. Imposing a strict version of *shari'a* (God-given, Islamic law) on the Afghan population, the Taliban based its rule on the "true tenets of Islam" alleged to have been realized in the world only once before by the seventh-century *salaf* (pious predecessors) who led the *umma* for three generations following the death of the Prophet. By the end of the 1990s, Bin Laden had openly pledged allegiance to the Taliban, most likely in exchange for the regime's willingness to shelter his organization from US retaliation following the devastating 1998 al-Qaeda bombings of the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. To show his gratitude to his hosts, Bin Laden referred to the Taliban leader Mullah Omar as the Commander of the Faithful—one of the honorific titles of the *caliph*, the Islamic ruler of both the religious and civil spheres. Since this designation was deprived of its last bearer in 1924 when the modernist Turkish leader Kemal Ataturk replaced the Ottoman Caliphate with a secular nation-state, Bin Laden's fondness for it signifies nothing less than his rejection of eight decades of Islamic modernism—both in its nationalist and socialist garbs—as well as

his affirmation of Taliban-ruled Afghanistan as the nucleus of a global Caliphate destined to halt the long decline of the Islamic world and the corresponding ascendancy of the West. His anti-Western convictions notwithstanding, Bin Laden never hesitated to use modern technology to communicate his message.

As Bruce Lawrence notes, the bulk of Osama bin Laden's writings and public addresses emerged in the context of a virtual world moving from print to the Internet and from wired to wireless communication. Largely scriptural in mode, the Sheikh's "messages to the world" are deliberately designed for the new global media. They appear on video- and audiotapes, Web sites, and handwritten letters scanned onto computer disks and delivered to Arabic-language news outlets, including the influential Qatari satellite television network al-Jazeera. Bin Laden conveys his ideological claims in carefully crafted language that draws on the five traditional types of Muslim public discourse: the declaration, the juridical degree, the lecture, the written reminder, and the epistle. Disdainful of ghost-written tracts of the kind supplied by professional speechwriters to many politicians, he produces eloquent pieces of Arabic prose that speak in the "authentic, compelling voice of a visionary, with what can only be called a powerful lyricism."[24] Bin Laden's writings over the last fifteen years amount to a coherent doctrine appealing to millions of Muslims. His post–9/11 messages, in particular, contain specific instructions to the faithful on how to resist the advances of the American Empire, the "New Rome."

The ideological edifice of jihadist globalism rests on the populist evocation of an exceptional crisis: the *umma* has been subjected to an unprecedented wave of attacks on its territories, values, and economic resources. Although he blames the global "Judeo–Crusader alliance," Bin Laden considers its assault on Islam to be the expression of an evil much larger than that represented by particular nation-states or imperialist alliances.[25] At the same time, however, he and his lieutenants insist that the forces of "global unbelief" are led by specific individuals like President Bush or by concrete "hegemonic organizations of universal infidelity" such as the United States and the United Nations.[26] In their view, the collapse of the Soviet Empire—attributed directly to the efforts of the Arab-Afghan *mujahideen*—has made America even more haughty and imperialistic:

> [I]t has started to see itself as the Master of this world and established what it calls the new world order. . . . The U.S. today, as a result of this arrogance, has set a double standard, calling whoever goes against its injustice a terrorist. It wants

to occupy our countries, steal our resources, install collaborators to rule us with man-made laws, and wants us to agree on all these issues. If we refuse to do so, it will say we are terrorists.[27]

Bin Laden cites as evidence for such "Satanic acts of aggression" the open-ended presence of American troops on the Arabian peninsula, the ongoing Israeli oppression of the Palestinian people, the 1993 American operations against Muslim warlords in Somalia, the Western indifference to the slaughter of thousands of Bosnian Muslims during the 1991–5 Yugoslav Civil War, and the economic sanctions imposed by the West on Iraq after the first Gulf War, which contributed to the death of countless innocent civilians. Indebted to the discursive legacy of Third-World liberationism, the Sheikh considers these immoral and imperialist acts inflicted by Western powers on the *umma* but the latest crimes in a series of humiliations that can be traced back to the Great Powers' division of the Ottoman Empire after the Great War and post–World War II establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine. But what makes today's "attacking enemies and corrupters of religion and the world" even more dangerous than the medieval Christian crusaders or the thirteenth-century Mongol conquerors of the mighty Abbasid Empire is their all-out "campaign against the Muslim world in its entirety, aiming to get rid of Islam itself."[28] Rather than supporting the *umma* at this critical point in history when the Judeo–Crusader alliance has "violated her honor, shed her blood, and occupied her sanctuaries," Saudi Arabia and other Islamic countries have colluded with the infidel enemy. Abandoning the *umma* in her hour of need, these "apostate rulers" have desecrated the true religion of God's messenger and thereby lost their political legitimacy. Likewise, Islamic scholars and clerics who lent their learned voices to the defense of these "defeatist Arab tyrannies" deserve to be treated as "cowardly heretics" and "traitors to the faith."

In populist fashion, Bin Laden directs his first public letter intended for a wider audience against the appointed head of Saudi Arabia's collaborationist *ulema*. In addition to accusing the Mufti of spiritual corruption, he also objects to his alleged willingness to turn a blind eye to the moral decay of modern Islamic societies, most visibly reflected in their toleration of practices of usury expressly prohibited in the Qur'ān. The letter also laments the *ulema*'s unwillingness to resort to more drastic measures to prevent the further intrusion of Western values at the expense of Muslim principles. In several poignant passages, Bin Laden identifies as the worst feature of the present age of *jahiliyya* (ignorance,

pagan idolatry) "the degree of degradation and corruption to which our Islamic *umma* has sunk."[29] But what, precisely, does Bin Laden mean by "*umma*"? After all, this core concept, together with *jihad* and *tawhid*, serves as the ideational anchor of his political belief system. In the Sheikh's major writings, one finds ample textual evidence for his populist understanding of *umma*.[30] As Mohammed Bamyeh notes, the concept of the "Islamic community" has functioned historically as an equivalent of the Western idea of "the people," empowered to set limits to the tyrannical tendencies of governing elites.[31] Drawing on this traditional understanding of the *umma*, Bin Laden nonetheless departs from Western variants of populism by emphasizing that political authority can never rest on popular sovereignty, for political rule is not the exclusive property of the people. Rather, the righteous *umma* exercises political power in the name of God only, thus building its political institutions on the foundation of Islamic sovereignty.[32] Since God's authority transcends all political borders and any humanly designed lines of demarcation, the *umma* supersedes not only ancient tribal solidarities and traditional kinship structures but also, most importantly, modern Western conceptions of community rooted in the national imaginary. To be sure, contemporary Muslims carry national passports, but their primary solidarity must lie with the *umma*, a community that encompasses the entire globe: "You know, we are linked to all of the Islamic world, whether that be Yemen, Pakistan, or wherever. We are part of one unified *umma*. . . ."[33]

