Tell me what you Read: Representations of the United States in recent Arabic Titles: 2002-2014

Sami E. Baroudi

Lebanese American University
Email: sbaroudy@lau.edu.lb

Introduction:

In its broadest sense, this is yet another study on international perceptions of the United States.[1] Two features set this paper apart. First, it focuses on the Middle East: a region where the United States holds key geostrategic and economic interests[2] and where it faces a serious image problem.[3] Second, it investigates one specific probable source of these negative views: the writings of Arab public intellectuals.[4] The paper examines works on the United States that were originally authored in Arabic in order to ascertain how they depict the United States: its history, its society, politics, foreign and Middle East policy. For limitations of space, the paper only considers original works published by leading press houses in Beirut between 2002 and 2014. It examines all works published by ten press houses that included in the title: 1) the word *Amrika* (Arabic for America); 2) its masculine or feminine adjective *Amriki*, *Amrikia*; 3) the last name of a US President; 3) September 11; or 4) Iraq War (or Iraq Occupation). Beirut press houses were chosen because Beirut is one of the leading Arab cities in terms of publishing original and translated works (probably second only to Cairo), and because once the leading press houses were identified (based on intensive consultations with librarians and colleagues who publish in Arabic), it was fairly easy to get hold of all pertinent titles. While logistical considerations played a role in selecting Beirut and the press houses, it is quite unlikely that this selection would bias the paper's findings.

The Image of the United States among Arab Publics

To say that the United States has an image problem in the Arab world is a major understatement. Surveys of Arab public opinion between 2008 and 2011 show that while favorable views of the United States increased somewhat in 2009, following Barack Obama's accession to the presidency, they plummeted again in 2011. As the below table reveals, only small percentages of respondents in six Arab countries held favorable views of the United States.

Table 1: Percentages of Respondents with Favorable Attitudes towards the United States by Arab country 2008/2009/2011[5]

Year	Morocco	Egypt	Lebanon	Jordan	KSA	UAE
2011	12 %	5 %	23 %	10 %	30 %	12 %
2009	55 %	30 %	23 %	25 %	41 %	21 %
2008	26 %	9 %	21 %	16 %	13 %	22 %

The standard argument is that this negative image emanates from US Middle East policy which is biased in favor of Israel and overwhelmingly concerned with securing US control over Middle East oil and maintaining pro-US regimes in power, irrespective of their adherence (or lack of thereof) to democratic principles and basic freedoms. Nearly, all the intellectuals whose works are reviewed here implicitly, or explicitly, make this argument. This paper challenges the above argument by contending that US Middle East policy is not self-evident or self-explanatory. The Arab public learns about it, by and large, through the media and the writings and other discourses of Arab, American and European public intellectuals. The greatly overlapping spheres of the media and public intellectuals are the indispensable conduits for the transmission of knowledge to Arab publics about US Middle East policy and more generally the United States.

The paper is premised on the notion that these conduits inevitably influence the content of this knowledge about the United States. It contends that public perceptions of the United States are the product of two types of influences: 1) material influences that stem from actual US policies, especially towards the Middle East; and 2) ideational influences whose origins are the representations of the United States, and its policies, in the media and by public intellectuals. While it is impossible to isolate one type of influence from the other, this paper primarily focuses on ideational influences that take the form of the discourses of Arab public intellectuals as conveyed in their published work.

Beirut-Based Press Houses and Overview of the Works Covered:
For decades, Beirut has housed dozens of press houses due to the relatively open nature of the Lebanese political system and the government's overall respect of freedom of the press, at least in comparison to other Arab countries. Table two below shows the political orientation of each of the ten press houses covered in this paper and the number of original works it published on the United States (i.e. excluding translated titles).

Table 2: Beirut leading Press Houses, their Political Orientation and Number of Original Works Published

Press House	Political Orientation	Number of works published
Al-Dar al-'Arabiya Lil 'Ulum Nashirun (Arab Scientific Publishers, Inc.)	Neutral	14
Al-Mu'assa al-'Arabiya lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr (Arab Institute for Research and Publishing)	Arab Nationalist	10
Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya (Center for Arab Unity Studies)	Arab Nationalist	9
Riad el-Rayyes Books	Neutral	4
Dar Al-Nahar Lil Nashr (Dar An-Nahar)	Liberal	7
Dar al-Mahaja al-Baida's	Shia Islamist	4
Dar al-Nafaes	Sunni Islamist	2
Dar al-Saqi (Al-Saqi Books)	Neutral	1

Dar al- Farabi	Originally Marxist	2
Sharika al-Matbu'at lil-Tawzi' wa al-Nashr	Neutral	2
Total (10)		55

Derived from tables four to ten below, table three provides a breakdown of the titles covered using two dimensions: 1) the work's dominant tone; and 2) its primary focus.

Table 3: Classification of Works by Theme and Dominant Tone

Theme/Type	History	Society	Politics	Foreign Policy	Middle East Policy	Total
Positive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neutral	0	1	3	3	0	7
Critical	1	0	0	4	8	13
Polemical	5	1	1	3	25	35
Total	6	2	4	10	33	55

Not surprisingly, books whose primary focus is US Middle East policy comprise more than half of the total. More importantly, the overwhelming majority of works are either critical (approximately 24 percent), or polemical (approximately 63 percent). Books that are neutral in tone constitute a mere 13 percent of the total. The sections below present a detailed treatment of the views conveyed in most of the titles covered in this paper. Given the large number of works, it is essential to divide them using the aforementioned five themes or axes of analysis, always bearing in mind that most authors cover more than one theme in their works.

American History

While most of the works examined in this paper touch on American history, only six make it their primary focus. Table four below classifies these works by tone.

Table 4: Works on American History by Tone

Author	Title	Tone
Munir Akash[6]	*Haq al-Tadhiya bi al-Akhar: Amerka: wa al-Ibadat al-Jama'iya*	Polemical
Munir Akash[7]	*Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Thaqafiya: La'nat Kan'an al-Ingliziya*	Polemical
Munir Akash[8]	*Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Jinsiya: 400 Sana min al-Hurub 'ala al-Fuqara' wa al-Mustad'afeen fi al-Ard*	Polemical
Nassif Yassin[9]	*al-Irhab al-Amerki al-Mu'a'lam*	Polemical
Siham al-Kahtani[10]	*Al-Azhra's wa al-Rab: Qira'a fi al-Khitab al-Siyasi Amriki*	Polemical
Riad Tabbarah[11]	*Amerka wa al-Huriyat: Nazhra Tarikhiya*	Critical

Three of the books on American history are penned by one author: the Syrian-born, US-based Munir Akash. In these organically related works – all focusing on the theme of 'America's genocides' – Akash is preoccupied with debunking five principal ideas (or myths) which, in his view, the United States was founded on: 1) God promised America to the white settlers (or Anglo-Saxons) the same way that He had promised the land of Canaan (Palestine) to the Israelites, 2) the white settlers are God's chosen people and are racially and culturally superior to the races they annihilated and/or enslaved, 3) America is the 'savior of

the world', 4) America's 'manifest destiny' is to expand indefinitely; and 5) America has the 'right to sacrifice the other' since it is America's 'manifest destiny' to annihilate, enslave or dominate all other people.[12]

Akash's radical rendition has influenced several Arab authors such as Nassif Yassin and Siham al-Kahtani, who embrace his perspective, quoting and citing him extensively (see below). Akash's reading also bears major affinity to that of the renowned Egyptian author and journalist Mohamed Hassanein Heikal, who is arguably the doyen of Arab writers critical of the United States.[13] In a nutshell, Akash's construction of American history – despite its distortions and extremity – represents the dominant view of American history that is projected by Arab public intellectuals.

While Nassif Yassin dismisses charges of 'Occidentalism' or 'reverse Orientalism', his work is arguably a prime example of this genre. Drawing heavily on Akash, Yassin underscores the same themes of war, genocide and exploitation that, in his view, were legitimated in terms of religion and, to a lesser extent, social Darwinism.[14] For Yassin, the United States has historically appropriated for itself the right to 'catalog' human races and to determine their fates.[15] Saudi dissident author, Siham el-Kahtani, offers an equally stark reading of American history (and of American society, politics and foreign policy). For el-Kahtani 'waging war is at the core of American history and the American character, starting with the declaration of independence, which called for war, and the Gettysburg Speech which commemorated the bloodiest war in American history.'[16] Echoing Akash and Yassin, she highlights the central role that religion, especially the Old Testament, played in triggering and legitimating the 'genocide' of the native Indian population.[17] What el-Kahtani adds is her emphasis on the role of the 'Jews' (read the Jewish immigrants) in supporting the American 'genocide', through lending credence to and popularizing the phantom that the white settlers were God's 'chosen people', while America represented the 'promised land' whose 'manifest destiny' was to destroy all people and obstacles that stood in the way of its boundless expansion.[18]

Steering clear of polemics, Riad Tabbarah – Lebanon's former ambassador to the United States– offers a nuanced, albeit critical, reading of American history.[19] In line with the aforementioned authors, Tabbarah highlights the annihilation of the native Indian population which he attributes to the spread of diseases, such as small pox and the plague, which were brought by the Europeans,[20] and the wars between the settlers and the Indians which were invariably followed by mass slaughter.[21] In Tabbarah's account, slavery represented the other major injustice that marred American history. Tabbarah acknowledges, though, that the United States had made major strides in the second half of the twentieth century (what he dubs as the Golden Epoch of Freedoms) towards rectifying the gross injustices of the past.[22] In a nutshell, five out of the six works on American history are polemical in nature, while the sixth is critical bordering, at points especially with respect to the George W. Bush administration, on the polemical.

