

War on Terror: An American Hoax?
Boutarfa Hadi
Department of English
Badji Mokhtar University- Annaba

Abstract

In the wake of the 9/11 events, the USA adopted a strategy to fight the perpetrators who were at the origin of this tragedy. Such orientation was inserted in the framework that was commonly called "war on terrorism." The latter was overtly pursued as a revengeful policy decided by America to arrest, to jail or to kill those who audaciously desecrated some symbols of the American prestige. However, this "war on terror" proved to be a hoax invented and implemented to attain some concealed goals. The international community swiftly disapproved of it because it departed from its set objectives. Instead of fighting terrorists, America has so far assaulted innocent civilians, while the real terrorist state, Israel, continues to be backed and fully protected. It is in this sense that the present paper is supposed to shed light on this US weird conduct. It also attempts, inter alia, to dissect this strategy in order to point up America's linked dubious manoeuvres for fighting terrorism.

Keywords: *Terrorism, american hoax, unilateralism, hegemony, catalytic event.*

Résumé

Au lendemain de l'événement tragique du 11 Septembre 2001, les Etats-Unis ont adopté une stratégie communément appelée "guerre contre le terrorisme." Ils se sont assignés comme but principal la poursuite inlassable de ceux qui ont été à l'origine de cette effroyable tragédie. Cependant, cette campagne lancée contre un ennemi aux contours incertains s'avère peu convaincante quant à sa pratique. Outre cela, elle a été le point de départ d'une offensive sans précédent contre les libertés individuelles dans plusieurs coins et recoins. C'est dans ce contexte que le présent article est élaboré afin de mettre en exergue les manœuvres équivoques des Etats-Unis, tout en essayant de dévoiler la vraie face cachée de cette campagne démesurée.

Mots-clés : *terrorisme, offensive, ennemi, événement tragique, manœuvres équivoques.*

ملخص

غداة أحداث سبتمبر 2001، تبنت الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية استراتيجية قمعية هي "الحرب على الإرهاب"، وذلك للنيل من الذين كانوا سببا في اقتتاف هذه الفاجعة. لكن ما يلفت الانتباه هو انحراف هذه الخطة عن مسار القانون العام و حقوق الإنسان. إذ باسم هذا الشعار "الحرب على الإرهاب" استباح حرمات دول كثيرة، ورغم وصولها إلى هدفها المزعوم ألا وهو اغتيال المتهم الرئيسي في هذه القضية "ابن لادن"، فإن الاستفزاز ما زال متواصلا و الزعب ما زال مهيمنا؛ هذا ما جعل المجتمع الدولي ينتفض و يمقت كل ما أقدمت عليه الولايات المتحدة في هذا المضمار مبديا مخاوفه إزاء السيادة الوطنية والوحدة الترابية لكل قطر، وبعده العراق وأفغانستان و باكستان خير مثال على هذه التجاوزات الأمريكية. في هذا السياق يحاول الباحث أن يسلط الضوء على هذه الحرب و يضعها في إطارها الدولي لدراسة أبعادها السياسية و إبراز التوايا الحقيقية لأمريكا.

الكلمات المفتاحية: *الحرب على الإرهاب، الفاجعة، استراتيجية قمعية، حقوق الإنسان، التجاوزات.*

The second World War maiming was incontestably a turning point in the history of victorious America. The latter – encouraged by its vibrant economy, a short-lived post-war understanding with the USSR, and a US-dominated UN – acted as a world leader. Therefore, it was omnipresent to reorder the world into zones of influence according to its vital interests. For America, that period was in fact an opportunity to forsake isolationism, and to dominate the world political arena. Nonetheless, American early unilateralism was swiftly blocked by communist Russia that sought to share the world leadership.

In this respect, on specific interest-based vision, the entire world was somehow cleft into two contending blocs: the Eastern bloc found itself in the orbit of Russia, while the Western one was spearheaded by America. This situation engendered a kind of a status quo which characterized the whole Cold War era ⁽¹⁾. In the post-Cold War, and with the disintegration of the counterpoise, the ex-USSR, a superpower vacancy was quite perceived. In this volatile era, America started to evoke its apprehension as to the world security. It even revived the track of the reduction of nuclear weapons with Russia, and with Ukraine as well. Unilateralism, in its vision, required an obstacle-free environment. Hence, America was clearing its interests' area of any probable competitor. According to Ratzel's anthropogeography, America endeavoured to widen its "lebensraum," that is its vital space where its interests should be protected ⁽²⁾.

