The Allegory of History: Memory, Terror and Control

Maximiliano E. Korstanje

University of Palermo, Argentina & International Society for Philosophers, UK

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
human rights torture evilness terrorism	*The problem of terrorism after the attacks in American soil in September 2011 has changed the philosophical grounds in ethics and human rights fields. The question of torture and human rights violation was placed on the tapestry of the discussion. Is good or not by torturing terrorists?, are terrorist simple demons who want to destroy America or fighters for freedom?. This essay review explores in detail the problem of evilness and how history covers what next generation must remind. In view of that our thesis is that terrorism is not an external threat, but an internal stage of mind, enrooted in western civilization. Ideologically, history serves to keep the boundaries about what is wrong and good. We often love some cultural aspects as labor, tourism, mobilities and hate others such as terrorism, violence and torture. Both are inextricably intertwined. Our desire stimulated by the marketing campaigns and advertising alludes to the formation of discourse (history) to discipline threats into tolerable and desired objects. Basically, what inside we call strike, beyond the boundaries receives the name of terrorist attack. Terrorism is the organization of labor by other means.*

Introduction

Over recent decades, to what an extent history represents a simple discourse issued by elites to keep the control, or whether it associates to the empirical facts of past are two of the points we discuss in this essay review. Following the legacy and contradictions of Michel Foucault, we examine the role of history to rememorize traumatic events such as ethnic cleansing or genocides. The current literature rests on a great fallacy. If the genocides are perpetrated by evil-doers or demons, instead of humans, also we are unable to invoke history to vindicate the suffering. This happens simply because evilness is a universal and philosophical connotation which cannot be operationalized. Additionally, we place the concept of justice under the lens of scrutiny. By formulating that all humans have human rights, we are alluding that these rights are universal. The state, originally designed to serve as police for to honor these rights, is at a position of privilege respecting to the rest. This idea that Michael Ignatieff calls, the idolatry of Human Rights, is conducive to create an "imperialist" view of the world. Geoffrey Skoll is vital to understand how empires manipulate not only the allegory of history, the meaning of genocide but also the terror to keep internally its workforce and externally the other economies under submission. It is safe to say, this review goes beyond the paradigm of cultural studies to embrace many philosophical viewpoints. As Harvey put it, in a mobile world where the project of truth diluted forever, understanding events is an almost impossible task.

Capitalism and the mediated truth

Since the contributions of D. Harvey, our existent understanding of modernity has changed.

Harvey suggests that the essence of postmodernism upsurged after the Arabs-Israel wars through 70s decades, whenever the oil embargo pushed Western economies between the wall and blue sea. Since the economic rules have been radically altered, markets were circumscribed to abandon the current form of production, adapted from fordism. If the weberian analysis rested on the fact that capitalism is based on control, burocracy and linear calculation, Harvey adds, new capitalism (postmodernism) segmented the demands to offer unique and exclusive products to be consumed only under the line of sign. As a result of oil-embargo that jeopardized the industrial economies many factories appealed to create a new alternative to continue with their productions. The logic of creative construction was centered on the cyclical needs of destroying for creating and so forth. At a first glance, this worked fine because the western capitalist economies survived by means of specialized consumption but this engenders a serious risk for social life. Effects of postmodernism not only accelerated the social fragmentation, denounced by Weber a century ago, but also introduced in social sciences a moral relativism that created ultimately a state of anarchy and chaos. This new epistemological resistance, which envisaged in Enlightenment a type of Leviathan, experienced serious problems to understand the social world (Harvey 2004).

This means that the postmodern logic set the pace to incorporating a bunch of images, texts, and knowledge in an incoherent framework (kitsch) to be appropriated, understood and consumed depending on subject needs. Since, the self becomes in the epicenter of knowledge and technology, uncertainty and ambiguity mined the time. F. Jameson (1984), in this vein, considers that one of the main problems of poscapitalism seems to be the predominance of instantaneity over other forms of relations. Under this conjectural collage, M. Foucault wrote the truth is a result of the exercise of violence and power. Any society there is multiple flowing senses of powers that circulate elsewhere, to be orchestrated in a monopoly of discourse. Nonetheless, this discourse not only oppresses other discourse but also silences other voices. Under the lemma, economy of truth, Foucault argues that any discourse should be understood as a text, constructed according to previous cultural value, which is structured in a specific form of economic production. Even, the science, deemed for long time as an instrument to unveil the truth, is a result of a genealogy of history that is imposed by ruling groups. The monopoly of nation-state persists by means of disciplinary mechanisms whose ends particularly are aimed at modeling the subject minds. The violence is exerted over the bodies while the mind is conditioned by the morality. As the previous argument given, law, state and history are inextricably intertwined. Starting from the premise any truth seems to be, in foucaultian terms, an arbitrary construal functional to power, Foucault is strongly convinced, the jurisprudence absorbs the negative aftermaths of uncertainty, making the social life safer and further stable. The dialectics between the truth and history is given by the mixture violence and legitimacy. The authority of state corresponds with the needs of extorting the war outside beyond the frontiers of society. The history, as a mere ritual, works to strengthen the discourse of ruling elites. The history, narrated, constructed and transmitted seems to be always the voice of victors over vanquished whose actions are determined by the Empire of law (Foucault, 2001).