This central idea of "the people of the Qur'an" having been commanded by God to safeguard His sovereignty and to resist the sinful influences of despots, heretics, and infidels usurping God's ultimate sovereignty, received its most radical modern interpretation in the writings of the Egyptian political Islamist Sayyid Qutb, the older brother of Bin Laden's influential teacher at al-Aziz University. Taking as his point of departure the Islamic doctrine of *tawhid*, Qutb argued that all worldly power belongs to the one and only Lord of the Worlds whose single, unchanging will is revealed in the Qur'ãn. Unconditional submission to His will entails the responsibility of every member of the *umma* to prevent the domination of humans over humans, which violates the absolute authority of Allah. According to Qutb, the highest purpose of human existence is "to establish the Sovereignty and Authority of God on earth, to establish the true system revealed by God for addressing the human life; to exterminate all the Satanic forces and their ways of life, to abolish the lordship of man over other human beings."[34]

Having failed to repel the corrupting influences of Islam's internal and external enemies, today's *umma* has fallen into the equivalent of the pre-Islamic pagan age of *jahiliyya* characterized by rampant materialism and the rebellion of unbelief against the sovereignty of God on earth. Qutb even suggests that with the disappearance of proper political governance according to *shari'a*, the *umma* itself had ceased to exist in its "true" form. If only ordinary Muslims somehow could be shown the seriousness of their predicament, they might renew their faith and cleanse Islamic culture of its debasing accretions. The final goal of such an Islamic revival would be the restoration of the *umma* to its original moral purity under a new *salaf*. As Mary Habeck notes, Qutb's seemingly premodern inclinations actually contain strong modernist influences that turn political Islam into "a sort of liberation ideology, designed to end oppression by human institutions and man-made laws and to return God to his rightful place as unconditional ruler of the world."[35]

Qutb's version of political Islam greatly influenced al-Qaeda's understanding of the *umma* as a single global community of believers united in their belief in the one and only God. As Bin Laden emphasizes, "We are the children of an Islamic Nation, with the Prophet Muhammad as its leader; our Lord is one, our prophet is one, our direction of prayer is one, we are one *umma*, and our Book is one."[36] Expressing a populist yearning for strong leaders who set things right by fighting corrupt elites and returning power back to the "Muslim masses," al-Zawahiri shares his leader's vision of how to restore the *umma* to its earlier glory.[37] In their view, the process of regeneration must start with a small but dedicated vanguard willing to sacrifice their lives as martyrs to the holy cause of awakening the people to their religious duties—not just in traditionally Islamic countries, but wherever members of the *umma* yearn for the establishment of God's rule on earth. With a third of the world's Muslims living today as minorities in non-Islamic societies, Bin Laden regards the restoration of the *umma* as no longer a local, national, or even regional event. Rather, it requires a concerted *global* effort spearheaded by a jihadist vanguard operating in various localities around the world. Al-Qaeda's desired Islamization of modernity takes place in global space emancipated from the confining territoriality of "Egypt" or the "Middle East" that used to constitute the political framework of religious nationalists fighting modern secular regimes in the twentieth century. As Olivier Roy observes, "The Muslim *umma* (or community) no longer has anything to do with a territorial entity. It has to be thought of in abstract and imaginary terms."[38]

Although al-Qaeda embraces the Manichean dualism of a "clash of civilizations" between its imagined global *umma* and global *kufr*, its globalism transcends clear-cut civilizational fault lines. Its desire for the restoration of a transnational *umma* attests to the globalization and Westernization of the Muslim world just as much as it reflects the Islamization of the West. Constructed in the ideational interregnum between the national and the global, jihadist-globalist claims still retain potent metaphors that resonate with people's national or even tribal solidarities.[39] Nevertheless, al-Qaeda's focus is firmly on the global as its leaders successfully redirected militant Islamism's struggle from the traditional "Near Enemy" (secular-nationalist Middle Eastern regimes) to the "Far Enemy" (the globalizing West). This remarkable discursive and strategic shift reflects the destabilization of the national imaginary. By the early 1990s, nationally based Islamist groups were losing steam, partly as a result of their inability to mobilize their respective communities around national concerns, and partly because they were subjected to more effective counterstrategies devised by secular-nationalist regimes.[40] Hence, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri urged their followers to take the war against Islam's enemies global. Al-Qaeda's simple ideological imperative—rebuild a unified global *umma* through global *jihad* against global *kufr*—resonated with the dynamics of a globalizing world. It held a special appeal for Muslim youths between the ages of 15 and 25 who lived for sustained periods of time in the individualized and deculturated environments of Westernized Islam (or an Islamized West).[41] As Roy reminds us, this second wave of al-Qaeda recruits, responsible for the most spectacular terrorist operations between 9/11 and the London bombings of 7/7 (2005), were products of a westernized Islam. Most of them resided in Europe or North America and had few or no links to traditional Middle Eastern political parties. Their affinity for al-Qaeda's transnational *umma* and its rigid religious code divorced from traditional cultural contexts made them prime candidates for recruitment. These young men followed in the footsteps of al-Qaeda's first-wavers in Afghanistan who developed their ideological outlook among a multinational band of idealistic *mujahideen*.[42]

If the restored, purified *umma*—imagined to exist in global space that transcended particular national or tribal identities—was the final goal of populist-jihadist globalism, then *jihad* surely served as its principal means. For our purposes, it is not necessary to engage in long scholastic debates about the many meanings and "correct" applications of *jihad*. Nor do we need to excavate its long history in the Islamic world. It suffices to

note that jihadist globalists like Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri endorse both "offensive" and "defensive" versions of *jihad*.[43] Their decontestation of this core concept draws heavily on interpretations offered by Azzam and Qutb, for whom *jihad* represents a divinely imposed *fard 'ayn* (individual obligation) on a par with the nonnegotiable duties of prayer and fasting. Likewise, Bin Laden celebrates *jihad* as the "peak" or "pinnacle" of Islam, emphasizing time and again that armed struggle against global *kufr* is "obligatory today on our entire *umma*, for our *umma* will stand in sin until her sons, her money, and her energies provide what it takes to establish a *jihad* that repels the evil of the infidels from harming all the Muslims in Palestine and elsewhere."[44] For al-Qaeda, *jihad* represents the sole path toward the noble goal of returning the *umma* to "her religion and correct beliefs"—not just because the venerable way of *da'wa* (preaching, admonishing) has failed to reform the treacherous Muslim elites or convert the hostile crusaders, but, most importantly, because Islam is "the religion of *jihad* in the way of God so that God's word and religion reign supreme." Moreover, jihadist globalists are not choosy about the means of struggle: anything that might weaken the infidels suffices. Such tactics include large-scale terrorist attacks, suicide bombings, and the public killing of hostages: "To kill the Americans and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty incumbent upon every Muslim in all countries. . . ."[45]