With this ultimate consequence of the end of the Cold War, the international community did not see the world from the same former angles when *realpolitik* was the American prevalent orientation. Rather, it expected that a radical transformation of the usual game rules would occur, and it would surely entail a new world order in which the nation-state concept, as defined by the treaty of 'Peace of Westphalia,' would find its real context ⁽³⁾. Moreover, the world thought that multilateralism would substitute for the political codes of yore. However, America wittily forestalled nations and likely sought to impose its diktat. The attack of Iraq in 1991, the intervention in Somalia in 1992, and in Bosnia, in 1994, etc. are events that are still evoked as early manifestations of the New World Order, and also as American infringement of the international law.

In the same vein, after the "velvet revolution," the events of 9/11 have marked the second milestone of the American post-Cold War history. Albeit US interventionism has always existed, it has been intensified in the aftermath of this tragedy. "War on terror" henceforth becomes the leitmotif that often illustrates the US security agenda. Though America claims that the focus of this fight is worldwide, the targeted scapegoats are often traced and chased in specific areas.

Hitherto, the Arab and Muslim regions have remained the cherished perimeter of hunting. In this delineated zone each state feels suspect mainly after Bush's statement in which he vociferated that "America has made it clear to all nations: if you harbour terrorists, you are as guilty as the terrorists, you are an enemy of America, and you will be held to account." Such a bold discourse can only spark more hot spots, undermine America's presence in many areas, and expose its interests to more suicide attacks. The bombings of American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, in August 1998, are cases in point.

War on Terror and American Interests

A mere glimpse of this American strategy can be enough to any optimist to depict it as an efficient factor to rectify any world immoral departure. One can even envision a bright future and stability once this battle is gained. A battle reminiscent to the wilsonian idealistic vision related to the WWI, when he announced, a “war to end all wars.”⁽⁴⁾ Nonetheless, accounting for the practice of this new American track, the result proved to be counterproductive. Besides, this machiavellian policy probably hides the real objectives America has set to outlast its accustomed world hegemony.

Relying on such global vision, the US likely intends to expand all over the world its “jurisdiction” and its pattern of democracy. It strives to consolidate unilateralism, and to stem the way before any competitor in order to ensure an easy run of its vital interests⁽⁵⁾. The latter specifically revolve around two main issues: The Mideast oil, and the protection of Israel; and both require a permanent American presence⁽⁶⁾. Therefore, America struggles to keep at bay any world power seeking competition in the area. If oil, as a US survival interest, has entailed American invasion of Iraq, the protection of Israel now compels the US to increasingly militarize its foreign policy. With regard to such an attitude, many suspected spots have been subject of American pre-emptive attacks.

Furthermore, this policy has brought about a ‘shock and awe’ state that has engendered a series of American drastic measures: Iran’s blacklisting, incursion into Afghanistan, permanent threat and allegations to Syria, Lebanon, Gaza. The whole Arab and Muslim world is plunged in a continuous warfare state. This is the reason why, in this specific region, American presence remains embarrassing, and its practised policy is totally disapproved of. On the eve of the 9/11 events, Samuel Huntington was right when he succinctly spoke about America’s various interventions, and the horrific consequences that might engender. “While the United States regularly denounces various countries as ‘rogue states,’” he said, “in the eyes of many countries it is becoming the rogue superpower...the single threat to their societies”⁽⁷⁾.

The US perfectly knows that the majority of the states in the area of the Middle East, for instance, are critical of its policy. But, it thinks that since its main objective is to consolidate its foothold there, only a conclusive pretext will do. “War on Terror” becomes the magical solution advocated in any US interventionism. America has swiftly appreciated it and made it one of its strategic priorities in the post-9/11 events. Ever since, this strategy has indeed given it ‘carte blanche’ to meddle in nations’ affairs.