Although, this hot debate still remains in the science of jurisprudence between formalists and instrumentalists (Minda, 1995), the interpretation of law sometimes is considered irrespective of morality. C. Sunstein emphasizes on the application of jurisprudence adjusted to the social contexts where facts evolved. Without this, the law is nothing. While problems of daily life are resolved using the individual reasoning, the justice must accumulate a capital to make adequate decisions according to the cases to be resolved. As Foucault, Sunstein acknowledges that the function of justice is the reduction of uncertainty by the application of law. If the hobbesian lecture is right, adds Rawls, the justice should be understood as a consequence of social perspectives, and opportunities respecting to social change (Sunstein 1994). If people are aware about their real possibilities, sentences would

have been rejected. Based on the idea that the veil of ignorance is the only instrument by means people accept the law, Rawls describes not only how individual interests affect the societal order, but to what extent the sense of security is radically shifted whenever the reality is de-codified. Sunstein, to this argument, would reply that democracy is feasible under the condition citizens deposits certain trust on the system, accepting their burdens and obligations seen the partial nature of constitution (Sunstein 1996).

Following this, the pervasive nature of law seems to be one of the problems more interesting in the study of human rights. At some extent, the law is changed by who takes the power (rulers). Ethnicity cleansing, genocides and other atrocities have perpetrated by the approval of the law. D. Dworking (1996) to resolve this quandary convincingly explains that judges, under excuse of impartiality, conforms net of powers that are part of ruling elites. Their interpretation of constitutions, always broader and open to many views, is the weapon judges employ when their hegemony is at stake. Their sentences and the moral order where those sentences rest, are not only partial and disputable, but also biased. This discussion, anyway, does not invalidate the trials to persons guilty of genocide, but sheds certain light of conjuncture factors that mould to what an extent a group or a person is or not judged, as well as under what circumstances, the sentences is influenced by the social context. .

The revisionism of Holocaust

AAs one of most important scholars dedicated to themes of genocide in Argentina, in his recent book Daniel Feierstein discusses critically, on the needs to construct a conceptual framework to expand the current understanding of genocide, as well as explaining how it operates in context of instability and uncertainty. He reminds that genocide was a neologism, coined by Lemkin, which has been legalized by the United Nations through 1948 as a deliberate attempt of systematic destruction in whole population because of ethnics, racial or religious characteristics. This conception makes very difficult to be extrapolated to Latin American conjunctures. In its original draft, this project acknowledges that "argentine genocide" does not correspond with the classic definition of ethnic cleansing in view of the military-forces were moved by ideological goals. In his efforts to adjust the concept of crime towards the jurisprudence of genocide, Feierstein should force to a new definition beyond the boundaries of that which has been formulated by United Nation half century ago. Most certainly, this work shows the importance to formulate a new definition of genocide to add political violence as a criterion of obliteration. The declaration of UN in 1948, in fact, has not contemplated that a reason of genocide may be very well the ideology of victims. For that, it is necessary not only to reopen a hot-debate on the tactics and technique of Juntas to keep the order, but also the ways these types of events are repressed or memorized (Feierstein 2014).

In the same vein, Deborah Lipstadt delved in the impacts of Holocaust on public opinion as well its denial. There are a number of scholars and pseudo-intellectuals who exerted considerable pressure to tergiversate the history of Second World War, or at least its effects. Although the historiography often seeks for new proofs to revalidate the survivor experiences, holocaust deniers focus on a theory of conspiracy, elaborated by Zionism, where Germans are symbolically presented as monsters. These types of tactics are aimed at affecting the reputation of Germany in some way. Lipstadt is strongly convinced not only holocaust deniers keep neo-Nazi beliefs, but also this biased view only may be possible in a time of moral relativism. One of the aspects that characterize the life in late modernity is the lack of certainty about intentions and facts. The reality and truth set the pace to the text and interpretation. From this point of view, many neo-Nazis are still vindicating their ideology

approaching to nihilism or neo-pragmatism. If the falsehood or truth depends on the way things are considered by people, the main point of discussion lies on the right to publish or not to publish. As a result of this, facts are transformed in convincing fakes.