For Osama Bin Laden, *jihad* and *umma* are important manifestations of the revealed truth of *tawhid*, the oneness of God and His creation. As we have seen, it demands that Islamic sovereignty must be established on earth in the form of a Caliphate without national borders or internal divisions. This totalistic vision of a divinely ordained world system of governance whose timeless legal code covers all aspects of social life has prompted many commentators to condemn jihadist Islamism as a particularly aggressive form of totalitarianism that poses a serious challenge to cultural pluralism and secular democracy.[46] Responding to this charge, the al-Qaeda leadership has turned the tables on its critics. Pointing to the long legacy of Western aggression against the *umma*, Bin Laden tends to portray his organization's attacks as retaliatory measures designed to respond in kind to the oppression and murder of thousands of Muslims by the "Judeo–Crusader Alliance." The leaders of al-Qaeda never hesitate to include as legitimate targets of their strikes those Muslims deemed to be "apostates" and "handmaidens" of the infidel enemy. In their view, such actions of treachery have put such Muslim "hypocrites" outside of the *umma*.[47]

In the end, jihadist globalists fall back on a Manichean dualism that divides the world into two antagonistic camps: "One side is the global Crusader alliance with the Zionist Jews, led by America, Britain, and Israel, and the other side is the Islamic world." For Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, reconciliation violates the Islamic imperatives of unconditional loyalty to the *umma* and absolute enmity to the non-Muslim world: "The Lord Almighty has commanded us to hate the infidels and reject their love. For they hate us and begrudge us our religion, wishing that we abandon it." Consequently, al-Qaeda's message to Muslims all over the world is to nurture "this doctrine in their hearts" and release their hatred on Americans, Jews, and Christians: "This [hatred] is a part of our belief and our religion."[48] In an impassioned post–9/11 letter, Bin Laden offers a detailed refutation of the notion that Islam should be a religion of moderation or balance. In his view, "[I]t is, in fact, part of our religion to impose our particular beliefs on others. . . . And the West's notions that Islam is a religion of *jihad* and enmity toward the religions of the infidels and the infidels themselves is an accurate and true depiction." He also considers the UN-sponsored call for a dialogue among civilizations nothing but an "infidel notion" rooted in the "loathsome principles" of a secular West advocating an "un-Islamic" separation of religion and the state.[49]

His extremist rhetoric notwithstanding, Bin Laden never loses sight of the fact that jihadist globalists are fighting a steep uphill battle against the forces of market globalism. For example, he discusses in much detail the ability of "American media imperialism" to "seduce the Muslim world" with its consumerist messages. He also makes frequent references to a "continuing and biased campaign" waged against jihadist globalism by the corporate media—"especially Hollywood"—for the purpose of misrepresenting Islam and hiding the "failures of the Western democratic system."[50] The al-Qaeda leader leaves little doubt that what he considers to be the "worst civilization witnessed in the history of mankind" must be fought for its "debased materialism" and "immoral culture" as much as for its blatant imperialism. He repeatedly accuses the United States of trying to "change the region's ideology" through the imposition of Western-style democracy and the "Americanization of our culture."[51] And yet, even against seemingly overwhelming odds, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri express their confidence in the ultimate triumph of *jihad* over American Empire. The destruction of New York's "immense materialistic towers by nineteen young men" serves as an especially powerful symbol for the alleged waning global appeal of "Western civilization backed by

America."[52] 9/11 assumes great significance in al-Qaeda's *jihad* insofar as the successful terror attack offers the faithful clear proof that "this destructive, usurious global economy that America uses, together with its military force, to impose unbelief and humiliation on poor people, can easily collapse. Those blessed strikes in New York and other places forced it [America] to acknowledge the loss of more than a trillion dollars, by the grace of God Almighty."[53] Gloating over the staggering financial toll of the terrorist attacks on the global economy, Bin Laden offers a chilling cost–benefit analysis of jihadist strategy:

> [A]l-Qaeda spent $500,000 on the September 11 attacks, while America lost more than $500 billion, at the lowest estimate, in the event and its aftermath. That makes a million American dollars for every al-Qaeda dollar, by the grace of God Almighty. This is in addition to the fact that it lost an enormous number of jobs—and as for the federal deficit, it made record losses, estimated over a trillion dollars. Still more serious for America was the fact that the *mujahideen* forced Bush to resort to an emergency budget in order to continue fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. This shows the success of our plan to bleed America to the point of bankruptcy, with God's will.[54]

This passage is part of a videotaped address aired around the world only a few days before American voters went to the polls on November 3, 2004. Bin Laden ends his speech with a warning to the American people that their security is their own responsibility, not that of corrupt Democrat or Republican political elites. Thus, the Sheikh managed to inject himself into a national electoral contest as the self-appointed leader of the global *umma*. Articulating the rising global imaginary as a set of political claims, jihadist globalism appeared on the TV screens of a global audience as the world's chief critic of American democracy. As Faisal Devji notes, Osama Bin Laden's brand of political Islam projected no national ambitions, for it was as global as the West itself, both being intertwined and even internal to each other: "This is why Bin Laden's calls for the United States to leave the Muslim world do not entail the return to a cold-war geopolitics of détente, but are conceived rather in terms of a global reciprocity on equal terms."[55]

Another videotaped message delivered by the al-Qaeda leader in September 2007 unleashed further verbal broadsides against the "corrupt American political system." He linked the Bush administration's involvement in Iraq to transnational corporate interests that held the American people hostage to their all-out scramble for war-related profits. Osama Bin Laden's critique shows a remarkable resemblance to Pat Buchanan's

populist tirades against corporate elites. Indeed, the Sheikh charges "the capitalist system" with seeking "to turn the entire world into a fiefdom of the major corporations under the label of 'globalization'. . . ." However, unlike Buchanan's defensive attempt to hold on to a social imaginary that has seen better days, Bin Laden's vision contains an ideological alternative that, despite its chilling content, imagines community in unambiguously global terms.[56]

6.3. Imperial Globalism

Soon after 9/11, intellectual elites around the world began to wonder whether the al-Qaeda attacks marked the beginning of the end of globalization. In their view, the dark side of intensifying global interdependence had revealed itself in the United States' unexpected vulnerability to large-scale terrorist strikes carried out by nineteen jihadist hijackers armed with little more than box cutters and a spotty knowledge of how to fly commercial airliners. Impressed by the massive outbursts of patriotic sentiment that gripped the United States in the aftermath of 9/11, some commentators went so far as to predict the impending "collapse of globalism" followed by a worldwide resurgence of nationalism.[57] Enhanced surveillance and draconian security measures put in place in many countries appeared to bolster arguments in favor of the inevitable hardening of national lines of demarcation. American economist Robert J. Samuelson, a moderate advocate of market globalism, reminded the readers of his popular *Newsweek* column that previous globalization processes had been halted and even reversed by similarly traumatic events such as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. If such a relatively minor act of terrorism had pushed Europe into the nationalist nightmare of the Great War, then the al-Qaeda attacks surely possessed the potential of sparking an even larger conflagration.[58]

