

American Exceptionalism

Mohamed Rabie

The identity of every nation is rooted either in history or ideology or a mixture of both. Because the United States had no history before its independence in 1776, it had to invent a national identity and anchor it in an ideology of its making. At the time, there was only one ideology, religion, which Americans had decided to separate from the state. Since all ideologies tend to be rigid and often undemocratic, the invented American ideology of exceptionalism turned out to be rigid and discriminatory. The United States invented a slogan that says that America is exceptional to the norm; this claim is justified by saying that the roots of American exceptionalism are to be found in the principles of individualism, liberty, equality, opportunity, democracy, and egalitarianism. Emphasis on this claim by many American thinkers and politicians, liberal and conservative, resulted in adopting "American exceptionalism" as a national ethos.

Rationalwiki.com defines American exceptionalism as "a belief that the United States is unique or exceptional when compared with the historical development of other countries."¹ Attempts to perpetuate this claim during election campaigns and every time America faced a serious challenge have made American exceptionalism a popular ideal held by many Americans on the right and left of the political and ideological divides.² But for US politicians, American exceptionalism has been a rhetorical slogan to provoke enthusiasm among the largely naive masses during election campaigns and national celebrations, and severe crises. But the promotion of this slogan has led its believers to become racists and feel proud to be racists.

Being exceptional, the United States as a nation is supposed to set an example for other nations to follow; it has to be a "shining city upon a hill." But America has failed time and time again to be such a city in every war it launched since 1892 when it invaded and captured most of Spain's colonies in Asia and South America. Though most Americans are unaware, if not ignorant, of other people's cultures, acting as being exceptional has provoked resentment to American actions everywhere. American ruling political elites

have given themselves the liberty to interfere in the internal affairs of most nations and ignore international laws they do not like. This paper is an attempt to explain the American Exceptionalism ethos and recount some of the crimes America committed in its name.

David Frum, who served in the White House during the George W. Bush presidency, says, "As Americans have become more uncertain of their nation's continued hegemony, their leaders have insisted ever more emphatically upon the doctrine of American exceptionalism. The debate over America's relative decline seems to pit those who would absolutely deny the reality of decline and those who welcome it. Yet the lesson of the decline of British power between 1870 and 1914 would seem to be that the post-American world will be a much more dangerous and violent place, as ambitious new contenders seek power in ever more aggressive ways."³ But an honest review of America's actions since the Monroe declaration of 1823 would reveal that the bad situation we are in today, including the decline of America, came as a result of continued American interference in the affairs of other nations.

The Monroe Doctrine, which expressed American opposition to European colonialism in the Americas, stated that "further efforts by European nations to take control of any independent state in North or South America would be viewed as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."⁴ The statement "articulated United States' policy on the new political order developing in the rest of the Americas and the role of Europe in the Western Hemisphere. Monroe forewarned the imperial European powers against interfering in the affairs of the newly independent Latin American states or potential United States territories. While Americans generally objected to European colonies in the New World, they also desired to increase United States influence and trading ties throughout the region to their south."⁵ This means that the United States sought to replace other colonial powers and rule unchallenged.

The Monroe doctrine was the first indication that America, which was about 4 decades old only, was determined to expand and create a sphere of influence where it can function freely without respect to international law. To say that the post-American world would be a much dangerous and violent place, as Frum claims, amounts to saying that the world has no choice but to abide by the dictates of the American empire despite what it does and fails to do because we cannot survive without it. But American imperialism since its

inception has been building ghettos for its captive nations and individuals, where people are forced to live in fear, surrounded by poverty, insecurity, despair, and loss of hope. The way White Americans treated the American natives and the black people who were kidnapped from Africa and sold as slaves in America gives an example of what American exceptionalism actually means.

23 years after the Monroe declaration of 1823, the US launched a war on Mexico to annex as much of its land as possible, but with the minimum population. Daniel Immerwahr says; “This was no accident. The Mexican War of 1846-48 had ended with US forces occupying Mexico City. Some in Congress proposed taking all of Mexico. From a military perspective, that was entirely feasible. But South Carolina senator John C. Calhoun, one of the nation’s prime defenders of slavery, objected. We have never dreamt of incorporating into the Union any but the Caucasian race; the free white race; are we to associate with ourselves, as equal companions, and fellow-citizens, the Indian and mixed races of Mexico?” The United States annexed the thinly populated northern part of Mexico (including present-day California, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona) and let the populous southern part go. This carefully drawn border gave the United States, as one newspaper put it, ‘all the territory of value that we can get without taking the population.’⁶ In total, 10 states of the present-day United States were taken from Mexico: Arizona, California, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