> *"The vast majority of intellectuals in the Western world have not fallen prey to these falsehoods. But some have succumbed in another fashion, supporting Holocaust denial in the name of free speech, free inquiry, or intellectual freedom. An absolutist commitment to the liberal idea of dialogue may cause its proponents to fail to recognize that there is a significant difference between reasoned dialogue and anti-intellectual pseudo-scientific arguments" (Lipstadt 1993: 71).*

Most certainly, Lipstadt's account should be duly interpreted. She is not against the true revisionists or historians who have the opportunity to situate the sacred-facts under the lens of scrutiny. Morally speaking, Six million civilians killed are the same than 200 thousand. The Holocaust is very well a human disaster simply because unarmed groups have systematically assassinated without a fair trial, this was not only true, but also an undeniable fact. Truthfully, what come after the Germany defeat was not better… but this is not enough to say Holocaust never existed. Secondly, problems with holocaust deniers are not surely epistemological, because these studies are not aimed at discovering the truth. Carefully fabricated to misunderstand or distortion to the public opinion. The needs of hearing another side or another voice, which are always valuable aspects of science, unfortunately pave the ways for the advent of pseudo-intellectuals. After all, as Lipstadt put it, people who have no suffered or experienced the atrocities of Nazi´s camps, have some problems to understand or feel how racism works. Here begs a more than interesting question, why generations that has not lived Holocaust should be familiar with this event?, is history a continuum of cruelty where the dog eat the dog?. It is unfortunate that Lipstadt did not witness the tragedies of 9/11 and the Israel's siege to Palestine folk. S. Zizek who was aware of this issue, re-questioned not only the role of Israel in international politics, but also given some conditions how lambs becomes in wolves (Zizek 2009).

N. Guidotti-Hernandez (2011) argues that nation-states have historically played a pervasive role in the conquest of otherness. The racialized violence exerted on minorities was accompanied by an unspeakable violence which wrote the history. Nation states are formed under process of differentiation and its economic re-organization of territory. Far away of being a site of frank dialogue, stability and understanding, US-Mexico border shows a legacy of territorial disputes and conflict. At the same time, nation-states administrate racism and sexism to control their citizens, who under some circumstances may defy on the economic conditions that sustain the class hierarchy, a much broader selective memory narrates some events over-exaggerating certain aspects of politics but silencing others. Following this argument, it is important not to loose the sight that borders are spaces of multi identities that needs from violence to exist; in so doing, multi-racial communities enact violence each other to perpetuate their own cultural values and amnesia. She presents an innovative thesis respecting to the role played by selected-memory in silencing violence, but also contrasts sharply to the old belief that portrays Anglos and Chicano under the lens of master/slave game. Under some conjuncture, the law is tergiversated to protect the interests of elite. This slippery matter will be treated in next lines.

Debating the roots of Evilness

Undoubtedly, catastrophe, genocide and moral disaster are strong terms which throughout XXth century waked up the humankind from its slumber. One might speculate that evilness can be narrated by means of the survivor's testimony but this seems not to be the only one. The social

imaginary weaves different versions and discourses respecting to a certain event. In addition, it is clear how our own moral cosmology leads us to fabricate judgements about the meaning of events that are often enrooted in the political discourse of dominants. M. Pia Lara argues that evilness can be described whenever the people come across with a point of convergence between their needs of justice, psychological trauma and moral stance about what the tragedy means. Events as Auschwitz or even the bloody dictatorships in Latin America are examples of that. Most certainly, the existent understanding of genocides is possible due to critical filters that accommodate events into the view of morality. To some extent, she coins a new term for referencing those damages suffered by survivors of these disasters: moral damage. Like in Auschwitz, the sorrowful and pain of victims cannot be narrated by words. For describing their torment, new words must be certainly coined. This exactly what did Lemkin by Genocide (Gen = ethnicity and cide = cleaning) or Arendt when created the term Totalitarianism. Both coined two neologisms by referring to events that have no reference or further specification in the language before. As the previous argument given, the reflexive judgement helps philosophers and lay-people not only to understand the impacts of events and avoid similar disasters in future but also to reconstruct a moral history precisely of what Adorno called "nie wieder! – never again". Even though, one might accept how sadism and passion for cruelty are two much deeper sentiments that predominate in human nature, the reflexive judgement replaces the debate in public sphere to the extent of orchestrating necessary collective efforts to comprehend the spectrum of evilness. No matter than time or culture, human beings are underpinned in the belief that they are able to control the evilness and above all contingency but in practice this way of thinking not only does not allow changing the future but also condition our moral criticism to avoid a similar disaster at a latter day.

Lara´s argument points out that imagination permits witnesses to express whatever is indescribable recurring to new linguistic terminologies that certainly creates their version of history. Therefore, the good stories, legends and myths are good simply because they restore the human condition and their inevitable propensity to evil. They describe under what conditions the mythical archetype determines human behaviour. Whether, Arendt has already demonstrated how the banality of evilness (in the case of Eichmann) sedates the moral consciousness even in scholars. It is important to denote that this exactly was the troubling role played by Heidegger during the Regime of National-socialism in Germany. The fact is that the exacerbation of instrumentality works as a mechanism to shape the moral view of events is often present in authoritarian governments. The fearful nature of Nazi's atrocities suggests that not only they have been planned but also executed with downright impunity and moral indifference about what the suffering of others meant.