As we shall see, however, market globalism did not expire on September 11, 2001. Although its basic ideational architecture remained intact, some of its core claims underwent modification in the hands of "neoconservatives" in the Bush administration who turned their militaristic vision of "democratic globalism" and "Pax Americana" into official American foreign policy.[59] Strictly speaking, of course, the United States did not constitute an "empire." But one could make a reasonable case for the persistence of American imperialism as a continuous and largely informal process that started with the seventeenth-century expansionist settlement

of the North American continent and periodically assumed more coercive expressions. Perhaps the most obvious of these formal imperialist chapters in US history was the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, parts of Samoa, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico in the 1890s. A century later, however, the United States no longer exerted direct dominion or formal rule over conquered peoples under its sovereign authority. And yet, the country had emerged from the Cold War as a new kind of empire of vast wealth, peerless military power, and global cultural reach. Its economy accounted for almost one-third of the world's output, and its military expenditures exceeded those of the next twenty nations combined. Its films, music, food, sports, and technological products flooded the planet. American investments in research and development reached nearly 40 percent of the world's spending on scientific innovation. No doubt, America had become a "hyperpower" that considered the entire world its geopolitical sphere of influence. After 9/11, it found itself in the historically unprecedented position of enforcing its own idea of global order—even in unilateral fashion if it so desired. American foreign policy expert Max Boot expressed such sentiments in the pages of the neoconservative *Weekly Standard* when he argued that only a muscular United States willing to accept its imperial status was up to the necessary task of stabilizing a world unsettled by the actions of jihadist terrorists eager to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction. For Boot, the new environment of global insecurity presented nothing less than a clear-cut "case for American Empire."[60]

"Imperial globalism" might, therefore, be an apt characterization of this neoconservative inclination to shape the globe in its own image by military means. As Martin Shaw notes, "It is clearly plausible to define the Bush administration's kind of globalism as 'imperial' in character."[61] But let us recall from our earlier discussion that neoconservativism and neoliberalism were hardly ideological opposites. Sprouted from the rich soil of 1970s' Hayekism, they represent two variations on the basic market-globalist theme. On the major issues of economic globalization, their ideological differences were negligible. Neoconservatives pushed the liberalization and global integration of markets just as hard as neoliberals, but they were more inclined to combine their economic laissez-faire attitude with intrusive government action for the regulation of the ordinary citizenry in the name of public security and traditional values. In the waning months of George H. W. Bush's one-term presidency, neoconservative hawks in his administration were linking their demands for a more assertive and expansive use of US military power to the claim that their

country's promotion of globalization furthered the spread of freedom and democracy around the world. Their unilateralist vision for American "benevolent global hegemony" was sketched out in the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance document, drafted by the then Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. The plan called for an unprecedented military build-up for the express purpose of deterring any potential competitors—even America's traditional Western European allies—from "even aspiring to a larger regional or global role."[62]

This imperative served as the strategic foundation of a more philosophical statement of principles issued in 1997 by the Project for a New American Century (PNAC), a newly founded neoconservative think tank that included such political and intellectual heavyweights as Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Robert Kagan, Norman Podhoretz, and William Kristol. Recanting his neoconservative heresy in the aftermath of the Bush administration's conduct of the Global War on Terror, Francis Fukuyama, another cosigner of the PNAC platform, offered an apt summary of its ideological principles: the belief that the internal character of political regimes matters; the conviction that American foreign policy must reflect the deepest values of democratic societies, and that American power has been and could be used for moral purposes; the notion that the United States needs to remain engaged in international affairs, and, as the world's dominant power, it has a special responsibility for global security; a fervent belief in free markets and free trade coupled with a strong distrust of "social engineering projects"; and strong skepticism about the legitimacy and effectiveness of international law and institutions to achieve global security.[63] After 9/11, the PNAC's credo of preventing the rise of a global competitor was complemented by the idea that America reserved its right to strike any nation, organization, or network deemed to impede "freedom's cause" at any time. Known as the Bush Doctrine, this preemption clause found its official expression in the 2001 *Quadrennial Defense Review*, the 2002 *Nuclear Posture Review*, and, most importantly, the 2002 *National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (updated 2006). The core principle of the PNAC now stood at the center of American national security: "It is time to reaffirm the essential role of American military strength. We must build and maintain our defenses beyond challenge."[64]

But market globalism's imperial turn did not start with the al-Qaeda attacks and the ensuing dominance of neoconservatives in the Bush administration. As we have seen, even Thomas Friedman conceded that America's "soft power"—its culture, political ideals, and

policies—depended on its not-so-hidden "iron fist" of globally stationed troops whose military might keeps the world's markets and trade routes "safe" for corporate globalization. Toward the end of its second term, the Clinton administration encountered serious challenges to this market-globalist vision of the world. As a result, it began to oscillate between its long-standing soft-power approach of persuading others to want what it wanted and a new hard-power strategy of breaking down resistance by forcing others to comply with America's wishes.[65] Between 1998 and 2000, President Clinton authorized the NATO-led war against Serbia as well as extensive bombing raids on Iraq without bothering to obtain approval from the UN Security Council. Critics charged that such unilateral interventions violated nothing less than the Charter's core principle: the inviolable sovereignty of each member nation. Moreover, the increasingly hawkish American president backed extraordinary "security measures" against justice-globalist protesters in the United States and abroad that included hi-tech surveillance and the massive use of police force. He even tightened his soft-power outlook on world trade and global commerce. In his best-selling account of the Roaring Nineties, Joseph Stiglitz provides striking examples of his country's increasingly hard-powered economic agenda, citing the government's growing willingness to support coercive measures devised by transnational drug companies for their operations in the global South. Clinton's former economic adviser did not mince words: "America's international political economy was driven by a whole variety of special interests which saw the opportunity to use its increasing global dominance to force other countries to open their markets to its goods on its terms. The U.S. government was seizing the opportunities afforded by the new post–Cold War world, but in a narrow way, benefiting particular financial and corporate interests."[66]

However, the existence of such imperial threads of continuity between the late Clinton and the early Bush administrations should not detract from the fact that America's new hard-power approach added an entirely new dimension in the aftermath of 9/11 when the glove came off, exposing the iron fist of an irate Empire. Declaring a Global War on Terror in "defense of liberty, democracy and free markets," George W. Bush abandoned the mild isolationist rhetoric of "compassionate conservatism" he had espoused for a short period during the 2000 election campaign and reverted to his hard-line neoconservatism—a perspective he shared with the likes of Cheney, Rumsfeld, and Wolfowitz. Failing to take advantage of the remarkably pro-American global sentiments expressed in the September 12 "We are all Americans now" headlines

of French newspapers and the solidarity vigil staged by thousands of Iranian youths in downtown Tehran, the Bush administration escalated its unilateralism and indifference to the interests of others. Allies were informed rather than consulted. "Regime change" in Iraq was a foregone conclusion. The world's population was neatly divided into those standing "with us" and those who were "against us." The "enemy" label was slapped onto any foreign country or organization that did not display an unconditional willingness to carry out the will of the forces of light. Indeed, the American government seemed to suffer from what Robert Jay Lifton referred to as "superpower syndrome"—a medical metaphor pointing to an aberrant collective mindset projecting dangerous fantasies of apocalyptic confrontation and cosmic control.[67]