“War on Terror” and the Catalytic Event

In the wake of the disastrous 9/11 event, the whole world was shocked owing to its magnitude. However, at the same time, peoples also expressed a mood of scepticism as to the misty atmosphere surrounding the real causes of its ignition⁽⁸⁾. Unlike the world position, American reaction, in this case, was in stark contrast. The tragedy was likely regarded differently and utterly exploited. The USA adopted it as a main catalytic agent to wage its endless crusade, “war on terror.” No other known political event in American history had been so cherished. For the federal governing staff, it became the unique and incontrovertible issue to justify this terrorist-hunting campaign.

Shortly after the 9/11 attacks, the central character of the American narratives, Bin Laden, was pointed as the chief enemy of the nation. He was even indicted before any

trial or investigation ⁽⁹⁾. In truth, America used to procrastinate in such cases unless the culprit himself pleads guilty, and, thus, he puts an end to any suspicion. Investigations in Kennedy's assassination, for instance, have lasted scores of years and the verdict is still unknown ⁽¹⁰⁾. In the case of Bin Laden, the swift allegation is so astonishing that it throws the floor open for comments. It gives the impression that everything is prepared beforehand, mainly when America persists with its diehardism. It strives to prove the involvement of the hero of al-Qaeda. It always continues to regard him as the main focus of the war on terrorism. The epitome of the US triumph in such a long-run operation is overtly Bin Ladin's arrest, or killing. America has promised a tempting ransom for any catcher of this 'integrist,' dead or alive. However, the latter remains mythical, invisible, and unreachable in the lunar landscape of Afghanistan. The world still wonders at US behaviour. America – with its well-equipped NATO troops, backed by unmatched intelligence and spying devices – has shown its "inability" to dislocate an ill-equipped fugitive! So far, Bin Laden has never been encountered, or maybe it has never been question to attain his hideout because his arrest or killing leads to the denouement of the plot, and, thereby, to the end of any pretence.

The invasion of Iraq – as a piece of the big puzzle "war on terror" – is another America's violation of international law, mainly when the advanced reasons to justify its incursion proved bereft of any truth. The allegations related to the Iraqi possession of the WMD have so far remained inconclusive. Peoples from all hues disbelieve these American announcements. They see them as mere pretexts to intervention. But, despite the fake delivered reports, the Iraqi regime was convicted of being in 'material breach,' and, hence, it was 'decapitated' ⁽¹¹⁾.

The 9/11 event was perfectly exploited and dramatized by America to marshal public support. In the aftermath of this convulsion, the US took some relative measures. It started outlawing some Islamic organizations throughout the world. Among others, some specific spots were designated to be targets of probable US preventive attacks; Abu sayyaf group in the Philippines; Somali Islamic Courts Union; Hezbollah, to name but three. However, disregarding the sporadic American pre-emptive strikes here and there, American manoeuvres remain restricted, and America remains too selective in its attacks. Only Iraq and Afghanistan are now the real battlefields of the American "war on terror," while the banned organizations are not located only in these two states.

Furthermore, Iran was depicted as a 'rogue' state – along with Iraq – therefore it is also daily subject of American rebuke. North Korea, however, though it is one of the axis of evil has been differently treated ⁽¹²⁾. The reason is, Iraq and Iran are victim of their envied riches and geostrategic locations, but communist Korea is covertly under the aegis of China, a permanent member of UN Security Council, and Korea's traditional ally.

As aforementioned, to both strengthen its position and outlast its presence in the area, America has always been in search of reliable pretexts. For instance, it has often equated 'terrorism' in Afghanistan with the anarchy it has created in sovereign Iraq. And both, as it argues, need continuous US supervision ⁽¹³⁾. Many a time, America claims that some fighting units of al-Qaeda, coming from Afghanistan, often seep through the neighbouring states to join 'some terrorists' in Iraq; but it only aims at

justifying both its indispensable presence there, and the service it provides. America pretends that both areas, Iraq and Afghanistan, are volatile zones and, hence, they need its full and permanent cooperation⁽¹⁴⁾.

In this perspective, the invasion of Iraq is double-edged. Accounting for the strategy to fight terrorism, America seeks to get the upper hand of the riches of the country, and at the same time, to supervise the Iranian emerging power. Intervention in Afghanistan is also prominent in American calculation. It can be inserted in its policy to control the eastern flank of Iran and, thereby, to comb the whole area in order to crush any nuclear assistance between the Muslim nuclear powers: Iran, and Pakistan. In addition, American presence in these two hot spots can be an opportunity to control the transfer of arms from Iran to Hezbollah in Lebanon, and to Hamas in Gaza.