American Society
While the majority of the works surveyed in this paper devote some attention to American society, only two make it their primary focus. One of these works is critical, while the other is neutral.

Table 5: Works on American Society by Tone

Author	Title	Tone
Michael W. Suleiman, editor[23]	*Al-'Arab fi Amrika: Sira' al-Ghorba wa al-Indimaj*	Neutral
Saud al-Mawla[24]	*Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad: Dirasa fi 'Ilm al-Ijtima' al-Siyasi*	Polemical

Lebanese author Saud al-Mawla provides a multifaceted critique of American society. To start with, he depicts American capitalism as ruthless and as the prime source of domestic and international exploitation, rampant poverty and major socioeconomic inequalities.[25] In addition, he deplores the prevalence of crime in America, which he attributes to the belief in the inviolable individual right of possessing weapons[26] and a culture that 'sanctifies war and violence.'[27] War and violence are 'America's gods,' he states.[28] More importantly, he does not refrain from generalizing about the 'American character' which, to him, represents a volatile mix of excessive individualism and attachment to one's ethnic or religious group.

Standing in sharp contrast is the edited volume *Al-'Arab fi Amrika: Sira' al-Ghorba wa al-Indimaj*. With contributions from prominent Arab-American historians and social scientists, the work comprises empirically- rich and analytical essays focusing on the multi-faceted challenges facing Arab-American communities in the United States and Canada. The essays differ in terms of methodology, communities studied, and specific findings, but they converge on two overarching conclusions. These conclusions are succinctly presented in the opening essay by Michael W. Suleiman. First, Arab communities have fared well in the United States, achieving above medium levels of education and income. Second, Arabs have not fully integrated into American society. In Suleiman's view, this is partly due to the triumph of multi-cultualism in America. But a more important reason, according to Suleiman, is the overall hostility of American society to Arab immigrants.[29]

American Politics

While nearly all the works examined in this essay make some reference to US domestic politics, only four make it their primary focus. Table six below classifies these works by tone.

Table 6: Works on American Politics by Tone

Author	Work	Tone
Chibli Mallat[30]	*Al-Dimuqratiyya fi Amerka*	Neutral
Tarek Mitri[31]	*Madina 'ala Jabal? 'An al-Din wa al-Siyasa fi Amerka*	Neutral
Charles Malik [32]	*Israil, Amerka wa al-'Arab: Tanabu'at min Nisf Qarn*	Neutral
Laila Abu Zaid[33]	*Amrika al-Wajh al-Akhar*	Polemical

Chibli Mallat offers a succinct and objective account of the American political system. Mallat does not break new grounds in terms of original research; he merely restates in a condensed fashion well-known facts, concepts and theories about the American political system. The work's true value lies in presenting the general Arab reader with an informative and empirically-grounded image of US domestic politics. Tarek Mitri offers one of the best treatments, in Arabic, of the origins, political inclinations and influence of the principal Christian religious movements in the United States. Mitri emphasizes the divergent political agendas of different Protestant (Evangelical) movements.[34] The main distinction he draws is between the liberal Evangelicals (represented in main by the US National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches) and the Fundamentalist Evangelicals, who are commonly known as the Christian fundamentalists or the Christian right.[35] As a ranking member of the World Council of Churches, he clearly identifies with the first group, which, he notes, accepts social spending, shuns foreign wars, supports a more balanced US Middle East policy and advocates dialogue with Muslims. While rejecting allegations that the Fundamentalist Evangelicals have campaigned openly and widely against Muslims and Islam, he strongly rebukes them for: 1) not denouncing some of their figures who attacked Islam in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, and 2) taking no action to educate their members on the values of tolerance, acceptance of the other

and dialogue.[36] Although abounding with subtle criticisms of the George W. Bush administration, the Neoconservatives and the Christian Right, the overall tone of Mitri's book is academic and neutral.

Charles Malik's work could have been excluded from this study since it was penned back in 1949. But, because it was published in 2002 and given the very important and controversial assertions it makes, it is treated here albeit in great concision. Malik makes five major observations about the United States. First, 'the political weight of the Arabs in America is null in comparison to that of the Jews.' Second, in the case of a 'fundamental divergence between Israeli and Arab interests, America will back Israeli interests.' Third, the Arabs should be weary of US plans to develop the Arab world and should constantly inquire 'about the role of the Jews' in these plans. Fourth, in the long haul, one could expect a 'popular reaction in America against Jewish control of all aspects of American life.' Fifth, despite the 'injustices that American policy inflicted and will inflict on the Arabs, the American character in its essence is unscathed, good and noble.'[37]

Standing in sharp contrast is Moroccan journalist and literary figure, Laila Abu Zaid, who offers an impressionistic and polemical reading of the American political system, deploring America's obsession with nuclear weapons, disregard for international treaties and its laissez faire approach to domestic social problems, such as poverty, education and health care. She rhetorically asks, 'Can the American political system be so lacking of any moral restraint or humane trait?' And she answers, 'I renewed my quest even for traces of these, I searched for a long time, [I searched] seriously and earnestly but I could not find.' [38]

American Foreign Policy
This section deals with eight of the ten works which focus primarily on US foreign policy. I start with table seven which classifies the ten works based on their overall tone.

Table 7: Works on American Foreign Policy by Tone

Author	Title	Tone
Ghassan Salamé[39]	*Amerika wa al-'Alam: Ighra' al-Quwa wa Madaha*	Neutral
Hadi Kobeissi[40]	*Al-Siyasa al-Kharijiya al-Amirkiya bayn Madrasatain: al-Muhafizhiya al-Jadida wa al-Waqui'iya*	Neutral
Amer Awaad[41]	*Dawr Mu'assat al-Ri'asa fi Sun' al-Istratijiya al-Amrikiya al-Shamila*	Neutral
Hussein Kanaan[42]	*Min George Washington ila Obama: al-Wilayat al-Mutahida al-Makiya wa al-Nidham al-Duwali*	Critical
Nassar al-Rubaiee[43]	*Dawr al-Haymana al-Amrikiya fi al-'Alaqat al-Duwaliya*	Critical
Bashir Abdel-Fattah[44]	*Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya*	Critical
Vincent al-Gharib[45]	*Ma'ziq al-Imbraturiya al-Amrilkiya*	Critical
Abdulhay Zalloum[46]	*Amrika bi-'Uyoun 'Arabiya*	Polemical
Issam Naaman &Ghaleb Bou Mosleh[47]	*Haqiqa al-'Asr: Inhiar al-Nizam al-Iqtisadi al-Duwali wa Intiha' al-Qiyada al-Amirkiya lil-'Alam*	Polemical
'Adel al-Bishtawi[48]	*Tarikh al-Zhulm al-Amerki*	Polemical

Ghassan Salamé – an internationally renowned Lebanese academic, former minister and former UN envoy to Iraq – provides a critical appraisal of US foreign policy since 'the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the US ascendancy to the pinnacle of the international system.'[49] Although quite critical of the 'reckless course' of US foreign policy under George W. Bush and the 'neoconservative bunch', Salamé voices optimism that the United States, being a democracy, can reverse the 'erroneous policies' of the Bush administration. Another Lebanese academic, Hadi Kobeissi, offers an impartial, albeit over-simplistic,

reading of the conflicting influences of neo-conservatism and realism on the making of foreign policy. Drawing on a few classical sources in English, he presents the Arab reader with a general overview of the principal ideas that guided American foreign policy and the tensions between them. While the work suffers from major flaws (such as missing out on the entire political science literature on each of neo-conservatism and realism), it does provide useful and undistorted information about American politics, especially regarding the influence of ideas and decision-makers' mindsets on the formulation of foreign policy.[50]

Young Iraqi academic Amer Awaad (b. 1976) offers an objective analysis of the role of the presidency in the formulation of American foreign policy, with a particular focus on the post-cold war era. Hussein Kanaan, who held various faculty and senior government positions in Lebanon, offers an impressionistic and critical reading of US foreign policy, noting that, in the Post-World War II, the United States has sought global hegemony, albeit in a more subtle way than previous imperial powers. He writes, 'In the wake of World War II, Washington transformed the nature of the imperial game from actual colonization to exerting hegemony via local tools and through understandings with regimes rather than with the people, which is quite shameful.' [51] But despite his harsh criticisms of the George W. Bush administration, he voices guarded optimism regarding the prospects of a different foreign policy under Obama, especially with regard to the Middle East and the Muslim world.[52]

Iraqi author and politician Nassar al-Rubaie offers a moderate critique of American hegemony. Avoiding polemics, al-Rubaie documents the evolution of American power and American hegemonic designs, highlighting the role of US media, Wall Street, American Multinational corporations and US-dominated international institutions (such as NATO, the UN, the World Bank, the IMF, GATT and the WTO) in promoting and sustaining American hegemony, especially over the World economy.[53] In the concluding chapter, al-Rubaie contends that there are 'many signs of the decline in American hegemony and in the legitimacy of US leadership of the international system,' which indicates that the international system is moving towards multi-polarity.[54]

Egyptian researcher at 'Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies', Bashir Abdel-Fattah, offers a considerably harsher critique of American hegemony, especially as it was exercised under the George W. Bush administration.[55] Under Bush, the Americans exerted their hegemony with 'boastfulness and arrogance', triggering the 'resentment of the rest of the world which reeled under this hegemony and sought ways to rebel against it and bring it down,' he notes. [56] In line with most Arab authors, he highlights the many security and foreign policy failures of the Bush administration.[57] In addition, he voices major skepticism regarding the ability and willingness of Obama to veer clear of the failed policies of his predecessor, not primarily due to opposition from Neoconservatives but because 'Obama himself is drawn to the traditional realist school of foreign policy which emphasizes power politics and hard power over soft power.'[58]