Its militaristic inclinations notwithstanding, the Bush administration constructed its imperial globalism within the established framework of market globalism. Its new National Security Strategy (NSS) continued to hold out the promise of "a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade." Dedicated to the vigorous promotion of "economic freedom beyond America's shores," NSS reaffirmed in unambiguous terms the importance of opening the entire world to "commerce and investment." Given the centrality of its preemption clause, it is easy to overlook the document's unwavering commitment to market-globalist policies. For example, NSS underscores the government's determination to use its "economic engagement with other countries" to "secure the benefits" of deregulatory measures, business investment and entrepreneurial activity, tax cuts, "sound" fiscal polices that enhance business activity, and free trade. For the Bush administration, the lessons of history were crystal clear: market economies, not command-and-control systems choked by the heavy hand of government, represented the best way to promote prosperity and reduce poverty in the world. Policies that "further strengthen market incentives and market institutions" were not only good for America but also "relevant for all economies—industrialized countries, emerging markets, and the developing world." Rearranging the ideological claims of market globalism around the new core concept of security, NSS proclaims "free markets and free trade" the "key priorities of our national security strategy."[68]

This post–9/11 emphasis on America's global security agenda required additional ideological modifications of market globalism. For one, there was no longer any need to hold on to the shaky ideological claim that nobody was in charge of globalization. Although rhetorical echoes of the "leaderless market" still reverberated in corporate circles, imperial

globalists promoted their idea that global security and stable world markets depended on the United States—that "indispensable nation"—wielding its power. Almost overnight, the "free market" was stripped of its miraculous self-regulating powers. Arguing that the United States had an obligation to ensure that the global integration of markets was not hampered by "ideological extremists" at both ends of the political spectrum, President Bush delighted in the glorification of American global leadership: "Today, humanity holds in its hands the opportunity to further freedom's triumph over all these [terrorist] foes. The United States welcomes our [sic] responsibility to lead in this great mission." The assertion that the United States was now in charge of globalization was usually made in conjunction with the familiar market-globalist claim of the democratic benefits accruing from the liberalization and global integration of markets. For example, Bush's *New York Times* op-ed piece published at the first anniversary of 9/11 contains the following passage: "As we preserve the peace, America also has an opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom and progress to nations that lack them. We seek a peace where repression, resentment and poverty are replaced with the hope of democracy, development, free markets and free trade."[69] A year later, the President reiterated his government's unwavering "commitment to the global expansion of democracy," which represented one of the pillars of America's "peace and security vision for the world." The same claim takes center stage in Bush's 2005 Inaugural Address: "The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world. . . . So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world."[70]

It is easy to see how the notion of "securing freedom" by means of an American-led drive for global democratization facilitated the integration of the military objectives of the Global War on Terror into the larger market-globalist discourse. As international law expert Richard Falk notes, imperial globalism "combines ideas of American dominance associated with economic globalization, that were prevalent before September 11, with more militarist ideas associated with the anti-terrorist climate of the early 21st century. . . . While not abandoning the ideological precepts of neoliberal globalization, the Bush administration places its intense free market advocacy beneath the security blanket that includes suspect advice to other governments to devote their resources to non-military activities." Cultural theorist William Thornton concurs: "Empire keeps all the major features of globalization, plus one: it stands ready to enforce

market privileges the old-fashioned way. . . . Emphatically, however, power economics did not surrender the field to resurgent power politics. Rather the two joined forces in the common cause of Empire."[71]

Another important consequence of Bush's assumption of responsibility for globalization and the democratization of the world was the addition of a new claim to the ideological arsenal of imperial globalism: globalization requires a Global War on Terror. Power elites around the world put forward this contention on countless occasions and in numerous contexts. Let us consider three versions of presenting American-led perpetual warfare as the necessary bodyguard of corporate-led globalization. The first comes from neoconservative veteran Robert Mcfarlane, President Reagan's former National Security Adviser. Shortly after the US military's opening "shock and awe" Iraq campaign in March 2003, Mcfarlane, now the chairman of a Washington-based energy corporation, teamed up with Michael Bleyzer, CEO of an international equity fund management company, to write a revealing op-ed piece for the *Wall Street Journal*. Bearing the suggestive title, "Taking Iraq Private," the article praises the military operations in Iraq as an "indispensable tool" for establishing security and stability in the region. According to the imperial-globalist duo, the Global War on Terror prepared the ground for the profitable enterprise of "building the basic institutions that make democracy possible."[72]

In the second version, pondering how a "Global American Empire" should "manage an unruly world" after 9/11, Robert Kaplan, an award-winning journalist and influential Pentagon insider, quickly settles on the claim that globalization requires a Global War on Terror. Arguing that free markets cannot spread without military power, the best-selling author advises the Bush administration to adopt the pagan warrior ethos of second-century Rome, which he distills into "ten rules" for the expansion of American Empire. These include fast-track naturalization for foreign-born soldiers fighting for the Empire; training special forces to be "lethal killers one moment and humanitarians the next"; using the military to promote democracy; preventing military missions from being compromised by diplomacy; establishing the resolve to "fight on every front," including the willingness to strike potential enemies preemptively on limited evidence; dealing with the media "more strictly"; and cracking down on internal dissent, targeting justice-globalists and antiwar demonstrators in particular.[73] Similarly, Norman Podhoretz, foreign policy adviser to Republican Presidential candidate Rudy Giuliani, calls for the escalation of the US-led Global War on Terror into a full-blown "World War IV" (apparently, "World War III" ended in the defeat of the Soviet Union). Podhoretz

surveys a post–9/11 landscape teeming with "enemies" of all kinds, the two principal ones being "Islamofascism" and misguided Western leftist intellectuals critical of the US operations in Iraq. For the patriarch of American neoconservatism, only a "tough" and "unforgiving" approach of the kind adopted by the Bush administration might eventually succeed in "draining the swamps" of terrorism and political treachery, thus ensuring the full globalization of liberal democracy and free markets.[74]

The third, and perhaps most original, version of the new imperial-globalist claim that globalization requires a Global War on Terror flows from the pen of Thomas P. M. Barnett, managing director of a global security firm and former professor of military strategy at the US Naval War College. A former Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Pentagon's Office of Force Transformations, the Harvard-educated strategist provided regular briefings to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and the intelligence community. He also interacted regularly with thousands of high-ranking officers from all branches of the US armed forces. *The Pentagon's New Map*, Barnett's best-selling reexamination of American national security, links the author's military expertise to his long-standing interests in economic globalization.[75] The book presents a straightforward thesis: in the global age, America's national security is inextricably bound up with the continued global integration of markets and increasing flows of trade, capital, ideas, and people across national borders. Since 9/11, it has become abundantly clear that the one-sided identification of globalization with an "economic rule set" must be complemented by an understanding of globalization as a "security rule set" mandating the destruction of transnational terrorist networks and all states harboring them.