This long “war on terror” is multifaceted. It is not an objective per se. America never seeks to rid the world of terrorists for the mere reason that these very so-called terrorists had once been US-made. They were specially trained and armed to disturb some anti-American regimes. America was once the main manipulator of these ‘fanatics.’ However, it has completely lost their control. The rift that has affected this pact between America and its terrorists is a kind of “Frankenstein-like” story in which the creature escapes to its creator. In this regard, to fight “terrorism” all over the world is only an American strategy to justify the US interventionist policy. Yet, on the premise that it is depicted as worldwide, America wants to use it as a deterring strategy. In fact, it is now used as a trump card to coerce states. Due to the “war on terror,” no nation in the world feels safe from the US war machine. Any obduracy can be ruthlessly sanctioned. America’s fight against this phenomenon has led it to wisely use the UN Security Council in order to adopt punitive resolutions against sovereign nations⁽¹⁵⁾.

Such American orientation has always been consensual at home. Many US presidents espoused it to become a priority on their agendas. Bush senior, for example, invaded Somalia to “restore hope;” Clinton, under the banner of his “Operation Infinite Reach,” carried a bombing campaign in Sudan⁽¹⁶⁾. He also ordered air strikes on some targets occupied by Abou Sayyaf group in the Philippines. The Bush junior administration faced the whole world though it focused its assaults on Afghanistan and Iraq. Obama, who is supposed to be more rational, according to his electoral rhetorics, is no exception. He promised to pull out American troops from both Afghanistan and Iraq, but he ironically besought Congress for ‘a new way forward.’ His ‘Overseas Contingency Operation’ – as he used to dub “war on terror” – came also to the fore of his agenda. He vowed to defeat al-Qaeda in Pakistan, Iraq, Afghanistan, and to crush its activists anywhere. He argued that America needed a more powerful and comprehensive strategy to extirpate the active planning of al-Qaeda assaults on the US from its safe haven in some states⁽¹⁷⁾. As a Nobel Peace Prize recipient, Obama has been honoured “for his extraordinary efforts to strengthen international diplomacy and cooperation between peoples.”⁽¹⁸⁾ His advent is in fact thought to scour America’s image in the world. Nonetheless, to keep on implementing a hard-headed policy is a full alignment with the US hawkish stands.

American policy connected to “war on terror” has entailed only hatred to the US nation. As long as it continues its course, it will beget more and more horrendous effects in America, and it will also jeopardize the whole world. As in the boomerang

effect, the US has so far been reaping the side-effects of its own action and reaction. Any attack on America is a direct consequence of what it perpetrates in the world, mainly the protection of the supranational state, Israel. This 'big stick' strategy, as said by Theodore Roosevelt, which the sole superpower adopts, has caused more harm than good. It has even mingled the world relationships, and created an atmosphere of mistrust and spleen. the main guarantor for America's security is only a total abstinence from such a tough policy.

This war, however, is of great benefit to Israel. The latter has been recipient of US lavish assistance. To face any probable attack, the Jewish state has been armed to the teeth. It has been assigned to fight "terrorism" in its specific area. Israel made it clear when it assured America that each one of them had to fight its own "Bin Ladin;" alluding to the President of the Palestinian Authority, Arafat, whose compound was then besieged by Israel.

"War on terror" is a bold decision that is in aversion to the world game rules. As a direct effect of such an open defiance, the Gazan activists become more radical and fiercer than ever. In fact, America is quite aware of the impact of the Islamist tendencies and the dimension of their extremism. Moreover, it believes that pragmatism will do in such a case. Hence, It sometimes accommodates its foes because, as the president of Centre for New American Security, John A. Nagl, said, "viewing them all through one lens distorts the picture and magnifies the enemy."⁽¹⁹⁾ As a tactical posture, America seeks to harness Islamism intentionally "to win the war against religious extremism"⁽²⁰⁾.

In truth, this American strategy to fight "terrorism" would only radicalize people owing to its objectives that are based on irrational evidence and idiocies: to invade sovereign nations in order to quell "terrorists." Such a decision remains inconceivable. Therefore, "war on terror" has been so counterproductive that it has only strengthened fierce opposition to America. It has even helped terrorist recruitment, increased the likelihood of attacks against the US and its allies; and, of course, increased violent anti-Americanism.