Adopting Marxian analysis, Vincent al-Gharib traces America's imperialist foreign policy to the recurrent crises in its capitalist economy.[59] Al-Gharib maintains that the US economy has been declining since the 1970s, due in part to the rise of other economic powers, such as Japan and Germany.[60] More importantly, though, this decline emanated from internal reasons, primarily the: 1) overvaluation of the US Dollar, 2) heavy reliance on imports of oil, consumer products and especially capital, 3) decline in the industrial base, and 4) large trade and budgetary deficits.[61]

Al-Gharib's thesis on the economic sources of American foreign policy is reiterated by several Arab intellectuals such as the far more polemical Jordanian author Abdulhay Zalloum and Lebanese authors Issam Naaman and Ghaleb Bou Mosleh. Zalloum harshly criticizes US leadership of the global economy on three principal grounds. First, it is purely self-serving as it exclusively promotes the interests of US financial institutions and US MNCs, while enabling the United States to bankroll mounting budgetary and trade

deficits through printing money.[62] Second, it had triggered recurrent international economic crises with highly adverse consequences on the developing economies.[63] Third, it is largely based on US control of the Middle East energy resources.[64] For Zalloum, this historic US preoccupation with controlling Middle East oil (in order to ensure US economic dominance) was the root cause for various US covert and overt military interventions in the Middle East region (including the Afghanistan and Iraq invasions).[65]

Issam Naaman and Ghaleb Bou Mosleh posit a causal link between the crisis in the US capitalist economy and the pursuit of an imperialist foreign policy. Subscribing to the 'imperial overstretch' thesis, they maintain that the United States has trapped itself into a vicious cycle where mounting domestic, economic, and political crises lead to an unsustainable imperialist policy, which in turn exacerbates the domestic problems.[66] As indicated by its title, the work's central thesis is that American international leadership is on the wane. The authors note, 'The American Empire might not have reached the end of the road as stated by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, but American leadership of the UN and the World has reached its logical end.' [67]

American Middle East Policy
Three main themes dominate Arab scholarship on US Middle East policy: 1) the US approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict; 2) the 2003 US invasion and occupation of Iraq; and 3) the 9/11 attacks and the Bush administration 'war on terror'. While nearly all works surveyed cover two or more of these themes, I discuss each work only under one theme (based on the book's primary focus) in order to broaden the compass of works examined.

The United States and the Arab-Israeli Conflict
Five works focus primarily on the US approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict: one is critical and four are polemical in nature.

Table 8: Works on the US Approach to the Arab-Israeli Conflict by Tone

Author	Title	Overall Tone
Camille Nowfel[68]	*'Arab Amerka: Raha'in Ba'isa*	Critical
Abdulhay Zalloum[69]	*Amrika Israil al-Kubra: Israil Amrika al-Sughra: al-Tarikh al-Haqiqi Li-Amrika fi al-'Alam al-'Arabi Arabi*	Polemical
Mohammad al-Sammak[70]	*Al-Din fi al-Qarar al-Amirki*	Polemical
Husni Ayesh[71]	*Amrika al-Isra'iliya wa Isra'il Almrikiya*	Polemical
Islamonline[72]	*Harb Kasr al-Irada Bayn al-Muqawama wa al-Mushrou' al-SahioAmriki*	Polemical

Camille Nowfel criticizes the US historic bias in favor of Israel, which only grew after the presidencies of Eisenhower and Kennedy, highlighting its negative repercussions on the US image in the Arab world. Nowfel contends that the United States was never pressured to choose between supporting Israel and promoting its interests in the Arab world.[73] Nowfel attributes this unwillingness of most Arab leaders to press the United Sates on the Israel issue to their fear of losing American backing on which they depended.[74]

Abdulhay Zalloum (whom we previously encountered in another work) presents loosely-structured thoughts on: 1) the influence of the Zionist lobby on US Middle East policy,[75] 2) the religious sources of the US unconditional backing for Israel,[76] and 3) the commonalities in the histories of the United States and Israel, as both states were founded on religious myths that justified the forceful expropriation of the lands of other people and their annihilation.[77] Mohammad al-Sammak, who serves as Secretary General of the

Christian-Muslim Committee for Dialogue in Lebanon, highlights the role of 'Christian Zionism' in explaining America's unconditional support for Israel.

Jordanian author Husni Ayesh maintains that Israel and the Zionist lobby determine US policy towards the Arab-Israeli Conflict. For Ayesh, the US-Israeli relationship works exclusively for the benefit of the latter. With flowery language, he writes, 'Israel collects, while the US Congress borrows in order to fund a socialist, apartheid and sectarian state, which denies citizenship rights to any of its inhabitants who is not Jewish.'[78]

An equally polemical work is the collection of commentaries that were posted on the Islamonline website (http://www.islamonline.com/) around the time of the Summer 2006 Israeli operations against Gaza and Hezbollah, and which were reproduced in print under the catchy title: *Harb Kasr al-Irada Bayn al-Muqawama wa al-Mushrou' al-SahioAmriki*.[79] The volume abounds with denunciations of American complicity in the Israeli operations, including accusations that the United States instigated Israel to attack the infrastructure in Lebanon in order to put pressure on the government to disarm Hezbollah which was threatening US plans for Lebanon and the region.[80]

The 2003 Iraq War:

Fifteen works address the theme of the Iraq war focusing on: 1) the motives behind the invasion and occupation of Iraq (two works), 2) the role of the US media in legitimating the Iraq occupation (four works), and 3) the consequences of the occupation on Iraq, the region and the United States (nine works). I start with table nine which classifies these works by theme (under the Iraq war) and overall tone. I then offer short synopses of twelve of these works.

Table 9: Works on the Iraq War by Theme and Tone

Author	Title	Theme	Tone
Mohammad al-Qaissi[81]	*Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita*	Invasion Motives	Critical
Taha al-Shakarji[82]	*Al-Harb al-Amirkiya 'ala al-'Iraq*	Invasion Motives	Polemical
Ahmad 'Abd al-Majid[83]	*Istimala al-'Atifa*	Role of Media	Polemical
Abdelillah Belkeziz[84]	*Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh*	Role of Media	Polemical
Muṣṭafa al-'Ubaydi[85]	*Ṣafaḥāt iḥtilāl al-'Irāq*	Role of Media	Polemical
Walid Shmait[86]	*Imbratouriyat al-Muhafizhin al-Judud*	Role of Media	Polemical
Duham al-'Azzawi[87]	*Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq wa ab'ad al-Fidiraliya al-Kurdiya*	Consequences	Critical
Iman Ragab[88]	*Al-Nizham al-Iqlimi al-Arabi*	Consequences	Critical
Khaled **a**l-Yaqoubi[89]	*Al-Siyasa al-Amerkiya tijah al-'Iraq*	Consequences	Polemical
Abd al-Wahab al-Qassab[90]	*Ihtilal ma ba'd al-Iatiqlal*	Consequences	Polemical
N.A.	*Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir*[91]	Consequences	Polemical
Baha' al-Din al-Khaqani[92]	*Al-Fawda al-Khalaqa*	Consequences	Polemical
'Abd 'Ali al-Ma'mouri[93]	*'Awlamat al:Qatl*	Consequences	Polemical
'Abd al-Hussein al-Soulayman[94]	*Baghdad min Holako ila Bush*	Consequences	Polemical
Fadel al-Rubaie[95]	*Ma Ba'd al-Istishraq*	Consequences	Polemical

Motives behind the 2003 Iraq Invasion and Occupation

Young Iraqi researcher Mohammad al-Qaissi (b. 1988) emphasizes the geostrategic (Iraq's location), economic (huge oil reserves and investment opportunities) and military (the establishment of military bases and changing the military doctrine of the Iraqi army) motives behind the US occupation of Iraq.[96] The 2003 US invasion was not an 'arbitrary decision', nor did it occur in order to "liberate the Iraqi people as claimed by the US administration," but it was promoted by 'very important strategic considerations,' he maintains.[97] While basing himself almost entirely on secondary sources in Arabic, al-Qaissi makes a number of plausible and well- supported claims, namely that: 1) strategic and economic considerations were far more important than ideological ones in prompting the 2003 invasion,[98] 2) the United States intended to use Iraq as a linchpin to exert hegemony over the Gulf region and insulate it from Iranian influence,[99] 3) the failure of the Iraq occupation and the Barack Obama decision to withdraw militarily do not mean that the United States has given up on its plans to dominate Iraq and the Gulf region,[100] and 4) in its future efforts to exert hegemony over the region, the United States will resort to diplomacy and soft power, relying primarily on bilateral political and military agreements.[101]

The more polemical Lieutenant General Taha al-Shakarji does not mince words in denouncing US policy towards Iraq, especially its conduct as an occupying power since 2003. In line with many Arab authors, he distinguishes between the real motives behind the 2003 Iraq invasion and the US declared goals of: 1) eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, 2) ending the threat that Iraq posed to its neighbors and 3) freeing Iraqis of Saddam Hussein's dictatorship.[102] For al-Shakarji, these stated goals were mere smoke screens that concealed more sinister American motives that revolved around: 1) further fragmenting the Arab world through breaking up existing states into small and vulnerable 'sectarian', 'ethnic' or even 'tribal' entities that can be easily manipulated by Israel and the United States, 2) tightening the strategic noose around Communist China, through dominating the strategically important and resource-rich Arab region, and 3) reinforcing America's international dominance through discrediting alternative conceptions of international relations, such as 'global pace', 'peaceful coexistence', 'deterrence' and 'international balance'.[103]