Around the human suffering, totalitarian regimes need of a radicalization of politics for gaining more legitimacy and authority. The tergiversation of ethic and moral values are accompanied with a much broader assurance what before was unmoral it becomes in moral now. These policies are politically aimed at dissuading viewers and audience their own practices are the correct. The moral basis for the radical destruction of otherness needs of certain complicity to the extent of localizing to a palpable enemy who can be targeted of all collective frustrations. The process of construction of a foe can be created by means of the articulation of a false-conspiracy where the other is gradually dehumanized. In this conjuncture, our language plays a pivotal role in re-elaborating new meaning and terms to legitimate the totalitarian policies. This means no other thing that the process of dehumanization corresponds with a compulsory need to label the otherness according to certain negative stereotypes to the extent of being a hazard for common-well being. Moreover, it is important not to loose the sight that the process of dehumanization is enrooted in the cultural background of society. Potential victims are targeted as enemies of State simply because they have been excluded from their right as corporal body. One might speculate that the human rights of Jews (regardless their

profession) were surely violated once they were divested from their rights as German citizens. This would never have been possible without the previous historical background in XVII and XVIIIth centuries that paved the ways for a wider sentiment of anti-Semitism which has been expanded previously throughout Europe. Under this tragic conjuncture, a point that immediately surfaces is ¿what should be the role of philosophy in this process?, ¿should we take a proactive stance before a totalitarian regime?

In sharp contrast with S. Zizek, Pia Lara acknowledges that it is strongly necessary to enhance our moral current understanding of disasters to construct an archetype whose guidelines can illuminate people in darkness. The moral evolution is the only way to prevent calamities as Auschwitz, but it is important to say here that there is an implicit danger when officials in quest of further legitimacy, manipulate politically the spectrum of moral damage simply because these policies created a show-case and spectacle of disaster that paved the ways for the advent of new stronger one. Reminders of what Auschwitz or Argentine's dictatorship were should be once again re-placed under the lens of scrutiny, quite aside of the monopoly of one-sided vision. A debate should be done accumulating different views and perspectives of involved social actors. Otherwise, we run the risk to prepare the conditions for the surfacing of a new dictatorship; the cynical dictatorship of human rights. The critical philosophy should examine and discuss to what extent the victims do not become in executioners; simply because boundaries among ones and others seem to be very tight.

Under this context, most likely the book of María Pia-Lara (2009) corresponds with an innovative project that explores the profundity of trauma with the needs of revenge and the social-structures that allowed a moral-disaster may certainly take room. This represents valuable efforts to connect the criticism of Frankfurt schooling with the postmodern nihilism of S. Zizek and Neomarxian School, a point underexplored in specialized literature that will start scholars talking in next year, above all in Latin America where the wounds of past will take some time before they get over. This is perhaps one of the problems in the argument of Pia-Lara. Whilst Zizek calls to hold of reacting before the moral cynicism of late-capitalism, she is convinced that scholars should take a moral stance based on criticism. To what an extent, such a stance may exert influence in other minds to legitimate other dictatorship is a troubling issue unresolved in the Lara´s argument. In order for readers to understand further about this matter, let me clarify the argument of Zizek respecting to how symbolic violence can be downrightly exerted by capitalism.

Following this, Zizek recognizes that the modern propensity to exercise violence under the figure of sovereignty is circumscribed to the manipulation bio-power and the principle of shortage which is based on the notion of uncertainty and contingency. That way, concepts such as risk, hazards and fear seems to be functional to the monopoly of power of elite. From the Eichmann's trial in Jerusalem to the postmodern terrorism, the bourgeois culture characterizes by an excess of instrumentalism and rationalization and of course by the spectacle of victimization. For that reason, the symbolic imposition of meaning constitutes as the primary form of violence West cynically exerts over the rest of globe. Charity, sympathy and victimization play an important role in order for elite to maintain their status-quo. The shocking for disasters, calamities and tragedies prevent people to understand the real causes which ushered into a situation of such a nature (Zizek, 2009: 12). The horror of violence rests on what cannot be said. In this vein, academician's thesis become in ideological discourses not necessarily for what they stress but for what they silenced. Ideology works as a dream, whereas the surface remains credible, the core is false.

The notion of false-urgency seems to be coined in observance of the last natural and made-man

disaster ranging from the current Haiti's earthquake or Katrina's hurricane in US. Whenever these types of tragic events whipped to poorer sector of the society, people donated their own properties in assistance of victims or survivors. It is not surprising to see a considerable volume of financial assistance has been bestowed to peripheral countries in moment of human-emergency but far-away of reversing the miserable conditions these countries stand, these types of campaigns reinforces the financial dependence that potentiated the crippling aftermaths of disaster. Concerns of corporations for well-being and charity are aimed at enhancing their own profits. Nowadays, by consuming certain products, one may contribute to scramble with poverty in Africa or Latin America.[1]