For Barnett, both of these rule sets are normatively anchored in the universal values of individual freedom, democracy, multiculturalism, and free markets. At the same time, however, these norms are also uniquely American, for they found their political expression for the first time in human history in the eighteenth-century American experiment of an expanding democratic union of *united states*.[76] In a daring conflation of national interest with global interest that runs counter to the Cold-War mindset of the US defense establishment, Barnett presents America as "globalization's ideological wellspring" destined to bring to the world nothing less than what its citizens already enjoy today: "the individual pursuit of happiness within free markets protected from destabilizing strife by the rule of law." For the strategist, American interests are by definition global interests precisely because the country is built on universal ideals of freedom and democracy and not restricted to narrow ethnic

or national identities. As the world's first truly multinational union, the United States is globalization incarnate. Moreover, the universal values at the heart of its constitution allow the American government to judge the rest of the world in universal terms of right and wrong, good and evil: "What gives America the right [to render these judgments] is the fact that we are globalization's godfather, its source code, its original model." And so it appears that by human design and historical destiny, the United States serves as the evolutionary engine of a multicultural world-system that ascends toward ever higher levels of connectivity, rule-bound behavior, wealth, security, and happiness. Although Barnett considers this course likely, he disavows historical determinism by conceding that there are no guarantees. Clearly, al-Qaeda and other "anti-globalization forces" committed to "a sort of permanent civilizational apartheid" are capable of derailing the globalization of individualism, democracy, and free markets. Thus, 9/11 marks a critical juncture in human history where America, globalization's source code, is called upon to guide the rest of the world toward the noble goals of "universal inclusiveness" and "global peace." Its Herculean task is to "make globalization truly global"—by any means necessary.[77]

This is, of course, where the new claim of globalization requiring a Global War on Terror comes in. In order to defeat the enemies of global interdependence, the Pentagon must devise a new strategy that, once and for all, abandons antiquated "inter-national thinking." National security in the twenty-first century must be reimagined in global terms as the ruthless destruction of all forces of disconnectedness and the nurturing of the "networks of political and security connectivity commensurate with the mutually assured dependence that now exists among all states that are deeply integrated with the growing global economy." In short, the Pentagon's new global strategy requires a new map—both in a cognitive and geographical sense—that divides the globe into three distinct regions. Unlike the three-world order of the Cold War, however, the entire world is now fair game for US military operations.

Barnett calls the first region on the Pentagon's new map the "Functioning Core," defined as "globalization thick with network connectivity, financial transactions, liberal media flows, and collective security." Featuring stable democratic governments, transparency, rising standards of living, and more deaths by suicide than by murder, the Core is made up of North America, most of Europe, Australia, New Zealand, a small part of Latin America, and with significant reservations, possible "new core" countries like India and China. Conversely, he refers to areas where

"globalization is thinning or just plain absent" as the "Non-Integrating Gap." This region is plagued by repressive political regimes, handcuffed markets, mass murder, and widespread poverty and disease. For Barnett, the Gap provides a dangerous breeding ground for "global terrorists" and other "forces of disconnectedness" opposed to the "economic and security rule sets we call globalization." This region includes the Caribbean Rim, virtually all of Africa, the Balkans, the Caucasus, parts of Central Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Southeast Asia. Along the Gap's "bloody boundaries," the military strategist locates "Seam States" such as Mexico, Brazil, South Africa, Morocco, Algeria, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia. Lacking the Core's high levels of connectivity and security, these countries are the logical entry point for terrorists plotting their attacks.[78]

Despite its horrific toll, Barnett considers 9/11 a necessary "wake-up call" that forced the United States to make a long-term military commitment to "export security" to the Gap. The Core has no choice but to treat the entire Gap region as a "strategic threat environment." Inaction or a premature retreat from Iraq and Afghanistan would jeopardize the fledgling world order based on America's universal values. For Barnett, the imperative for the Global War on Terror is rooted in the "underlying reality" of a "military–market nexus"—the dependence of "the merchant culture of the business world" on the military's "warrior culture":

> I express this interrelationship [of the military and the market] in the form of a "ten commandments of globalization": (1) Look for resources and ye shall find, but.... (2) No stability, no markets; (3) No growth, no stability; (4) No resources, no growth; (5) No infrastructure, no resources; (6) No money, no infrastructure; (7) No rules, no money; (8) No security, no rules; (9) No Leviathan [American military force], no security; and (10) No (American) will, no Leviathan. Understanding the military-market link is not just good business, it is good national security strategy.[79]

Ultimately, Barnett proposes a "global transaction strategy" built on three basic principles. First, the United States must increase the Core's "immune system capabilities" by responding quickly and efficiently to 9/11-like "system perturbations." Second, it must pressure the Seam States to "firewall the Core from the Gap's worst exports," namely, terror, drugs, and pandemics. Finally, America must remain firmly committed to a Global War on Terror and its overriding objective of "shrinking the Gap." There can be no compromise or vacillation. Globalization's enemies must be eliminated and the Gap region must be integrated into the Core. As

Barnett emphasizes, "I believe it is absolutely essential that this country lead the global war on terrorism, because I fear what will happen to our world if the forces of disconnectedness are allowed to prevail—to perturb the system at will."[80]

Needless to say, there are a number of problematic assumptions and omissions in Barnett's construction of imperial globalism. Three of its most troubling features are the author's inability to recognize al-Qaeda's jihadism as a globalist ideology; his uncritical perspective on American history; and his unreflective equation of "American values" with "universal values." As I have pointed out elsewhere, Barnett's third assumption also lies at the heart of the Bush administration's post–9/11 public diplomacy initiatives, which have done much to fuel anti-American sentiments around the world.[81] A testimony to Barnett's "military–market nexus," the newly created office of Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs unleashed a Madison Avenue-style advertisement campaign of "branding American values" on the Middle East. Since its official launch in 2002, however, evidence has been mounting that the intended "end-users" of "Brand USA" in the Gap region are not buying. In fact, world opinion polls conducted between 2002 and 2007 actually point to intensifying anti-American sentiments. This trend appears to be strongly related to the perceived discrepancy between America's proclamation of freedom and democracy and its actual policies in the Middle East and elsewhere.[82]

However, Barnett's construction of imperial globalism perfectly illustrates why 9/11 should not be read as leading to a "collapse of globalism" and the resurgence of the national imaginary. Rejecting dualistic notions of national security that place the global outside the national, the Pentagon strategist masterfully harnesses the language of American exceptionalism to his globalist vision. Pro-immigration and fiercely opposed to isolationism, he articulates the rising global imaginary in terms that would make national-populists like Buchanan cringe: "Globalization is this country's gift to history—the most perfectly flawed projection of the American Dream onto the global landscape. . . . In short, *we the people* needs to become *we the planet.*"[83] Barnett may be an imperialist, but his communal orientation is decidedly globalist. His ideological leanings suggest that the post–9/11 era has been a fertile ground for the hard-powering of market globalism into a doctrine that unites the twin goals of globalizing markets and American global hegemony—all in the name of "we the planet." If globalization represents a long-term historical trend toward greater worldwide interconnectedness, then the current imperial

episode should be seen as part of this trend: American empire inhabits globalization.[84]