US Media and the 2003 Iraq Occupation

Iraqi author Ahmad 'Abd al-Majid focuses on the role of the US media in preparing the stage for the 2003 Iraq invasion. For 'Abd al-Majid, the media campaign against Iraq preceded and accompanied the military one. This media blitz featured several elements including: 1) frightening Iraq with the superior military power of the United States, 2) personalizing the conflict by depicting the intended invasion as targeting Saddam Hussein, 3) exaggerating the threat that Iraq posed especially through its alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction, 4) mocking the Iraqi leadership and the capabilities of the Iraqi armed forces, and 5) twisting the facts and beating around the bush (*al-laf wa al-dawaran*) regarding US real intensions.[104]

In his introduction to the edited volume *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Souarh wa-Masaerh* (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences), Moroccan author and professor of philosophy, Abdelillah Belkeziz notes that the 'American occupation' utilized the media as a 'strategic weapon … that proved as lethal, and as effective, as the weapons of destruction that the American army deployed against Baghdad and the cities of Iraq.' The US media 'fabricated facts that had nothing to do with reality in order to justify the war and to deceive and delude the international public,' he adds.[105] The other contributors to the volume are equally polemical. Sabah Yassin lashes out at the US media for its role in promoting and justifying the Iraq invasion and occupation.[106] Muayad al-Khafaf highlights the complicity of the US media in leaking the story about the Abu Gharib torture of prisoners in order to demoralize the Iraqi resistance and detract attention from mounting US casualties in Iraq.[107] Fadel al-Rubaie attributes the occupation to the

ideas of the American Neo-conservatives who sought to extend the American empire to Iraq and the Arab region, as a prelude to unchallenged world hegemony, through spreading chaos. [108] He avers that the disbanding of the Iraqi army and police in the wake of the occupation was not a mistake but part of a deliberate plan to dissolve the Iraqi state and take Iraq back to the 'pre-state' days. For al-Rubaie, the US occupation led to the pillaging of Iraq, the crippling of its state institutions, the erosion of its sovereignty and the stirring of deadly sectarian strife, all in line with the US plan of spreading chaos.[109]

Lebanese author Walid Schmait focuses on the role of the US media in deceiving Arab and international publics, as well as the US public, through disseminating the Bush administration's pretexts for invading Iraq. More generally, Schmait dwells on the extensive use of the media by successive US administrations to promote American interests and values globally.

Consequences of the Iraq Occupation
Seven works highlight the occupation's deleterious consequences for Iraq, the Arab region and America's power and international standing. I start with the two critical works. Duham al-Azzawi offers a moderate critique of the negative consequences of the American occupation on Iraq's unity, with a particular focus on how it rekindled the hopes of Iraq's Kurds for independence. [110] Iman Ragab offers a sophisticated and critical treatment of the evolution of the US relationship with the 'Arab regional order' since 1945.[111] Her principal thesis is that, with the occupation of Iraq, the United States moved from being an external power influencing the Arab order to becoming part of that order. The occupation, thus, represented the final stage in the American "intrusion" (*taghalghul*) into the Arab regional order. [112]

Iraqi author Khaled al-Yaqoubi also highlights the negative consequences of the Iraq occupation. He notes that the United States made 'gross mistakes' in Iraq, especially in underestimating Iranian influence, and inadvertently paving the way for Iran to become the leading regional player in Iraq.[113] On a different note, al-Yaqoubi shares the view of most Arab authors that, in its foreign policy, the United States 'invariably gives priority to interests over ideals, values and morals…' [114]

'Abd al-Wahab al-Qassab offers an equally strong and polemical critique of the consequences of the Iraq occupation, noting that senior Bush administration officials, naming Dick Chaney and Donald Rumsfeld, will one day be held accountable, by the American public and American courts, not just for 'the vast losses they inflicted on a country that is thousands of miles away', but also for 'spilling American blood and wasting taxpayers money.'[115]

The short introduction to the highly polemical *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir* (The American occupation of Iraq: the Final Scene)[116] sets the volume's tone, with utterances such as 'The manner in which the United States has managed its occupation of Iraq has led to it its drowning in a bottomless swamp…' and Iraq ' has become a source of lethargy and the erosion of America's ability to market and implement its regional and international policies.'[117]The introductory essay divides the Bush years into two eras, 'The era before Iraq where American power imposed fear and obedience and the [post-Iraq] era that is marked by the beginning of the collapse of America's international role which started towards the end of the First World War.'[118] Highlighting the occupation's costs in terms of the 'growing number of killed American soldiers and destroyed military hardware' as well as rising casualties among Iraqi civilians and mounting economic and social problems in Iraq, the introduction ends on an ominous note, 'The scars of the occupation will not heal soon and there will be a generation of Iraqis who will harbor resentments toward the United States and those who supported its occupation and destruction ...' [119]

Iraqi Shiite author Baha' al-Din al-Khaqani notes that the spreading of chaos (he uses the term entropy) in Iraq and the Arab world was the principal (and intended) consequence of the US occupation. With great bitterness, he writes, 'The ultimate aim behind spreading this chaos is to depose all regimes and

all leaders that Washington considers opposed to it… and rekindle, in the teetering societies, historic animosities and sectarian and ethnic strife as well as heighten social injustice…' [120] The even more polemical 'Abd 'Ali al-Ma'mouri (also Iraqi Shiite) lashes out against the participation of US security companies in the suppression of popular revolts in occupied Iraq, noting that the United States sought to protect these companies 'against any prosecution under international or local laws in order to deploy them in its chauvinistic or religious wars of vengeance…' He goes on to note, 'Whether in Kosovo, Iraq or Afghanistan, these US wars targeted one specific religious component namely the Muslims … which is a manifestation of the political thought that came to prevail after 11 September 2000 and the address of George W. Bush in the aftermath of the attacks in which he spelled out the nature of the upcoming war as a crusade against Islam…'[121]

War on Terror
With hardly any dissent, Arab authors have denounced the Bush administration "war on terror", viewing it as a war on Arabs, Muslims and Islam, while underscoring its illegality and negative repercussions on international stability and the standing of the United States. I start with table ten which classifies the thirteen works on the 'war on terror' by tone. I then offer short synopses of nine of these works.

Table 10: Works on 9/11 and the US "War on Terror" by Tone

Author	Title	Tone
Sayyed Wild Abah[122]	*'Alam ma ba'd 11 September 2001*	Critical
Ahmad al-Yahya[123]	*Ghazwa New York al-Kubra*	Critical
Mahmoud Safar [124]	*Al-Islam wa-Amrika wa-Ahdath September*	Critical
Nazhem al-Jasour[125]	*Ta'theer al-Khilafat al-Amrikiya al-Urupiya 'ala Qadaya al-Umma al-'Arabiya*	Critical
Abd al-Ghani Imad [126]	*Sina'a al-Irhab*	Polemical
Mohsen Dalloul[127]	*Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*	Polemical
Ghazi al-'Aridi[128]	*Idaraal-Irhab*	Polemical
Mohammad Hussein Fadlallah[129]	*Al-Mudanas wa al-Muqadas*	Polemical
Issam Naaman[130]	*Amrika, al-Islam wa al-Silah Nawawi*	Polemical
Nibal Khamash[131]	*Imbraturiyat al-Akazheeb*	Polemical
Al-Fadl Shalaq[132]	*'Awdat al-Isti'mr wa al-Hamla al-Amirkiya 'ala al-'Arab*	Polemical
Abdulhay Zalloum[133]	*Hurub al-Betrol al-Salibiyah*	Polemical
Yahya Abu Zakaria[134]	*Al-Ghara al-Amrikiya al-Kubra 'ala al-'Alam al-Islami*	Polemical

Mauritanian journalist Sayyed Wild Abah offers a sophisticated and highly nuanced critique of the Bush administration 'war on terror' and more generally of America's international conduct in the Post-9/11 era. He highlights the Bush administration's utter failure to articulate an effective strategy which could have provided the basis for an international coalition against terrorism.[135] The administration even failed to secure European support for its 'war on terror', he observes.[136] While critical of US Middle East policy, Wild Abah is even more critical of Arab governments, and especially of Arab public intellectuals, noting that they lacked a deep understanding of American society and politics, while subscribing to over-simplistic views regarding America's power and international standing. For Wild Abah, these myopic views oscillated between the two extremes of overstating the case for America's power and international influence in order to

justify inaction and viewing the United States as a 'bankrupt empire that is on the verge of collapse and disintegration.'[137]

Saudi author and diplomat Ahmad al-Yahya presents a loosely structured critique of the US response to the 9/11 attacks, which highlights four themes that recur in the discourses of Arab intellectuals. First, the United States failed to produce conclusive evidence regarding the Arab identity of the attackers. (He, however, does not push this point too far).[138] Second, the US response was disproportionate, reflected deep-seated prejudices against Arabs, Muslims and Islam, and targeted innocent people who had no link to the attacks.[139] Third, terrorism should not be associated with Muslims or Islam since the United States has witnessed dozens of terrorist attacks by individuals and groups who were not Arab and had no relation to Islam.[140] Fourth, even if the 9/11 attackers were Muslims, their actions represented a gross misunderstanding of Islam which does not condone attacks on innocent civilians.[141]