From this perspective, Zizek distinguishes two sorts of violences, objective and subjective. The former refers to indoctrination exerted by the system by means of ideology, police and State whereas the latter denotes the possibility to indentify and demonize to whom we consider the source of violence. For Zizek, subjective and objective violence are inextricably intertwined. One of Zizek upshots is that postmodernity is blurring the boundaries between victims and culprits. The same Israel that has suffered the Nazi´s oppression is replicating now these techniques of tortures over Palestine's population. It can be hypothesized that fear cut the phenomenological world in two, we and others. For one hand, we show certain propensity to perceive the outsider world as insecure and dangerous while home can be seen as safe or a source of intimacy with others like me. This means that authenticity only is feasible by means of the ongoing articulation of what is fearful in external world. The figure of evilness reinforces the solidarity of people. When the hurricane Katrina visited New Orleans thousand of people were relegated to live in stadiums or even in streets. This natural disaster showed the darkest side of American inequalities on black and Latin American population. Nevertheless, the Mass-Media emphasized on the lootings and resurgence, larceny, assassinations, rapes and other episodes of violence after-disasters. Wasp's racism reappeared on agenda in US declaring the inferiority of blacks to live harmoniously in moment of emergencies. Whatever viewers were experiencing would be a supposed explanation about the aggression inherited to blacks. In this vein, admits Zizek, language amplifies the differences between self and others. Similar remarks can be observed in France after thousand of migrants pushed to security minister leave his appointment. There is a hermeneutic temptation to comprehend the meaning of disrupting events always under the moral shape of our own ethnocentrism. It is not surprising to see who is involved as main-responsible of the disaster intends to provide with a "pseudo-scientific" explanations to clarify the facts. Problems such as natural disaster, terrorism or even virus outbreaks involve West civilization as a primary liable and of course as a primary victim. The process of victimization eludes the responsibilities for the situation. This of course has been an issue that Pia-Lara should think twice.

Hannah Arendt Legacy

As a continuance of Hanna Arendt's legacy, in this book Judith Butler (2011) poses the question of violence and war beyond the boundaries of politics, to invent a new theory of ethics. The connection between visual and mobile cultures and the violence is exhaustively examined by Butler across this short research. In order for scholars to re-consider their stance respecting to the victimization and vulnerability, she considers that the instruments of war that causes suffering to human beings are originally created to make this life safer. An assumption of this caliber opens the door to discuss the paradox of hegemony where the frontiers between oppressed and oppressors are blurred. The war-state not only accelerates the vulnerability of human beings but also confers legitimacy to governors. In

---

1   The discussion about evilness and moral responsibilities are not finished. Nihilist and ethicists have debated long time on the conception of power respecting to ethic. The former considers that the stronger says what is wrong and good, while the latter ones signals to a more universal (Kantian) view of ethics.

view of this, Butler (2011) adds, we must accept that mass-media are monopolized by the sate to exert visual control over the population. The information that is circulated throughout the society remains associated to the discourse of politics, functional to ruling elite interests. Epistemologically speaking, whenever we hear or watch news related to battles, a frame of stereotypes is adjusted. The sense of reality, broadcasted by the media reports acts of war, but this information corresponds with a subtle tactics of violence as well. Most certainly, in the late capitalism, violence is commoditized and sold as a visual product to maintain entertained to audience, but at some extent, this runs a serious risk simply because lay-people understanding is framed on a biased view of facts. That way, the mediated frames not only exhibits the acts of violence, inherited in all wars, but also contributes to create a biased interpretation of the events. Therefore, the image becomes uncontrollable because of the velocity of reproduction that alters its contours. In perspective, the circulation of news determines the social bonds to the extent to control the loyalties of consumers. It is important not to loose the sight that many soldiers are recruited in the army forces to escape from the poverty or the situation they live. In this vein, war allows the professionalization of pour citizens and expands their possibilities, which are subject to the exploitation of senses in order for viewers to commit. As actors, soldiers play a role in the theatralization of battlefields. During the state of emergencies, wars wake up, citizenry confers their loyalty to the system and social protest is temporarily controlled, mitigated and reduced.

As the previous argument given, Butler acknowledges that the current preventive war-state evokes the rights to limit the daily life of people. Although there are, in some conditions, collateral damages in any conflict, western states are aimed at agreeing to typify legally a controlled quota of violence, decoding and controlling the violence by means of law and international covenant of human rights. The resources are mobilized to cause certain damage to enemies, with some care not to violating the grounding human rights. However, all wars, to some extent, violate the human rights. Similarly, the war-state facilitates further identification about what lives should be exterminated and what should be protected.   Unless otherwise resolved, it is clear how war produces deprivation in order for Empires to index new local economies, convert their inhabitants in workers and recycle their local resources to stimulate the consumption in largest metropolis. One of most interesting sections of this book refers to the way the bodies, victims are manipulated by armies to coin an ethnocentric discourse. The statistics about casualties depend on how the information is presented. This process moulds emotionally the reaction of people. While civilians are often considered as innocents, terrorists refer to soldiers. Underpinned in the proposition that some tactics of war consists in creating false information based on manipulation of words, Butler explores how the sentiment of victimization may be politically re-channeled to install a dictatorship. This means that human right proponents, sometimes, may support a bloody totalitarianism; a theme which may be studied in the contemporary Argentina. Whatever the case may be, the main thesis of this valuable research is that some leftist scholars should take attention not to be employed as proponents of a new subtle racism. Whether a stronger state exerts pressure against its ethnic minorities, as Muslims in USA, public opinion may react against these strategies denouncing constitutional rights. To solve this potential short-circuits, States, in the late modernity appeals to victimization. Efficient policies entail to cut the individual freedoms of Muslims, portraying their rejection to gays, radical feminists and lesbians. Some sexual minorities are, under these conditions, framed to fight against Muslim-Americans. Ethnocentrically, the national purity is used as a form of strengthening its own boundaries. Activists and left-wing scholars ought to re-consider the practical application of some philosophical concepts such as liberty, democracy, equal opportunities, racism, ethnocentrism, and fear. Secondly, it is important to situate the demands of minorities in pro of an egalitarian assimilation of migrants. One thing is to accept the cultural values of hosting community, and another is multiculturalism. Following this argument, if migrants are accepted by means of the sacrifice of their cultural values and customs, the reactionary nationalism would be a fertile source for terrorism. Rather, politicians should implement policies of acceptation