Mark Twain, according to historians, was “the most famous anti-imperialist in the country. He became the vice president of the Anti-imperialist League of New York and chronicled the expanding war with withering sarcasm. There must be two Americas, one that sets captives free, and one that takes once-captive freedom away from him and picks a quarrel with him nothing to found on; then kills him to get his land, Twain said.”⁷

Noam Chomsky calls American exceptionalism a myth that represents a distortion of the reality of America that was supposed to have been born as a ‘city on a hill’. The inspirational phrase ‘city on a hill’ was coined by John Winthrop in 1630 as he outlined the glorious future of a new nation ordained by God. But the future that the American nation has proven to be has been a series of invading other nations, killing innocent people, and amazing as much destructive power as possible to dominate and exploit the world. John Quincy Adams, the 6th American president, deplored the fate of “that hapless race of native Americans, which we are exterminating with such merciless and perfidious

cruelty among the heinous sins of this nation, for which I believe God will one day bring it to Judgement. But instead of God's judgment, those heinous sins today bring only praise for the fulfillment of the American idea."⁸

Chomsky goes on to describe some of the countless crimes committed by the white colonialists who exterminated the natives of America, occupied several countries in Latin America and Asia, invented the "torture paradigm" and used mercenaries to do the dirty work for them. "Since Vietnam, the US has mainly seen its torture done for it by proxy; paying, arming, training, and guiding foreigners doing it, but usually being careful to keep Americans at least one discrete step removed."⁹ Extermination, torture, and invasion were practiced by all American presidents; they were also praised by almost all politicians and many intellectuals. For example, Supreme Court justice Joseph Story who served from 1812 to 1845, said that "the wisdom of Providence caused the natives to disappear like the withered leaves of autumn even though the colonists constantly respected them."¹⁰ In 1898, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge called for intervention in Cuba, and described the American record of "conquest, colonization, and territorial expansion unequalled by any people in the 19th century." Lodge urged that conquest, colonization, and territorial expansion "not to be curbed now," as the Cubans too were bleeding with us to "come over and help us." But when America sent its troops in 1898 to Cuba, the army, instead of helping liberate the Cubans from Spanish colonialism, occupied Cuba and turned it into a virtual American colony that lasted until 1959.¹¹ The US continues to occupy a portion of Cuba until today.

"More importantly, torture has been routinely practiced from the early days of the conquest of the national territory and continued to be used as the imperial ventures of the 'infant empire' extended to the Philippines, Haiti, and elsewhere. Keep in mind as well that torture was the least of the many crimes of aggression, terror, subversion, and economic strangulation that have darkened US history, much as in the case of other great powers."¹² American colonial intentions started with the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 and became an official policy in 1898 when America went on a spree fighting on several fronts and occupying several countries in Latin America and Asia and countless islands around the world.

Trump, as a presidential candidate, told Republican primary audiences that George W. Bush had lied when he led the United States into Iraq; then said the war had done a “tremendous disservice to humanity.” Trump suggested that there is no moral distinction between the U.S. and other great powers; that American foreign policy in the Middle East is largely dictated by the interests of arms manufacturers; and that the U.S. judges foreign regimes by their utility to the American economic interests, not their commitment to human rights. Trump saw “Iraq's invasion as a criminal waste — but only because the U.S. failed to expropriate the region’s oil fields. And when Trump suggests our country isn’t so innocent, he isn’t imploring neoconservatives to hold America to higher moral standards, but rather, to hold foreign autocrats to lower ones.”¹³

In the 20th century, “the idealistic Woodrow Wilson made war on both Haiti and the Dominican Republic, killing thousands in order to block constitutional rule and fortify the position of international investors and domestic elites. In the 1920s and 1930s, the US military occupied Nicaragua and Honduras for the same purpose. In the 1950s the US organized the ouster of a moderate democratic regime in Guatemala, likewise in the Dominican Republic in the 1960s, resulting, both times, in horrendous violence and retarded development. In Brazil in 1964, Chile in 1973, and Argentina in 1976, the U.S. instigated or welcomed the overthrow of democratic governments by murderously repressive (but investor-friendly) military juntas. In the 1980s the U.S. orchestrated fanatically bloody insurgencies and counterinsurgencies throughout Central America, invariably against movements or governments with more popular support than the U.S. client. Given the choice between supporting democratic governments that threaten the interests of major American corporations and investors — and authoritarian governments that don’t — the U.S. has almost invariably opted for the latter.”¹⁴