Another Saudi critic of the 'war on terror' is Islamic thinker and former minister of the pilgrimage Mahmoud Safar. While condemning the 9/11attacks, and empathizing with the American people who were deeply shocked and angered by the attacks, Safar notes that the attacks could not have succeeded without some inside help from within the US government.[142] Equally important, he stresses that the Bush administration failed to produce conclusive evidence regarding the attackers' identity. But despite the weak evidence, the Bush administration used the attacks to launch its war on terror which indiscriminately and unfairly targeted Arabs, Muslims and the Islamic religion, he avers, while harshly critical of the US government – and especially the US media – for engaging in stereotyping and sweeping racial generalizations based on the actions of a few isolated individuals (that is if the 9/11attackers turn out to be Arabs). Finally, Iraqi author 'Abd al-Wahed Jasour provides a well-argued critique of US foreign policy in the post-Cold war highlighting how the policies of the Bush administration in the aftermath of 9/11 amplified the differences between the United States and Europe, especially regarding the Middle East.[143]

In order to save space, and since the seven polemical works cover similar terrain, I only cover five of them. Abd al-Ghani Imad – professor of sociology at the Lebanese University – highlights the historic, religious and ideational bases of the state terrorism of the United States and Israel. Tearing a page from Akash, Imad underscores the respective influences of Protestantism and social Darwinism in molding the American mind with respect to the relationship between the 'west and the rest' (his English words).[144] In this regard, he depicts the war on terror as a hollow slogan employed to awaken and legitimate deeply harbored suspicions and animosities towards Arabs, Muslims and Islam. Turning to polemics, he denounces Arab and Muslim leaders who, in order to assuage the United States, undertake regular pilgrimages to Washington and circumambulate around the White House.[145] Another Lebanese polemicist is former Parliamentarian and Minister Issam Naaman. Maintaining that the "war on terror" polarized and destabilized the world, Naaman denounces the United States for refusing to distinguish between terrorism and legitimate national resistance for practicing terrorism itself, and (above all) for spreading "creative chaos" all over the Arab and Muslim worlds in order to serve its interests and those of Israel.[146]

Amerka: Al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba by Mohsen Dalloul is yet another prime example of a polemical work, abounding with criticisms of American history, society, politics, foreign policy and especially Middle East policy.[147] Dalloul directs his diatribes at the triad of George W. Bush (hereafter Bush), the neo-conservatives and the Christian fundamentalists whom he dubs the 'Christian Zionists'. Bush is invariably depicted as reckless[148], duplicitous[149], opinionated[150], incompetent[151] and delusional, believing that he receives his commands from God with whom he is in direct contact.[152] As for the coalition of neo-conservatives and Christian fundamentalists, it is accused of using its control over the Bush administration in order to push for a dangerous and sinister foreign policy agenda. According to Dalloul, this agenda rested on five pillars: 1) the Middle East and Islam are the 'principal external threats to the United States,' 2) the

'whole world needs to be subjugated to American culture,' 3) the United States must 'control the resources of the Arabs, especially energy sources,' in order to 'subjugate the world, especially western countries, to its will,' 4) it is the 'manifest destiny' of the United States not only to dominate, but also to reshape, the world , since the United States is the 'wellspring of good and anyone who opposes it is evil,' and 5) military power is the main determinant of relations between states.'[153] For Dalloul, the consequence of the Bush administration's 'war on terror' included: 1) the rise in Islamic militancy and in terrorism,[154] 2) the growth in opposition to the United States, even from its allies,[155] 3) the greater militarization of international relations,[156] and 4) plunging of the US economy and the global economy into an unprecedented crisis. Despite the work's sub-title, it only deals tangentially with the Obama administration. Dalloul voices cautious optimism regarding the ability of President Obama to reverse the more extreme policies of his predecessor, especially as far as the occupation of Iraq and the war on terrorism.[157]

Fellow Lebanese author and politician, Ghazi al-'Aridi, delivers an equally damning critique of the Bush administration 'war on terror', stating repeatedly that the administration squandered all the international sympathy it gained on the eve of the September 11 attacks through undertaking unilateral and unjustified military action in Afghanistan and Iraq. He writes, 'The United States wasted a major opportunity after the attacks of September 11. For if we compare how the world back then stood on America's side and where its stands today we see a major difference.'[158] Al-'Aridi lays the blame for America's foreign policy blunders, especially in the Middle East, on the character of President Bush – whom he depicts as a "lightweight man" (*rajul khafif*)[159] – and the caliber of his presidential team. With considerable sarcasm he writes, Bush "installed around him a group of men who, as of day one, acted as if they were the rulers of the world and not just of the United States and that they can accomplish anything, being led by a man carrying a divine message." [160]

The renowned Lebanese Shiite cleric Sayyid Mohammad Hussein Fadlallah (1935-2010) dwells on the probable political motives behind the 9/11 attacks, highlighting the role of US policies towards the Third World in eliciting 'hatred among many of the oppressed people, Muslims and non-Muslims alike.' While condemning the attacks for targeting civilians, Fadlallah maintains that the Bush administration lacked credible proof that Osama bin Laden was behind them. He goes on to note that by targeting Bin Laden and Taliban, the Bush administration sought to restore 'shaken domestic confidence' and avenge 'America's wounded pride.' Fadlallah's extensive and very critical discourse on the 'war on terrorism' highlights three interrelated themes that are frequently invoked by Arab public intellectuals: 1) there is rampant terrorism in American society, 2) the United States sought to dictate its own conceptualization of terrorism, which deliberately glosses over the distinction between terrorism and legitimate resistance, and 3) the Bush administration strategically deployed the 'war on terror' slogan in order to generate domestic and global support against Arab and Muslim societies. In a nutshell, polemical works dominate Arab intellectuals' discourse on US Middle East policy, constituting nearly 75 percent of the total, while critical works represent the remaining 25 percent. Thus when it comes to US Middle East policy – the area of greatest interest to Arab intellectuals (based on percentage of work published) and undoubtedly to Arab publics – only negative views are conveyed.

Conclusion

By and large, Arab intellectuals project a highly negative image of the United States, especially regarding its history, foreign policy and Middle East policy. This manifests itself, in this study, in the preponderance of critical and polemical works, the absence of positive ones and the relatively small percentage of neutral works. The relatively high percentage of polemical works (approximately 63 percent) is particularly disturbing.

There are two worth-mentioning exceptions to this trend: western educated Lebanese Christian authors (namely: Mallat, Mitri, Malik and Salamé) and a couple of young Iraqi academics (Awad, al-Qaissi and Hashim). That young Iraqis should focus on the United States is hardly surprising, what is both interesting and refreshing is the dispassionate and academic style with which they approach the study of the United Sates, despite the then reality of occupation. Their writings (and those of the aforementioned Lebanese Christian authors) challenge the popular notion that American Middle East policy *per se* is the root cause of negative views of the United States, pushing us to seek a more sophisticated understanding of the sources of these views that takes into account the authors' formative experiences and ideological backgrounds.

These exceptions qualify, but do not abrogate, the paper's core claim that Arab intellectuals present Arab publics with a highly distorted and over-simplistic reading of the United States. While it is difficult to establish scientifically that these discourses are the main cause of negative public perceptions of the United States, there should be no doubt that the two spheres of intellectuals' discourses and public perceptions significantly overlap, reinforcing one another. The discourses of critical and especially polemical Arab intellectuals ought to be simultaneously: 1) read against the ideational backdrop of negative public views of the United States, and 2) viewed as contributing to these views, or (at least) to reinforcing and validating them. Stated otherwise, even if these discourses are not the principal source of negative public perceptions of the United States, they – at a minimum – lend them credence and serve to legitimate them. In line with the constructivist school, I reject the distinction between the material and ideational realms, agreeing with Adler that 'the manner in which the material world is shaped by human action and interaction depends on dynamic normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world.'[161]

To recapitulate, most Arab intellectuals subscribe to, and propagate, a negative image of the United States that resonates well among Arab publics. This image emphasizes: 1) a history of violence and negation of the other;2) a society that is built on inequality, consumerism and marginalization of broad segments; 3) a polity that is elite-dominated and not genuinely democratic; 4) a foreign policy that is bent on global domination and the forceful spreading of capitalism; and 5) a Middle East policy that deploys morals and ideals to conceal unconditional support for Israel, insatiable appetite for controlling the Arab region's energy resources and markets, and deep seated animosity towards Arabs, Muslims and Islam. Put in lay terms, the discourses of Arab intellectuals serve (at a minimum) to assure Arab publics that they are right in mistrusting, fearing and even detesting the United States.

But comforting as it may be, this US image is a myopic one. Adhering to it does not advance a nuanced and empirically-grounded understanding of the United States. By depicting the United States the way they do, Arab intellectuals (or to be fair the great majority of them) engage in Occidentalism or reverse-Orientalism. While this is not a policy paper, I cannot but speculate on possible ways for breaking this vicious circle (or whirlpool) that is formed from the interplay of critical and polemical intellectuals' discourses and negative public perceptions. One sign of hope is that the young generation of academics (e.g. Awad, al-Qassim and Hashim) is less polemical and more empirical than the older generation comprising mainly Arab nationalists (such as Heikal, Salim al-Hoss and Galal Amin[162]) and Islamists (e.g. Mohamad Hussein Fadlallah[163] and Yusuf Qaradawi[164]). Building on this observation, one may note that the advancement of graduate studies in political science and the other social sciences, at public and private regional universities, will raise the ratio of academics among public intellectuals. Most Arab governments are not hostile to the United States and may want to establish/strengthen American studies programs that prepare a new generation of Arab academics who are well versed in English (the language in which most research on the United States is conducted) and who possess the proper theoretical and methodological tools to analyze American history, politics and society objectively. In this regard, the American government, and

more importantly US think tanks and academic institutions, need to support these programs (e.g. through faculty and student exchanges and the provision of academic books and electronic resources) to ensure their academic rigor and alignment in terms of pedagogy and the emphasis on research with similar programs in the United States. Clearly, this would be an uphill battle. The older generation of Arab intellectuals will fight tenaciously to maintain its near monopoly over the production of knowledge on the United States and preserve intact the closed and negative US image. The battle cannot also be reduced to a generational one. Many of the young Arab intellectuals have not undergone a rigorous academic training and are as polemical as their older peers. But one must not despair.