of strangers more democratic and hospitable. Last but not least, Butler warns on the international business corporations that today control the mass media plays a pivotal role in the preventive war to Middle East and the policies of US worldwide. She accepts the access of information is based on the process of communication, but the coverage of wars seems to be framed following specific interests to maintain the power of status quo. Far away of being, terrorism a question of religious belief or fundamentalist values, terrorists attacks are result of the local resentment against USA and its arbitrary intervention in Middle East. To put this in bluntly, terrorism has a political nature oriented in a territory. The sense of the word, that usually is done by the media plays a crucial role in how news are interpreted, stereotyped and digested by the rest of population. Why some deaths are desirable while others are denied?

This book contains a lot of philosophical points, which trigger a necessary hot-debate to understand the social construes and their influence on the dialectics of national borders. This daunting master-work represents a vivid work that describes the problems and phantoms of American society post 9/11. The World trade center's attacks exhibited a cynic omnipotence that led US to violate the international rights in Iraq invasion. As a result of this, the frontiers were closed, and the country insulated to the advance of other cultural penetrations. Furthermore, she claims that conservative scholars validate the torture as a form of collating valid information to deter potential attacks in US soil. As a pretext, national or homeland safety has transformed the ways Americans connect with otherness. The role of left and its resistance to the negative effects of war-state are of paramount importance to forge a more egalitarian society, in doing so leftist movements should keep their critical view about the existent national stereotypes, enrooted in American culture. What is important to remind here, in this debate, seems to be the role of those minorities, as femininity, queers, and homosexuals, who have certainly fought in past by their rights, are now utilized to administer the precarization of other ethnicities. Nor Islam, neither Muslim culture are staunch enemies of feminist movements, as mass-media widely portraits.

Although this piece represents a good effort to understand how ideology is capitalized by the media, her main argument rests on a false assumption, respecting to freedom and democracy. Basically, the sense of democracy that characterizes our politics differs substantially in comparison with Greece. Some intellectuals consider erroneously that democracy is the cure for all illnesses. As originally used by Greeks, democracy was a resource by means a free citizen may call the assembly if a law was unfair. The legitimacy of kings or the slavery as a form of production was accepted in ancient Greece. They realized that justice and total freedom were incompatible. The access for all engenders an unabated state of chaos only. The precarization was a necessary condition of humankind that excluded the slaves. This created a stronger liaison between the master and its disciple. With the advent of modernity, rather, this cosmology not only was radically altered by mobilizing the human resources to change their residency, but also precarized the conditions of labor to reduce the salaries of workers. As a result of this, the system needed from an ideology to design the new world. Democracy and psychological needs were key factors to determine the introduction of capital, as a mediator between state, representants and citizens. As the previous argument, the ancient Democracy was transformed in other thing. Anglo-democracy worked to replicate the capital by building a symbolic wall among human beings. Today what Butler ignores is that Anglo-democracy not only appears to be part of the problem, not the solution but is based on capital, republicanism and business corporations. If Greeks were able to derogate the unfair laws, modern citizens are circumscribed to exercise their liberty on elections. International corporations in combination with ruling elites may exert considerable pressure for the Senate to legislate in its favor. This means that Anglo-democracy protects and intervenes in moments where the private interests are at stake. Her criticism against capitalism and its way of framing terrorism depends upon the existent forms of politics. Democracy has dead forever!

The problem of terrorism has been approached by countless scholars from different countries and in different tongues. What would be more than interesting to discuss is how it leads democracy to vulnerate the human rights, they were originally aimed at protecting. 9/11 and international terrorism has changed the world in many senses. The liberal scholar, Michael Ignatieff, acknowledges the difficulties to ask the world to honor the human rights, when US commit systematic violations to individual rights. US as a primary power, has created an state of exception where the doctrine of self-determination is posed as a warranty of democratic life against the allegations and claims of other countries alluding to human right violations. As a new constitutional agency, self-determination closes the hermeneutic circle between US and the rest of the world. Americans reserve the right to govern themselves at their discretion, the point is that they never are accounted by the crimes committed abroad. Like Feierstein, Ignatieff places the UN human right declaration under the lens of scrutiny. With the end of grating the freedom of isolationist groups, the negotiation should be situated under the lens of scrutiny of other democratic states. Most certainly, the discrepancy between self-determination and human rights are resolved in view of three key factors, a) the deliberative democracy, b) the struggle of all state against terrorism, c) the right of intervention of democratic states to respect the liberties of minorities.