Thus, we are led to conclude that the adaptation of market globalism to American Empire constitutes neither a retreat nor a defeat of the global imaginary. Rather, it is just another moment in the destabilization of the national that affects all geographical scales. The apparent reassertion of the national in the form of millions of flag-waving Americans who believe in the exceptional greatness and goodness of their country occurs squarely within the parameters of the rising globalist imaginary. Market globalism's love affair with American Empire is hardly a sign of its ideological incoherence or political weakness, but a reflection of its growing flexibility and responsiveness to a new set of political issues. Like all mature political belief systems, market globalism has begun to bear the marks of an ideational family, broad enough to contain both the economistic prototype of the Roaring Nineties and its more imperialist post–9/11 permutation. This ideological broadening of market globalism is also reflected in the rapid conversion of scores of neoliberals to at least a moderate version of what Michael Ignatieff calls "Empire Lite."[85] The militaristic display at the 2004 Democratic Convention in Boston, for example, showed that despite persisting differences with the Bush administration that deepened further after the Democratic takeover of Congress in 2006, prominent neoliberals like John Kerry and Hillary Rodham Clinton were warming up to some form of imperial globalism, including the President's unilateralist dogma that the United States does not "ask anybody's permission" in pursuit of its enemies. Even Thomas Friedman accepted the new claim that globalization requires a Global War on Terror, adding that the "epic struggle" against jihadist globalism was being waged by both military and ideological means: "We're fighting to defeat an ideology: religious totalitarianism. . . . The opposite of religious totalitarianism is an ideology of pluralism . . . ."[86] Strong words, indeed, for the American globalization guru who had only two years earlier insisted that the backlash against the globalizing economy was unlikely to produce a coherent alternative ideology.

6.4. The Return of Religion?

There is yet one more adaptation that market globalism underwent in the wake of 9/11: the incorporation of religious and moralistic features that mirrored, to some extent, the jihadist discourse of al-Qaeda. Like their

adversaries, imperial globalists saw the Global War on Terror as a necessary and righteous campaign against incorrigible evildoers. As George W. Bush put it, "Our responsibility to history is clear: to answer these attacks [of 9/11] and rid the world of evil."[87] Time and again, the American President emphasized that the ongoing "global war of uncertain duration" should be seen as the "decisive ideological struggle of our time." And, like his jihadist adversaries, he used "ideology" in ways that blurred conventional distinctions between political and religious belief systems. For example, he argued that al-Qaeda's "totalitarian ideology" was not grounded in "secular philosophy but in the perversion of a proud religion. Its content may be different from the ideologies of the last century, but its means are similar: intolerance, murder, terror, enslavement, and repression." On the other hand, Bush linked his own belief system to a noble "freedom agenda" intended by its divine Author for all of humanity: "We believe that freedom is a gift from almighty God, beyond any power on earth to take away."[88] Although his public pronouncements consistently disparaged the notion of an all-out war against Islam as well as the thesis of an inevitable clash of civilizations, they teemed with religious references and expressions of faith. The President's much criticized characterization of the Global War on Terror as a "crusade," for example, may have been an ignorant gaffe, but it nonetheless revealed his religious conviction that the "ideological struggle between freedom and terror" represented an epic confrontation between the forces of Good led by America and the unremitting Evil of radical Islamism.

The extension of the Global War on Terror into Iraq further intensified the administration's tendency to mix the determinist language of market globalism with belligerent pronouncements promising ultimate victory. Just as the Soviet "Evil Empire" had eventually succumbed to the forces of the "New Jerusalem," the jihadists' attempt to build a "radical Islamic Empire" would meet inevitable defeat. The same fate awaited the rogue states that constituted the President's famous "Axis of Evil." As Princeton ethicist Peter Singer has pointed out, Bush's tendency to see the world through religious Manichean lenses was evident in his speeches. Hundreds of times, he employed "evil" as a noun—a "thing" or a "force" with a real existence apart from the brutal and selfish acts of which human beings are capable. Singer concludes that Bush's narrow judgmental views eschew critical reflection in favor of moralistic intuitions expressed in the fundamentalist language of apocalyptic Christianity.[89]

The President's belief in the faith-based "moral clarity" of his message is shared by several key members of his administration who also consider

the creation of a global American imperium as part of God's plan. In 2003, Vice President Dick Cheney sent out a Christmas card to friends and supporters that read: "And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"[90] Formal and informal prayer meetings and Bible study sessions among White House staffers take place regularly. Since the emergence of Christian fundamentalists as the dominant constituency of the Republican Party in the 1990s, critical observers have pointed to an internal power shift toward the more radical end of the spectrum. Political commentator Kevin Phillips speaks of "theocons" enforcing "theological correctness"—a tendency he regards as the mirror image of the "political correctness" displayed by secular liberals in discussing minority groups, women's rights, and environmental issues.[91] Former *New York Times* foreign correspondent Chris Hedges takes this argument a step further by referring to the radical members of the Christian Right who dream of extending their "Christian nation" into a global Christian empire as "American Fascists." Out of nearly seventy million American evangelicals, Hedges estimates the size of this "militant core" as constituting around twenty million, or 7 percent of the US population. But his research on the expanding activities of this radical movement suggests that its political potency far exceeds its numbers. He closes his chilling study with an impassioned warning: "The radical Christian Right calls for exclusion, cruelty and intolerance in the name of God. Its members do not commit evil for evil's sake. They commit evil to make a better world. To attain this better world, they believe, some must suffer and be silenced, and at the end of time all those who oppose them must be destroyed."[92] Indeed, jihadism is hardly confined to Islam.

To be sure, the convergence of religion and ideology in the dawning global age appears to be a broader phenomenon that extends beyond Christian fundamentalists, jihadists, or imperial globalists. It is also happening in the justice-globalist camp. Ever since the Global War on Terror and global climate change became key issues on a par with the global economy, justice globalism has absorbed heavy doses of spiritual and religious thought from affiliated environmentalists and peace activists. Are we witnessing a reversal of the powerful secularization dynamic that served two centuries as the midwife of ideology? If so, does the rising global imaginary create more favorable conditions for the mixing of political and religious belief systems?

In recent years, there has been a growing chorus of critics who argue that students of political ideology have indulged for far too long in

an overly secularized approach to their subject. Mainstream studies of political belief systems are said to reify a spurious religion–ideology divide, paying inadequate attention to the fact that religious beliefs and political ideas have always been intermingled. Reflecting on the post–9/11 explosion of interest in "political theology," one critic has recently asserted that "Intellectual complacency, nursed by implicit faith in the inevitability of secularization, has blinded us to the persistence of political theology and its manifest power to shape human life at any moment."[93] Another concludes his discerning inquiry into the legitimacy of political religion as a concept with the suggestion that "the concept of 'political religion' is, for the time being, a necessary if somewhat ill-defined conceptual category. . . . It reminds us that religion does not allow itself to be easily banished from society, and that, where it is tried, it returns in unpredictable and perverted forms."[94]