---

[1]. Works on international public perceptions of the United States abound but differ in terms of analytical rigor. One of the best works is Giacomo Chiozza, *Anti-Americanism and the American World Order* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009). Other works include: Ian Burama and Avishai Margalit, Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of its Enemies (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004).

[2].Juan Cole, *Engaging the Muslim World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Leon Hadar*, Sandstorm: Policy Failure in the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005); Joel Migdal, *Shifting Sands: The United States in the Middle East* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2014).

[3].Pew Global Attitudes and Project: Nine Nation Survey (March 2004), accessed at:
http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID=796, 15 January 2006. Clawson and Rubin note: "the only surprising thing about Middle Eastern anti-Americanism is that anyone should be surprised by it." Patrick Clawson and Barry Rubin, "Anti-Americanism in the Middle East" in *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*, ed. Paul Hollander (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004), pp. 124-143.

[4]. Here I adopt a very broad construal of the notion of the "public intellectual" to include academics, journalists, politicians, men and women of letters, and religious figures; who write for the general reader with the purpose of alerting and educating them on serious matters that concern the general public. Works on public intellectuals that inform this study include: Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994) and Thomas Sowell, *Intellectuals and Society* (New York: Basic Books, 2011).

[5]. Adapted from Arab American Institute Foundation, *Arab Attitudes, 2011*.

[6]. Munir Akash, *Haq al-Tadhiya bi al-Akhar: Amerka: wa al-Ibadat al-Jama'iya* (The Right to Sacrifice the Other: America and Genocide) (Beirut: Riad el-Rayyes Books, 2002).

[7] Munir Akash, *Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Thaqafiya: La'nat Kan'an al-Ingliziya*(America and Cultural genocides" The English Curse of Canaan) (Beirut: Riad El-Rayyes Books, 2009).

[8].Munir Akash, *Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Jinsiya: 400 Sana min al-Hurub 'ala al-Fuqara' wa al-Mustad'afeen fi al-Ard* (America and Sexual Genocides: 400 years of Wars on the Earth's Poor and Oppressed) (Beirut: Riad El-Rayyes books, 2012).

[9]. Nassif Yassin, *Al-Irhab al-Amerki al-Mu'aulam* (Globalized American Terrorism) (Beirut: Dar al-Farabi, 2013).

[10]. Siham al-Kahtani, *Al-Azhra's wa al-Rab: Qira'a fi al-Khitab al-Siyasi Amriki* (The Virgin and the Lord: A Reading of the American Political Discourse) (Beirut: Al-Mu'assa al-Arabiya Lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2007).

[11]. Riad Tabbarah, *Amerka wa al-Huriyat: Nazhra Tarikhiya* (America and Freedoms: A Historic Look) (Beirut: Riad el-Rayyes Books, 2013). Biographical information about Tabbarah is available at:
http://www.madmaco.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=7&Itemid=9.

[12]. For a succinct statement of these five ideas see Akash, *Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Thaqafiya*, pp. 10-11. See also *Amerka wa al-Ibadat al-Jinsiya*, pp. 101-103.

[13]. Sami E. Baroudi and Jennifer Skulte-Ouaiss, "Mohamed Hassanein Heikal on the United States: The Critical Discourse of a Leading Arab Intellectual," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 51, No. 1, (2015), pp. 93-114. Other authors who echo Akash include Fahd al-'Arabi al-Harithi, *Amrika allati Tu'alimuna al-Dimuqratiya wa al-'Adl* (American that teaches us about Democracy and Justice) (Beirut and Riyad: N.A, 2004).

[14]. Nassif Yassin, *al-Irhab al-Amerki al-Mu'a'lam*, pp. 35-80.

[15]. Yassin, *al-Irhab al-Amerki al-Mu'a'lam,* p. 88.

[16]. el-Kahtani,*Al-Azhra's wa al-Rab*, p. 81.

[17]. el-Kahtani,*Al-Azhra's wa al-Rab*, pp. 105-148.

[18]. el-Kahtani,*Al-Azhra's wa al-Rab*, p.p. 86-90

[19]. Biographical information about Tabbarah is available at:
http://www.madmaco.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=7&Itemid=9.

[20]. Unlike Akash, Yassin and al-Kahtani, Tabbara does not accuse the white settlers of deliberately spreading diseases in order to kill the Indians.

[21]. Tabbara, *Amerka wa al-Huriyat*, pp. 29-36.

[22]. Tabbara, *Amerka wa al-Huriyat*,pp. 101-194.

[23] . Michael W. Suleiman, ed., *Al-'Arab fi Amrika: Sira' al-Ghorba wa al-Indimaj* (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya. 2003).

[24] . Saud al-Mawla, *Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad: Dirasa fi 'Ilm al-Ijtima' al-Siyasi* (America, the Democracy of Despotism: A study in political Sociology) (Beirut: al-Dar al-'Arabiya Lil 'Ulum Nashirun, 2009).

[25] . al-Mawla, *Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad*, esp. pp. 84-89.

[26] . al-Mawla, *Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad*, pp. 109-112.

[27] . al-Mawla, *Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad*, p. 94.

[28] . al-Mawla, *Amerka, Dimuqratiya al-Istibdad*, p. 92.

[29] . Suleiman, *Al-'Arab fi Amrika: Sira' al-Ghorba wa al-Indimaj*, p. 41.

[30] . Chibli Mallat, *Al-Dimuqratiyya fi Amerka* (Democracy in America) (Beirut: Dar al-Nahar, 2002). Mallat is a renowned Lebanese lawyer and law professor with extensive links with the media and the academy in Europe and the United States. For information about Mallat, check his website: http://www.mallat.com/ (accessed on 31 July 2014).

[31] . Tarek Mitri, Madina 'ala Jabal? 'An al-Din wa al-Siyasa fi Amerka (Beirut: Dar al-Nahar lil-Nashr, 2004). Mitri, a Lebanese Greek Orthodox, holds a doctorate in Philosophy and has been a very active member of the World Council of Churches in charge with dialogue with Muslims. Between 2005 and 2008, he was a member of the Lebanese cabinet.

[32] . Charles Malik, *Israil, Amerka wa al-'Arab: Tanabu'at min Nisf Qarn*(Israel: America and the Arabs: Prophecies from Half a Century) (Beirut: Dar al-Nahar, 2002). The work was a report that Malik, then Lebanon's ambassador at the United Nations and the United States, submitted to the Lebanese President, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister in order to deepen their understanding of pertinent international realities. Malik was a prominent Lebanese philosopher and diplomat who went on to become Lebanon's foreign minister between 1956 and 1958.

[33] . Laila Abu Zaid, Amrika al-Wajh al-Akhar (America: the Other Face) (Beirut: Al-Dar al-'Arabiya lil-'Ulum Nashirun, 2014).

[34] . Mitri, *Madina 'ala Jabal? ,* pp. 64-83.

[35] . Mitri, *Madina 'ala Jabal?*, pp. 89-116.

[36] . Mitri, *Madina 'ala Jabal?*, pp. 81-83.

[37] . Mitri, *Madina 'ala Jabal?*, pp. 19-21.

[38] . Abu Zaid, *Amrika: Al-Wajh al-Akhar*, p. 8.

[39] . Ghassan Salamé, *Amerika wa al-'Alam: Ighra' al-Quwa wa Madaha* (America and the World: the Temptation of Power and its Limits) (Beirut: Dar al-Nahar, 2005).

[40] . Hadi Kobeissi, *Al-Siyasa al-Kharijiya al-Amirkiya bayn Madrasatain: al-Muhafizhiya al-Jadida wa al-Waqui'iya*(American Foreign Policy between two Schools: Neoconservatism and Realism) (Beirut, al-Dar al-Arabiya lil-'Ulum 2008).

[41] . Amer Hashim Awaad, *Dawr Mu'assat al-Ri'asa fi Sun' al-Istratijiya al-Amrikiya al-Shamila ba'd al-Harb al-Barida* (The Role of the Institution of the Presidency in the making of American Grand Strategy after the Cold War) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al- Arabiya, 2010).

[42] . Hussein Kan'an, *Min George Washington ila Obama: al-Wilayat al-Mutahida al-Makiya wa al-Nidham al-Duwali*(From George Washington to Obama: the United States of America and the International System) (Beirut: Dar al-Nahar, 2013).

[43] . Nassar al-Rubaie, *Dawr al-Haymana al- Amrikiya fi al-'Alaqat al-Duwaliya*(The Role of American Hegemony in International Relations) (Beirut: Al-Dar al-'Arabiya lil-'Ulum Nashirun, 2013).Al-Rubaie currently serves as Iraqi minister of Labor and Social Affairs. His CV is on the Ministry's website. http://www.molsa.gov.iq/en/index.php?name=Pages&op=page&pid=72 (accessed August 27, 2014).

[44] . Bashir Abdel-Fattah, *Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya*(The Renewal of American Hegemony) (Beirut: al-Dar al-'Arabiya lil-'Ulum Nashirun, 2010).

[45] . Vincent al-Gharib, *Ma'ziq al-Imbraturiya al-Amrilkiya*(The Predicament of the US Empire) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al- Arabiya, 2008).

[46] . Abdulhay Zalloum, *Amrika bi-'Uyoun 'Arabiya*(America in Arab Eyes) (Beirut: Al-Mu'asasa al-Arabiya Lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2007).