Ignatieff goes on to say overtly that

> *""So Human rights might best fortified in today's World not by weakening of already overburdened states but by their being strengthened wherever possible. State failure cannot be rectified by human right activism on the part of NGO's. What is required when state fail is altogether more ambitious; regional powers brokering peace accords between factions, peacekeeping forces to ensure that truces stick, multilateral assistance to build national institutions, like tax collection, police forces, courts, and basic welfare services" (Ignatieff 2001: 35)*

Nonetheless, the act of violating human rights is always a lesser evil, in a context of terror and uncertainty, Ignatieff adds. Terrorism not only enables the logic of dictatorship but evokes the need to establish the lesser evil for society. The unjust act of war is impossible to prevent, but only in democracy that cruelty can be regulated. The self control of democratic institutions outweighs the abuse of some others in moment of uncertainty. The liberty of people is undermined because the state should predict when the next blow will take form. The atmosphere of fear leads society to embrace dictatorial policies otherwise would be neglected. In view of that, he alludes to this as lesser evil. The suspension of liberties seems to be a collateral damage in the fight against terrorism [2]. Ignatieff´s view not only the liberal position respecting to the preventive war and terrorism, but also the conceptual pretext to legitimate the military intervention in other autonomous countries.

In the opposite pole, Geoffrey Skoll, professor emeritus from SUNY at Buffalo has explained convincingly that the priorities of states is keeping the order and preserving the interests of status quo. In times of stability, states rest its legitimacy in the market because it provides to citizenry a reason to belong. The mass-consumption works in this stage as a mechanism of self-indoctrination. At the time the conditions of exploitation changes to instable forms, and chaos surfaces, states monopolize the use of violence to re-establish the lost order. It is hypothesized in Skoll´s view, the market functions as a mediator between democracy, market and people. Terrorism should not be defined as an external threat to West, as many studies emphasize on. Rather, terrorism is the organization of labor by other means. Far way of being, ill-minded persons who like to obliterate our civilization, terrorists earned

---

2   Michael Ignatieff a liberal writer has known by his thesis of lesser evil. He justifies that violence regulated by democracy is not a bad thing to struggle against terrorism.

Ph doctorates, and masters at the best western universities. The ways 9/11 was planned doubtless was copied by a management guidebook. As James Piazza (2005) put it, it is common to think terrorism is the staunch enemy of democracy, but reality shows the reverse. Democracy and terrorism are inextricably intertwined. What anyway Ignatieff has right is that terrorism blurs the boundaries of causality covering the reasons of terrorism to be incorrectly remembered. To set a present example, the allegory of US as the fighter of justice does not say too much on the US as the primary violators of human rights in Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib. To understand this, we have to delve into the history of terrorism and the capitalized organization of labor. This poses an interesting dilemma, what is the difference between a strike and a terrorist attack?

The history of workers' unions is fraught with violence, death, and blood. Now these organizations seem to be legally recognized. Most of them were historically aligned to leftist political movements coming from Europe, Germany, and Italy. The industrial revolution and industrial capitalism were prerequisite for workers to think in terms of collective organizations. The US American Federation of Labor was founded in 1886. One of the main strengths was the power of negotiation with the owners of capital. James Joll (1979) explains that at first anarchists were depicted as dangerous by the ruling class press and the politicians who did their bidding in Gilded Age America. The United States government waged chronic war against unions beginning at the end of the Civil War And continuing until the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930s. The first syndicalists that defied the state were labeled as terrorists. These workers professed a nonnegotiable fight for oppressed classes, which have been relegated by the capitalist aristocracies (Joll, 1979). At the end of WWII the American ruling class achieved a double capitulation domestically and abroad. The famous Marshall Plan worked as a catalyst to undermine the ever-growing worker demands in Europe, while the CIA consorted with gangsters and former Nazis and Fascists to subvert and terrorize workers, their unions, and their political parties. At the same time, legislation such as the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act restricted the political activities of unions and blunted workers' only weapon against exploitation—the strike. The problem of communism seems not to be the anti-capitalism values it represents, but its potential effects on workers, a threatening influence that would jeopardize the American economy.