American exceptionalism must, therefore, be seen and understood as America, the exceptional, must have rights and privileges that other nations cannot and must not have. It is an ethos translated into a strategy for international dominance that ignores the rights and needs of other nations and denigrates their cultures, feelings, history, and humanity. However, this is the attitude and the policy that all imperial powers pursued throughout history. Chomsky says that Adolf A. Berle, President Franklin Roosevelt’s advisor, said

that “control of the incomparable energy resources of the Middle East would yield substantial control of the world. And that loss of control would threaten the project of American global dominance that was articulated during World War II and has been sustained in the face of major changes in the world order since that day.”¹⁵

The idea of being exceptional is not much different from the mission that Europeans claimed were entrusted by God to carry out during the first waves of colonialism in Africa and Asia; to Christianize and civilize the savages of the world, particularly the African savages. In the following few paragraphs, I shall mention some examples that reflect how the French, British and American forces behaved in some of the lands they occupied during their mission to Christianize and civilize the savages.

The French were proud of their “civilizing mission” in the colonies they controlled; however the French minister of war called for exterminating the Algerian population, and when the Algerians revolted in 1954, the French forces killed about 5 million Algerians before leaving. “When Sékou Touré of Guinea decided in 1958 to get out of the French colonial empire, and opted for independence, the French colonial elite in Paris got so furious, and in a historic act of fury, the French administration in Guinea destroyed everything in the country which represented what they called the benefits from French colonization. Three thousand French left the country, taking all their property and destroying anything that could not be moved: schools, nurseries, public administration buildings were crumbled; cars, books, medicine, research institute instruments, tractors were crushed and sabotaged; horses and cows in the farms were killed, and food in warehouses was burned or poisoned.”¹⁶ And in the process of civilizing the uncivilized people of Africa, 14 African countries were forced by France to pay colonial tax for the benefits of slavery and exploitation that colonialism brought them.

“Long before the arrival of the Europeans, present-day Mali was comprised of parts of various ancient civilizations that prospered from trade in such precious commodities as slaves, salt, and gold in the Sahara. The Mali Empire reached its zenith of power and influence during the 14th century when the city of Timbuktu inspired dreams of glory and was renowned as far away as the Mediterranean and Arabia as a center of wealth and

Islamic learning. The decline of the West African empires coincided with the inexorable rise of European states that zealously sought to extend their presence and influence across the globe.”¹⁷ In 1892, France took control of Mali whose geography at that time included parts of contemporary Mauritania, Senegal, Niger, and Burkina Faso. Being an Islamic empire, Mali used the Arabic language in conducting its trade in Africa and the Middle East. So to kill that prosperous trade, destroy the centers of learning in Mali, and enslave its people, France murdered thousands of teachers who taught Arabic and forced the people of the territories it colonized to use the French language.

Michel Collon, a Belgium historian, describes what the French did in Mali when they arrived there: “In the 1200s there was an empire in Mali. It was founded by Sundiata Keita. The empire had a very organized federal system with a parliament, and an army, an educational system, and a public treasury. It organized the extraction and sale of gold and developed cotton and peanut farming. There were very famous university centers in Timbuktu. And one of Keita’s successors; Boubakar, two centuries before Columbus, launched two maritime expeditions to discover America. And what is interesting is that there was a whole economy in Africa and Mali; an economy with a trade of caravans coming from Gambia to West Africa to the Mediterranean. It was effectively organized and controlled by the Tuaregs. It was an extremely prosperous trade. And when the French colonizer got there, interested in raw materials what did he do? He dislocated and broke this trade. To manage the trade and the economy, he brought Lebanese and Greek. And the great French democracy, what did it do? It murdered thousands of Arabic language teachers. Why? Because this trade between all these regions and all these countries needed a language that everyone understands. So if we wanted to destroy this trade, and everything would be exported to France, we had to massacre thousands of Arabic teachers at the time.”¹⁸

“As a result, French is now the dominant language in Mali and across West Africa, while Christianity pervades the region. In addition, the French authorities forced African laborers to produce goods such as peanuts and cotton, which were transported to the coast by railways and roads, while the vast interior remained destitute and undeveloped. In the 1930s, to build up the local cotton industry to feed French textiles, France

established an irrigation program that flooded areas (thereby displacing Malian villages) of the Niger River Valley, using labor that amounted to plantation slavery.”¹⁹

To colonize Syria and Lebanon following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the first world war, the French imposed on Lebanon a sectarian constitution that divided the people into several groups and caused the government to become one of the most corrupt in the world, which led to transforming Lebanon into a failed state that can neither manage its economy, bring peace to the country nor repay a portion of its huge public debt. As for Syria, America, unhappy with the Syrian close relationship with Iran, trained a small army of mercenaries in 2011, invaded Syria hoping to topple the government in weeks, but after 10 years of fighting the war does not seem to have an end in sight. The war destroyed many of Syria’s historic sites and human treasures, caused a refugee crisis of immense proportions, where about 15 million Syrians have become refugees living in neighboring countries, in Europe, or internally displaced because their homes and villages were destroyed. In the meantime, America occupied the Syrian oil fields and has continued to exploit the oil for its benefit.