[47] . Issam Naaman and Ghaleb Bou Mosleh, *Haqiqa al-'Asr: Inhiar al-Nizam al-Iqtisadi al-Duwali wa Intiha' al-Qiyada al-Amirkiya lil-'Alam* (The Truth of the Century: The Collapse of the International Economic Order and the End of American International Leadership) (Beirut: Sharika al-Matbou'at Lil Tawzi' wa al-Nashr, 2009).

[48] . 'Adel al-Bishtawi, *Tarikh al-Zhulm al-Amerki wa bidayat zaman al-Uful al-Imbraturi al-Madid*

[49] . Salamé, *Amerika wa al-'Alam*, p 9.

[50] . Kobeissi, *Al-Siyasa al-Kharijiya al-Amirkiya bayn Madrasatain*.

[51] . Kan'an, *Min George Washington ila Obama*, p. 29.

[52] . Kan'an, *Min George Washington ila Obama*, pp. 117-137.

[53] . Nasar al-Rubaiee, *Dawr al-Haymana al- Amrikiya,*p. 237-339.

[54] . al-Rubaiee, *Dawr al-Haymana al- Amrikiya,* p.. 440-441.

[55] , Bashir Abdel-Fattah, *Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya* (The Renewal of American Hegemony) (Beirut: al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil-ʻUlum Nashirun, 2010).

[56] . Abdel-Fattah, *Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya*, p. 18.

[57] . Abdel-Fattah, *Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya* , pp. 9-14.

[58] . Abdel-Fattah, *Tajdeed al-Haymana al-Amrikiya*, pp. 95-96.

[59] .al-Gharib, *Ma'ziq al-Imbraturiya al-Amrilkiya*, p. 13.

[60] . al-Gharib, *Ma'ziq al-Imbraturiya al-Amrilkiya*, p. 116.

[61] . al-Gharib, *Ma'ziq al-Imbraturiya al-Amrilkiya*, pp. 116-117.

[62] . Zalloum,*Amrika bi-ʻUyoun ʻArabiya*,pp. 17-23, 143-172; 247.

[63] . In this regard, Zalloum dwells at length on the US role in triggering the 1994 Pezo Crisis and in imposing a tough austerity program on Mexico. Zalloum, *Amrika bi-ʻUyoun ʻArabiya*,pp. 159-162.

[64] . Zalloum,*Amrika bi-ʻUyoun ʻArabiya*,pp. 25-83, 115-142.

[65] . Zalloum,*Amrika bi-ʻUyoun ʻArabiya*,esp. pp. 163-172;

[66] . Naaman and Bou Mosleh,*Haqiqa al-'Asr,* pp. 28, 33, 91-97.

[67] . Naaman and Bou Mosleh,*Haqiqa al-'Asr,* p. 33.

[68] . Camille Nowfel, *'Arab Amerka: Raha'in Ba'isa* (America's Arabs: Desperate Hostages)(Beirut: Dar an-Nahar, 2003). Nowfel is a Lebanese-born nationalized American who served as interpreter for the White House and State Department from the Eisenhower until the Ford Administration.

[69] . Abdulhay Zalloum, *Amrika Israil al-Kubra: Israil Amrika al-Sughra: al-Tarikh al-Haqiqi Li-Amrika fi al-ʻAlam al-ʻArabi Arabi* (America: a Huge Israel: Israel a Small America, the true History of America in the Middle East) (Beirut: Al-Mu'asasa al-Arabiya Lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2009).

[70] . Mohammad al-Sammak, *Al-Din fi al-Qarar al-Amirki* (Religion and how America Decides) (Beirut: Dar al-Nafaes, 2003).

[71] . Husni Ayesh, *Amrika al-Isra'iliya wa Isra'il Al-Amrikiya* (America the Israeli and Israel the American) (Beirut: Al-Mu'asasa al-Arabiya Lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2006).

[72] . Islamonline, *Harb Kasr al-Irada Bayn al-Muqawama wa al-Mushrou' al-SahioAmriki* (The War of Defeating the Wills between the Resistance and the Zionist-American Project) (Beirut:

[73] .Nowfel, *'Arab Amerka: Raha'in Ba'isa*, pp. 15, 307-309.

[74] . Nowfel, *'Arab Amerka: Raha'in Ba'isa*,

[75]. Zalloum, *Amrika Israil al-Kubra: Israil Amrika al-Sughra*, pp. 23-44.

[76] . Zalloum, *Amrika Israil al-Kubra: Israil Amrika al-Sughra*, pp. 77-112.

[77] . Zalloum, *Amrika Israil al-Kubra: Israil Amrika al-Sughra*, pp. 77-81.

[78] . Ayesh, *Amrika al-Isra'iliya*, p. 296.

[79] . Islamonline, *Harb Kasr al-Irada Bayn al-Muqawama wa al-Mushrou' al-SahioAmriki* (The war of Defeating Wills between the Resistance and the Zionist-American project) (Beirut: al-: al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil-ʻUlum Nashirun, 2007).

[80] . Islamonline, Harb Kasr al-Irada, esp. pp. 45-58, 62-68.

[81] . Mohammad Wael al-Qaissi, *Makana al-ʻIraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*(The Significance of Iraq in the American Strategy towards the Gulf)(Beirut: al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil-ʻUlum Nashirun, 2013).

[82] . Taha Nouri Yassin al-Shakarji, *Al-Harb al-Amirkiya ʻala al-ʻIraq* (The US war on Iraq) (Beirut: al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil-ʻUlum Nashirun, 2004). While al-Shakarji refers to himself as Brigadier General, it is doubtful that he was still an active member of the Iraqi army at the time he wrote his work.

[83] . Ahmad ʻAbd al-Majid, *Istimala al-ʻAtifa: Fayaleq al-Di'aya al-Amrikiya allati Mahadat li-Ghazou al-ʻIraq* (Appealing to Emotions: The Legions of American Media that set the Stage for the Invasion of Iraq) (Beirut: Al-Mu'assa al-ʻArabiya lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2008).

[84] . Abdelillah Belkeziz. ed., *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-ʻIraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh* (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya,2005).

[85] . Mustafa Ali al-Ubaidi, *Ṣafaḥat iḥtilal al-ʻIraq : mushahadat ṣuḥufi min ḥarb la tantahi, 2003-2007*(Beirut: Al-Dar al-'Arabiya Lil 'Ulum Nashirun, 2007).

[86] . Walid Schmait, *Imbratouriyat al-Muhafizhin al-Judud:al-Tadlil al-I'lami wa Harb al-ʻIraq* (The Empire of the Neoconservatives: Media Deception and the Iraq War) (Beirut: Dar al-Saqi, 2005).

[87] . Duham Mohammad al-ʻAzzawi, *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-ʻIraq wa Ab'ad al-Fidiraliya al-Kurdiya* (The American Occupation Iraq and the Implications of Iraqi Federalism) (Beirut: al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil-ʻUlum Nashirun, 2009).

[88] . Iman Ahmad Ragab, *Al-Nizham al-Iqlimi al-Arabi fi Marhalat ma Ba'd al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-ʻIraq* (The Arab Regional Order in the Era Following the US Occupation of Iraq) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2003).

[89] . Khaled Mohsen Jaber al-Yaqoubi, *Al-Siyasa al-Amerkiya tijah al-ʻIraq wa In'ikasatiha al-Iqlimiya wa al-Doualiya ba'd Nissan 2003*(American Policy towards Iraq and its Regional and International Implications after 2003) (Beirut: Al-Dar al-ʻArabiya lil ʻUlum Nashirun, 2013).

[90] . Abd al-Wahab 'Abd al-Sattar al-Qassab, *Ihtilal ma ba'd al-Istiqlal: al-Tada'iyat al-Istratijiya lil-harb al-Amrikiya 'ala al-'Iraq* (The Occupation that followed Independence: The Strategic Repercussions of the American War on Iraq) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2007).

[91] . Abdelillah BelkezizAl-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya, 2005).

[92] . Baha' al-Din al-Khaqani, *Al-Fawda al-Khalaqa: Istratijiyat al-Siyasa al-Kharijiya al-Amrikiya li-Ma'at Sanna Qadima* (Creative Chaos: American Foreign Policy Strategy for the Next One-hundred Years) (Beirut: Dar al-Mahaja al-Baida', 2012).

[93] . 'Abd 'Ali al-Ma'mouri, 'Awlamat al:Qatl: Al-Hadara al-Amirkiya al-Jadida (The Globalization of Killing: the New American Civilization) (Beirut: Dar al-Mahaja al-Baida', 20

[94] . 'Abd al-Hussein al-Soulayman, *Baghdad min Hulagu ila Bush* (Baghdad: From Hulagu to Bush) (Beirut: Dar al-Mahaja al-Baida', 2013).

[95] . Fadel al-Rubaie, *Ma Ba'd al:Istishraq: al-Ghazou al-Amriki lil-Iraq wa al-'Awda ila al-Coloniat al-Baida'* (After Orientalism: The US Invasion of Iraq and the Retuen of White Colonialism))Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2007).

[96]. al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*, esp. pp. 67-68.

[97] . al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*,p. 269.

[98] . al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*,pp. 67-158.

[99] . al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*,p. 181, 231-250.

[100] .al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*, pp. 262-268.

[101] . al-Qaissi, *Makana al-'Iraq fi al-Istratijiya al-Amrikita tijah al-Khalij*,pp. 269-274.

[102] . al-Shakarji,*Al-Harb al-Amirkiya 'ala al-'Iraq*, pp. 37-49.

[103] . al-Shakarji,*Al-Harb al-Amirkiya 'ala al-'Iraq*, pp. 28-35.

[104] . Abd al-Majid, *Istimala al-'Atifa*, pp. 118-195.