Emilio Gentile—a leading proponent of the currently fashionable view that totalitarian ideologies like fascism, Nazism, or communism are best explained as political phenomena that assume the features of religion—adds his voice to the chorus with his discussion of the "sacralization of politics," which allegedly occurred in the modern era after the political realm had gained its independence from traditional religion. According to this Italian historian, the religious impulse continued to exert its power on those modern systems of meanings that came to be known as political ideologies: "By taking over the religious dimension and acquiring a sacred nature, politics went so far as to claim for itself the prerogative to determine the meaning and fundamental aim of existence for individuals and the collectivity, at least on earth."[95] Much in the same vein, the prominent political thinker John Gray has recently argued that the most influential secular ideologies of the modern period were actually shaped by repressed religion. His recent book represents an extreme version of the alleged primacy of religious ideas: "Modern politics is a chapter in the history of religion. . . . The Enlightenment ideologies of the past centuries were very largely spilt theology." For Gray, the rise of al-Qaeda's jihadist globalism and Bush's imperial globalism merely marks the return of "apocalyptic religion" as a major force in global politics.[96]

One of the unfortunate outcomes of this timely and necessary discussion has been the proliferation of concepts invented to shed light on the intensifying ideology–religion nexus. As one learns very quickly by following the scholarly debates raging in various academic journals devoted to the subject, "political religion" should not be confused with "civil religion." "Religious politics" is not necessarily the same as

"secular religion." The "sacralization of politics" is alleged to differ from the "politicization of religion."[97] Since it would require another book to enter into the subtleties of these debates, let us end this study with a brief reflection on the possible reasons for the convergence of ideology and religion that draws on the main arguments presented here.

Six chapters ago, we started our discussion of ideology with a detailed account of Destutt de Tracy's attempt to establish a "science of ideas" without appeal to divine revelation or metaphysical speculation. Separating reflection about human affairs from theological conjecture about the other world, such a science would yield truths applicable to politics and society. Henceforth, the metaphysical claims to transcendental Truth generated by established religion would be, at best, a private matter. Although Napoleon Bonaparte and Karl Marx linked *idéologie* to the misty realm of metaphysics, false consciousness, and religion, the emerging grand political belief systems of the national age remained true to Tracy's conception of ideology as secular ideational systems serving the larger cause of human betterment by rejecting or at least curtailing religious faiths. As we emphasized in the early chapters of this book, however, there never existed in politics impenetrable walls separating ideology from religion, the secular from the sacred, or the church from government. Struggling to escape the womb of theology and establish alternative ideational systems trading in certitudes, the elite codifiers of all ideologies—even conservatives after a slow start—were forced to devise multiple strategies for the containment of religion, including co-option, absorption, and imitation.

Most of all, however, ideologies sought to keep a healthy distance from religion in order to fulfill their primary function of articulating a political agenda for the secular, *national* community. Citizens' freedom *of* religion was predicated on the liberal imperative of freedom *from* religion. During the last two centuries, therefore, the national imaginary and its political articulations served as a curb, or a lid, on religion that kept it from regaining its prerevolutionary dominance. To be sure, the religious never simply faded away as some hubristic "ideologues" had predicted. But it was curtailed, checked, reined in, and, in some cases, driven underground by the national. With the rise of the global imaginary, however, the national and its political translations have become destabilized. As a result, the curb on religion is being eased, allowing it to spill into ideology more than at any other time in recent memory. Hence, we should not be surprised at the convergence of ideology and religion in an era when the national

imaginary is weakening. Moreover, as any attentive student of history knows, Empire and religion have always been fond of each other as both harbor global aspirations. At the very least, they have shown greater affinity for each other than the nation and religion. Assuming that the current phase of globalization is, indeed, one characterized by the "great ideological struggle" between imperial globalism and jihadist globalism, then one would expect religion to play a much more prominent role than in the national age.

We can, therefore, respond to our two questions probing the possible return of religion in the affirmative. We are, indeed, witnessing a weakening, if not a reversal, of the powerful secularization dynamic of the last centuries as a result of the decline of the national. And, yes, the rising global imaginary has been creating more favorable conditions for the convergence of political and religious belief systems. It is unlikely that secularity in the West will disappear any time soon, but the religious will give it a run for its money, forcing previously unimagined forms of accommodation and compromise. In short, the rising global imaginary will continue to create favorable conditions for "religious ideologies" or "ideological religions." Consequently, we ought to treat religious ideas and beliefs as an increasingly integral part of the three competing globalisms that translate the rising global imaginary into concrete political agendas. Increasingly, the common frame of reference will be the "global community" although national, and even tribal, imaginings of human association will remain with us for a long time to come.

6.5. Concluding Remarks

Philosopher Nelson Goodman once noted, "Worldmaking as we know it always starts from worlds already at hand; the making is a remaking."[98] The world already at hand has been erected on the foundation of the national imaginary. Its continued impact is apparent in the enduring power of the organizing logic of the national over crucial aspects of social life. While globalization remains in full swing after 9/11 and the ensuing Global War on Terror, it remains a partial and conditional dynamic. But it would be foolish to deny that globalization—the expansion and intensification of social relations across world-space and world-time—has unsettled the geographical and conceptual territoriality of the national. Loosening the grip of traditional time–space constraints on billions of

people, the global appears in a largely immaterial economy mediated by the digital communication and information of our network society.[99] It has empowered individuals who enjoy access to the myriad nodes and nerves of the global matrix while consigning the excluded to the postmodern equivalent of the Dark Ages.

As the eruptions of the global continue to sear the national, they not only change the world's economic infrastructure but also transform our sense of self, identity, and belonging. For example, as late as the 1980s, jet travel was considered a special occasion that triggered anticipatory excitement for days. Today, boarding a transcontinental airliner has become a mundane marker of people's increased mobility—thanks to new security measures an increasingly bothersome event as commonplace as train rides in the late nineteenth century. The same applies to multiple geographical and social attachments like dual and regional citizenships. Individuals from various socio-economic backgrounds who consider themselves to be at home in more than one country are no longer perceived as rare curiosities. The number of such "place polygamists" has skyrocketed in the last few decades.[100] Until recently, most people spent their entire working lives in the nation-state of their birth. But the generation born between 2000 and 2020 will find it rather common to pursue its professional careers in multiple locations around the world.

Even Americans, reared in a self-referential cultural environment that visitors from abroad often experience as stifling parochialism, can no longer isolate themselves from the intrusion of the global imaginary. It springs to life with a click of the mouse or a cursory glance at wall-mounted HDTV screens showing in real-time US troops battling a multinational force of Islamist "insurgents" half a world away. But it is not technology in the abstract that builds and energizes the global imaginary. The local concreteness of the global stares us in the face as the Cuban-Chinese restaurant around the corner or the Eurasian fusion café next door. These hybrid culinary establishments are serving us up a daily taste of a global stew that is slowly thickening but still needs plenty of stirring.

The national is slowly losing its grip on people's minds, but the global has not yet ascended to the commanding heights once occupied by its predecessor. It erupts in fits and false starts, offering observers confusing spectacles of social fragmentation and integration that cut across old geographical hierarchies in unpredictable patterns.[101] Consider, for example, the arduous processes of regional economic and political integration that are limping along on all continents. And yet, expanding formations

like the European Union—however chronic their internal tensions—have become far more integrated than most observers predicted only a decade ago. The short duration and unevenness of today's globalization dynamics make it impossible to paint a clear picture of the New World Order. But the first rays of the rising global imaginary have provided enough light to capture the contours of a profoundly altered ideological landscape.