Even though the first strikes were bloody and violent, with the passing of years anarcho-syndicalists were legally accepted in societies which not only needed the masses to work, but also sublimated their protests into reified forms of negotiation that for better or worse accelerated the reproduction of capital. Their formerly attributed terrorism was commoditized into negotiations and legally circumscribed strikes. The archetype of revolution, the general strike, was occasionally employed in the fight against bosses and capital owners. General strikes held by workers became the epicentre for future benefits to the work force. States exerted their disciplinary force to exterminate terrorist anarchists, who rejected joining the union organized workers. In the First World War CGT and workers did support the state. The working class gave their loyalties to nation states no matter the side they took during the war. Two world wars accelerated not only the reproduction of capitalism, but disciplined anarcho-syndicalism almost to its disappearance. Joll, in this vein, explains that anarchism indeed did not disappear, but changed into new forms. History showed that worker union and terrorism has been inextricably intertwined. If tourism continued the logic of labor by other means—as a form of entertainment, alienation or escape—we must accept that the terrorist mindset has survived in syndicalism. Therefore, we do not hesitate to state that tourism is terrorism by other means. Let us remind readers that modern tourism surfaced by the combination of two contrasting tendencies: the technological advance that shortened the points of connection, invention of new machines, and the wage benefits or working hour reduction, proposed by syndicalists. In this respect, modern labor would not be possible without the direct intervention of the first anarchists, most of them labeled as terrorists. To the extent that a strike is considered a legal mechanism to present

certain claims, while terrorist attacks are discouraged, seems to be a matter that specialists do not examine properly. A closer view reveals that there are similar processes in both, a strike and terrorism. As the vaccine is the inoculated virus to strengthen the body's immune system, strikes are process of dissent and discord that mitigate the negative effects of conflict. After all, strikes are merely the collective effects of workers withholding their labor. There is nothing violent or threatening about them, except to those who depend on other people's work to sustain themselves—i.e., the owners of capital. In their struggle with workers, the ruling class uses as one if its weapons the construal of strikes as taking consumers as hostages. Whenever passengers are stranded at an airport or train stations because of problems between owners and unions, the sense of urgency facilitate the things for stronger ones. Businesses and terrorism organizations are not concerned about the vulnerability or needs of passengers. The latter one are manipulated as means for achieving certain goals. In a world designed to create and satisfy psychological desires, consumers as holders of money, are of paramount importance for the stability of system. The threat that represents the consumers and the derived economic loses are enough to dissuade owners from the worker's claims. In these types of processes, typified by law, State not only takes intervention mediating between both actors but also is in charge of leading negotiations. Nonetheless, if negotiations fail, the state uses its armed force might to force the workers back to their jobs. An early historical example is the great rail strike of 1877 when federal troops were withdrawn from the occupied former Confederacy to kill strikers, terrorizing the mass of rail workers to end the strike.

The organization of labor and terrorism has been historically intertwined. While the former was legalized by state, the latter one was repelled beyond the boundaries of industrial society. However, at the bottom, both share the same logic to the extent they exploits the most vulnerable in their benefits using the surprise factor to cause instability. The original violence changed to more subtle forms of struggle where workforce negotiates with capital owners by their salaries. But what scholars ignore is that these forms of negotiations were not only copied by terrorists to impose their political claims, but also works as disciplinary mechanism of control disposed by modern state. This reminds what Robin (2009) declares in his book Fear that the sensation of uncertainty and insecurity instilled by international terrorism serves to dissuade worker unions they have to accept governmental policies because they should be "good boys", patriots in the struggle against terrorism. Following this reasoning, workers accept policies otherwise would be rejected. Therefore, terrorism not only opens the doors for capital owners to discipline workforce, but also commoditizes terror to close the hermeneutic borders between US and the World.

References

Butler, J. (2011). *State Violence, War, Resistance*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Katz.

Dworking, R. (1996). *Freedom's Law: the moral reading of the American Constitution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Feierstein, D. (2014). *The Genocide as a social practice, reorganizing society under the Nazis and military juntas*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Foucault, M. (2001). *Defender la Sociedad*. Buenos Aires: FCE.

Guidotti-Hernández, N. (2011). *Unspeakable Violence. Remapping Us and Mexican National Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harvey, P. (2004). *The condition of posmodernity: An inquiry into the origins of Cultural Change*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.

Joll, J. (1979). *The Anarchists*. London, UK: Methuen & Co.

Ignatieff, M. (2001). *Human Rights. As Politics and Idolatry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, p. 35.

Ignatieff, M. (2005). *The Lesser Evil…* Bogotá: Taurus.

Jameson, F. (1984). 'Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late Capitalism'. *New Left Review,* 146, 53-92.

Minda, G. (1995). *Postmodern Legal Movements. Law and Jurisprudence at Century´s end*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Lipstadt, D. (1993). *Denying the Holocaust: the growing Assault on truth and memory*. New York, NY: The Free Press, p. 25.

Pia-Lara. (2009). *Narrating Evil: a post-metaphysical theory of reflexive judgment*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Piazza, J. (2005). 'Terrorism, Democracy and State Failure in the Middle East: An Empirical Analysis of 19 States.' Poster prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 2005.

Robin. C. (2004). *Fear. The history of political ideas*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Skoll, G. (2007). 'Meaning of terrorism'. *International Journal for The Semiotics of Law*. 20 (1), 107–127.

Skoll, G. and Korstanje, M. (2013)."Constructing an American fear Culture from red scares to terrorism". *International Journal for Human Rights and Constitutional Studies*. 1 (1), 1-34.

Sunstein, C. (1994). *The Partial Constitution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sunstein, C. (1996). *Legal Reasoning, political Conflict*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zizek, S. (2009). *Violence*. Buenos Aires: Paidos.