[105] . Abdelillah Belkeziz, foreword to *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh* (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya, 2005), p. 9.

[106] . Sabah Yassin, *I'lam Ihtilal al-'Iraq: al-Sadma wa al-Ru'b* (Media Coverage of the Iraq occupation: Shock and Awe) in *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh,*(The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences)*ed.* Abdelillah Belkeziz (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya, 2005), pp. 15-33.

[107] . Muayad Kasim al-Khafaf, "*Al-Sura al-Dhihniya 'an Amrika fi al-Mujtama' al-'Iraqi*" (The Mental Image of the United States in Iraqi Society) in *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh* (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences) *ed.* Abdelillah Belkeziz (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya, 2005), pp. 35-67.

[108] . Fadel al-Rubaie, "Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-Iraq: Taktik al-Hurub min Kabous al-Sharq al-Awsat al-Jadid: Nata'j wa-Tada'iyat" (The American Occupation of Iraq: The Tactic of Escaping from the Nightmare of the New Middle East: Consequences and Ramifications) in *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: Sourh wa-Masaerh*, (The American occupation of Iraq: Its Images and Consequences) *ed.* Abdelillah Belkeziz (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiyya, 2005), pp. 129-161.

[109] . al-Rubaie, "Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-Iraq," pp. 137-144.

[110] . al-'Azzawi, *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq wa Ab'ad al-Fidiraliya al-Kurdiya,* p?

[111] Iman Ahmad Ragab, *Al-Nizham al-Iqlimi al-Arabi fi Marhalat ma Ba'd al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq* (The Arab Regional Order in the Era Following the US Occupation of Iraq) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2003), esp. pp. 9-34.

[112]. Ragab, *Al-Nizham al-Iqlimi al-Arabi fi Marhalat ma Ba'd al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq*, pp. 226-352.

[113]. al-Yaqoubi, *Al-Siyasa al-Amerkiya tijah al-'Iraq*, p. 565.

[114] .al-Yaqoubi, *Al-Siyasa al-Amerkiya tijah al-'Iraq*, p. 566.

[115] . 'Abd al-Wahab 'Abd al-Sattar al-Qassab, *Ihtilal ma ba'd al-Iatiqlal: al-Tada'iyat al-Istratijiya lil-harb al-Amrikiya 'ala al-'Iraq* (The Occupation that followed Independence: the Strategic Consequences of the American War on Iraq) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2007), p. 324.

[116] . *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir* (The US Occupation of Iraq: The Final Scene) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al-Arabiya, 2007).

[117]. *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir* , p 7

[118] .*Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir*

[119] . *Al-Ihtilal al-Amriki lil-'Iraq: al-Mashad al-Akhir,* p. 8.

[120] . al-Khaqani, *Al-Fawda al-Khalaqa*, p. 377.

[121] . al-Ma'mouri, *'Awlamat al-Qatl*, p. 13.

[122]. Sayyed Wild Abah, *'Alam ma Ba'd 11 September 2001: Al-Ishkalalt al-Fikriyah wa al-Stratijiya* (the World after 11 September 2001: Ideational and Strategic Conundrums)

[123]. Ahmad bin Hamd al-Yahya, *Ghazwat New York al-Kubra: Qisat Ahdath al-Hadi 'Ashar min September 'am 2001* (The Major Raid on New York: The Story of the Events of September 11 of the Year 2001 A.D.) (Beirut: Al-Dar al-'Arabiya lil 'Ulum Nashirun, 2011).

[124]. Mahmoud bin Mohammad Safar, *Al-Islam wa Amrika wa Ahdath September* (Beirut: Dar al-Nafaes, 2004).

[125] . Nazhem 'Abd al-Wahed Jasour, *Ta'theer al-Khilafat al-Amrikiya al-Urupiya 'ala Qadaya al-Umma al-'Arabiya fi Haqabat ma ba'd al-Harb al-Barida* (The Effects of American-European Differences on the Affairs of the Arab Nation in the Post-Cold War Era) (Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wihda al- Arabiya, 2007).

[126] .Abd al-Ghani Imad, *Sina't al-irhab: fi al-bahth 'an mawtin al-unf al-haqiqi* (The Making of Terrorism: In Search of the Terrorism's Real Home) (Beirut: Dar al-Nafaes, 2002)

[127] . Mohsen Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba: hal Uslih Obama Ma Afsadh Bush?* (America: The Perplexed Empire: Can Obama Repair what Bush Corrupted?) (Beirut: Dar al-Farabi, 2009).Dalloul started out as journalist before immersing himself in Lebanese politics. During the Syrian hegemony over Lebanon (1990-2005), he was a fixture on the Lebanese political scene serving in successive cabinets and in parliament.

[128] . Ghazi al'Aridi, *Idarat al-Irhab: Al-Athar al-Karithiya al-Mudamira li-Idarat al-Irhab fi al-'Alam wa fi al-Sharq al-Awsat.* (The Administration of Terror: The Catastrophic and Destructive Consequences of the Bush Administration on the World and the Middle East) (Beirut: Al-Dar al-'Arabiya lil 'Ulum Nashirun, 2009).

[129] . Mohammad Hussein Fadlallah, *Al-Mudanas wa al-Muqadas: Amerka wa rayat al-Irhab al-Douali* (Beirut: Riad el-Rayyes, 2003).

[130] . Issam Naaman, *Amrika, al-Islam wa al-Silhah Nawawi: Hadir al-Sira' wa Mustaqbalah fi Dunya al-'Arab wa al-'Ajam* (The United States, Islam and nuclear weapons: present realities of the conflict and its future in the land of the Arabs and the Persians) (Beirut: Sharika al-Matbu'at lil-Tawzi' wa al-Nashr, 2006).

[131] .Nibal Khamash, *Imbratoriyat al-Akazheeb : Mustalahat al-Khidah al-Amriki ba'd 11 Ayloul* (The Empire of Lies: The Terminology of American Deception after 11 September) (Beirut: Al-Mu'assa al-'Arabiya lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2004).

[132] . Alfadl Shalaq, *'Awdat al-Isti'mr wa al-Hamla al-Amirkiya 'ala al-'Arab* (Beirut: Dar al-Nafaes, 2004).

[133] . Abdulhay Zalloum, *Hurub al-Petrol al-Saleebiya wa al-Qarn al-Amriki al-Jadeed* (The Crusading Wars for Petroleum and the New American Century) (Beirut: Al-Mu'assa al-'Arabiya lil-Dirasat wa al-Nashr, 2005).

[134] . Yahya Abu Zakaria, *Al-Ghara al-Amrikiya al-Kubra 'ala al-'Alam al-Islami* (The Major American Raid on the Islamic World) (Beirut: Dar al-Mahaja al-Baida', 2003).

[135] . Abah, *Alam ma Ba'd 11 September 2001*,p. 40.

[136] . Abah, *Alam ma Ba'd 11 September 2001*,pp. 52-54.

[137] . Abah, *Alam ma Ba'd 11 September 2001*,p. 29.

[138] . al-Yahya*, Ghazwat New York al-Kubra*, p. 13

[139] .al-Yahya*, Ghazwat New York al-Kubra*, pp. 22-30.

[140] . al-Yahya*, Ghazwat New York al-Kubra*, pp. 103-116.

[141] . al-Yahya*, Ghazwat New York al-Kubra*, Pp. 117-126.

[142] . Safar, *Al-Islam wa Amrika wa Ahdath September*, pp. 13-16.

[143] . Jasour, *Ta'theer al-Khilafat al-Amrikiya al-Urupiya 'ala Qadaya al-Umma al-'Arabiya*, esp. pp. 245-373.

[144] . Imad, *Sina't al-irhab: fi al-bahth 'an mawtin al-unf al-haqiqi*, p. 17.

[145] . Imad, *Sina't al-irhab: fi al-bahth 'an mawtin al-unf al-haqiqi*,

[146] . Naaman, *Amrika, al-Islam wa al-Silhah Nawawi*, pp. 31-36

[147] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba,*

[148] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, p. 43.

[149] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, pp. 127, 132

[150] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, pp. 37, 43.

[151] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, p. 36

[152] . Dalloul, *Amerka, al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, p. 128.

[153] . Dalloul, *Amerka: al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, pp. 29-30.

[154] .Dalloul, *Amerka: al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, p. 236.

[155] .Dalloul, *Amerka: al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, p. 48.

[156] .Dalloul, *Amerka: al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, pp. 89-96.

[157] .Dalloul, *Amerka: al-Imbraturiya al-Mudtariba*, pp. 425-6.

[158] . al-'Aridi, *Idarat al-Irhab*, p.15.

[159] .al-'Aridi, *Idarat al-Irhab*,p. 9.

[160] . al-'Aridi, *Idarat al-Irhab*

[161] . Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics,"*European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3, No 3, (1997), pp. 319-363.

[162] . For the polemical discourses of al-Hoss, Amin and other Arab intellectuals see Sami E. Baroudi, "Countering US Hegemony: The Discourse of Salim al-Hoss and other Arab Intellectuals," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 1, (January 2008), pp. 105-129.

[163] . Sami E. Baroudi, "Islamist Perspectives on International Relations: The Discourse of Sayyid Muhammad Hussein Fadlallah," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1, (2013), pp. 107-133, esp. pp. 116-122.

[164] . Sami E. Baroudi, "Sheikh Yusuf Qaradawi on International Relations: The Discourse of a Leading Islamist Scholar," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 50, No. 1, (2014), pp. 2-26, esp. pp. 10- 13. See also Sami E. Baroudi, "In the Shadow of the Quran: Recent Islamist Discourse on the United States and US Foreign Policy," *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 4, (2010), pp. 569-594.