From the foregoing facts, it becomes crystal clear that the overt objectives of the "war on terror," namely to defeat terrorists everywhere by stemming the way before any sponsorship, support and safe haven, proved to be mere rhetorics. In engaging in such a war, America seeks to interfere in world affairs, to justify its unilateral preventive war, to cover both its human rights abuses and its daily violation of international law. Even the states that side with America in its "war on terror," and are substantially helped by it, are undemocratic, and they have always been notorious tyrants.

It goes without saying that American "war on terror" is masterminded, and brandished by America. Thanks to this strategy, it has managed to create an ambiguity even in the interpretation of the word 'terrorism' itself. In its jargon, the latter denotes that any rise to claim one's own rights is a terrorist act. In this regard, Hamas activists who often denounce Israel's abuses are outlawed, and severely assaulted⁽²¹⁾. Al-Qaeda members and Taliban were once regarded as freedom-fighters when they were in fight against the Soviet invasion. But, when they subsequently expressed hostilities towards America, they found themselves blacklisted, ever-despised, invaded, and eventually overthrown⁽²²⁾.

The concept of the “war on terror” proved to be highly contentious since it has been fully exploited by America. In this case, one can join Fukuyama when he indicates that “terrorism is not an enemy but a tactic;” and he adds, “calling it ‘war on terror’ obscures differences between conflicts.”⁽²³⁾ So far, this American crusade has never been a sincere endeavour to defeat, or at least to reduce international terrorism. Therefore, this “huge overreaction” has led America to both politicize and militarize its relative efforts⁽²⁴⁾.

It is noteworthy that America’s “war on terror” is purely strategic. It is seemingly a new approach pertinent to the new world conjuncture, a conspiracy meticulously fabricated to attain some specific goals. This phenomenal issue is closely dictated by the protection of America’s vital interests in the region of the Middle East. Had oil reserves and Israel existed in Asia or elsewhere, America’s crusade to fight terrorism would have certainly driven it to those areas.

Indeed, America is a strong nation to be reckoned with. As a hyperpower, it has got the military potential and the deterring weapons to curb violence all over the world, to put out conflagrations, to spread peace in the world without raiding sovereign states. It can also play the role of an honest broker, and to act as a real peace-making nation. America vows to humiliate “terrorists,” however, with its aggressive conduct, and double-standard policy, it only keeps on disappointing the international community. It is waiting for a victory over a virtual enemy, but triumph in this sense can be abhorred by the whole world. The French stateswoman, Simone Veil, has perfectly depicted such an action when she puts it this way, “It is better to fail than to succeed in doing harm,” for the mere reason that any ever success in such a way is a crime against humanity.

The bottom line is that the “war on terror” proved also to be a hoax which has been invented and perfectly exploited by America for the reasons stated above. Although Bin Laden is eventually killed, as it has been reported, the course of the US crusade is still going on and with no end in sight. Such US determination to continue the fight bears witness to many conspiracy theories.

America seeks to forcibly implement this strategy come what may. Yet, in fighting “terrorism,” the unique superpower has created an endless world terror, and a widespread disorder that together have engendered indignation and resentment throughout the world⁽²⁵⁾. This American unilateralist decision has prodded many developed and emerging nations to react energetically. Brazil, Venezuela, Turkey, Iran, the Arab states, and to some extent Russia and China have all expressed their deep concern as to America’s handling of the “terrorism” issue. They have brazenly shown their reticence to US vision towards this phenomenon.

Undoubtedly, the fight against “terrorism” becomes, on American agenda, a kind of a ‘philosophers’ stone,’ a master key to all security problems. It is regarded as a state strategy and not as a mere partisan policy. It is also instrumented as a best message to crystalise the pattern of the would-be relationship between nations⁽²⁶⁾. Henceforth, the US concept of “most favoured nation,” is somewhat based on one’s support for American “war on terror.” In a warning tone, Bush has clearly reminded the international community that “You are either with us or against us.”

In fact, terrorism becomes a phenomenon that threatens stability everywhere and, thereby, It should be fought ruthlessly. However, its eradication needs more finesse

than muscles. Violence has never restored order; rather it has only begot anarchy and extremism. Afghanistan and Iraq remain two vivid examples in this case. In truth, America's crusade to quell al-Qaeda members has no manifest success. Rather, it has only encouraged the "other," the sub-state actor, to radicalize in many hot spots. In fact, behaving in such unregulated conduct in fighting terror will discredit the nation, America in this case, with the international community, and erode its role as a world superpower. Moreover, it will undermine liberty and the rule of law around the world as it will create an atmosphere of scepticism. The most efficient fight against terrorism is indeed to earnestly address the causes that have prompted it in order to bring the adequate solutions.

Works cited

- 1- Friedman, Norman. *The Fifty-Year War: Conflict and Strategy in the Cold War*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2007: 20.
- 2- Goldgeier, James; Mc Faul, Michael, *Power and Purpose: US Policy toward Russia after the Cold War*. Washington , D.C. : Brookings Institution Press, 2003, 52-58.
- 3- Philpott, Daniel. *Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations*. Princeton University Press, 2001: 71
- 4- Wilson's war message to Congress delivered on 2 April 1917.
- 5- Aslund, Anders, *How Small Is the Soviet National Income?*, in Rowen , Henry S.; Wolf, Charles Jr. *The Impoverished Superpower: Perestroika and the Soviet Military Burden*, California: Institute for Contemporary Studies., 1990 :36.
- 6- D'Amato, Paul. "US Intervention in the Middle East: Blood for Oil." *International Socialist Review*, Dec. 2000-Jan. 2001 :23.
- 7- Chomsky, Noam. "Rogue States," *Z Magazine*, April 1998: 2.
- 8- Meyssan, Thierry. *L'effroyable Imposture*. Editions Carnot, 2002: 18.
- 9- Havelly, Joe. "What Proof of Bin Ladin's Involvement," *Cable News Network LP, LLLP*, 13 Sept. 2001:12.
- 10- Waldron, Lamar & Hartmann Thom. *Legacy of Secrecy: The Long Shadow of the JFK Assassination*. Counterpoint Press: USA, 2008: 777.
- 11- Burke, Jason. "Secret World of US Jails," *Observer*, 13 June 2004: 10.
- 12- Chomsky, Noam. *Interventions*. City Lights Books, 2007: 8.
- 13- Woodward, Bob "Detainee Tortured, Said US Official," *Washington Post*, 14 Jan. 2009: 21.
- 14- Applebaum, Anne. "North Korea: Threat or Menace?," *Slate*, 12 Feb. 2002: 22.
- 15- Norm, Dixon. "Afghanistan: Taliban: Made by the USA," *Green Left*, 10 Oct. 2001.
- 16- Noorani, A.G. "The Demise of US Diplomacy" *Frontline*. 3-6 Jan. 2004:1
- 17- Savage, Charlie. "Obama's War on Terror May Resemble Bush's in Some Areas," *New York Times*, 17 Feb. 2009: 5.
- 18- Erlanger, Steven and Stolberg, Sherlay G. "Surprise Nobel Prize for Obama Stirs Praise and Doubts." *The New York Times*, 9 Oct. 2009:1.
- 19- Smith, Malinda S. *Securing Africa Post-9/11 Discourses on Terrorism*. US: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010:197.
- 20- Green, Dan. "Harnessing the Islamist Revolution: A Strategy to Win the War against Religious Extremism." *Strategic Studies Quarterly*. Fall 2008, Volume 2, No. 3.
- 21- Richissin, Todd. "'War on Terror' Difficult to Define," *The Baltimore Sun*, 2 Sept. 2004: 32-33.
- 22- Ibid 33.
- 23- LLC Books. *9/11-Related Legal Issues: Criticism of the War on Terror*. Books LLC, 2010. Available at: www.infibeam.com/books/info/llc-books/9-11-related-legal-issues-criticism-war-terror/9781156753613
- 24- Hasan, Kalid "Pakistan Must not Harbour Taliban," *Daily Times*, 16 Nov. 2006:29.
- 25- Priest, Dana. "CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons," *The Washington Post* 2 Nov. 2005.

26- Croker, Chester et al. Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World. USA: US Institute of Peace Press, 2007: 98.

For more details on “ Nation-State” consult Hopkins, A. G. ed. Global History: Interactions Between the Universal and the Local, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.