Britain did in India as much damage and destruction as France did in Africa; the policies were similar, and the horrors were comparable. John Stewart Mill urged his government to complete the liberation of India, which was a free and prosperous nation controlling a large portion of world trade. Mill’s essay on humanitarian intervention was written shortly after Britain’s horrifying atrocities in suppressing the Indian 1857 rebellion became public. So it seems that ‘humanitarian intervention was coined in Britain to serve its imperial designs and was adopted by America to justify its unjustifiable intervention in poor nations that were meant to control those countries, dominate their peoples, and exploit their natural and trade resources. Chomsky says that “the conquest of the rest of India was in large part an effort to gain a monopoly in the opium trade for Britain’s huge narcotrafficking enterprise, by far the largest in world history, and designed primarily to compel China to accept Britain’s manufactured goods.”²⁰

It is worth noting that the year 1892 which witnessed France’s occupation of Mali, also witnessed the war that the United States launched against the Spanish Empire.

Since the Spanish empire was a great power in retreat, the American war against it ended in 1998 when Spain ceded control of the Philippines to the United States in addition to several other islands. Following that treaty, the United States occupied and annexed the Philippines, many Asian islands, and a few Latin American countries that were colonies of Spain. On February 4, 1899, just two days before the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty, fighting broke out between American forces and Filipino nationalists led by Emilio Aguinaldo who sought independence rather than a change in colonial rulers. The ensuing Philippine-American War lasted three years and resulted in the death of over 4,200 Americans and over 20,000 Filipino combatants. And as many as 200,000 Filipino civilians died from violence, famine, and disease.”²¹

And as the U.S. was busy fighting in the Philippines, a group of American insurgents overthrew the Queen of Hawaii and took control of the government. “On July 3, 1894, the insurgents renamed themselves the Republic of Hawaii and continued to seek annexation with the United States. President Cleveland entered into a treaty of annexation with the insurgents on June 16, 1897.”²² And even though the Queen of Hawaii protested the annexation, the U.S. Congress approved the annexation and consequently, Hawaii became the 50th American state.

The U.S. decision to annex the Philippines was controversial at home. Americans who advocated annexation expressed different motivations: desire for commercial opportunities in Asia, and fear that if the United States did not take control of the islands, another power might do so; others claimed that the Filipinos were incapable of self-rule, because they were not fit to do it themselves, and because God had chosen the US to do it and Christianize the country and its people. As for Americans who opposed U.S. colonial rule of the Philippines, they had their reasons; while some thought it was morally wrong for the United States to become a colonial power, others feared that annexation might eventually permit the non-white Filipinos to have a role in influencing the direction of American national politics. So, the positions of both the advocates and the opposition were laced with racism, not morality or ethics.

“When it became clear that U.S. forces were intent on imposing American colonial control over the islands, the early clashes between the two sides in 1899 swelled into an all-out war. Americans tended to refer to the ensuing conflict as an “insurrection” rather than acknowledge the Filipinos’ contention that they were fighting to ward off a foreign invader. The war was brutal on both sides. U.S. forces burned villages, implemented civilian concentration policies, and

employed torture on suspected guerrillas, while Filipino fighters also tortured captured soldiers and terrorized civilians who cooperated with American forces.”²³

“William McKinley spoke at length for the reasons for US intervention in the Philippines, and his most honest statements came when he described his own decision-making conclusions: first, the islands couldn't go back to Spain; secondly, France and Germany couldn't be allowed to control them; and third, under no condition could they be turned over to the Filipinos for self-rule, since they were unfit for democracy and "Western civilization". Thus, it was clear that the US had to do something on its own, because, of course, no other state was capable of it, or justified. In the process, McKinley said, the US would educate them, uplift them, civilize them, and Christianize them.”²⁴

The American colonization of the Philippines lasted 47 years; it started in 1899 and ended in 1946 when the US granted the Philippines independence. However, in both wars, the American-Philippine and the American war on Vietnam, orders were given to soldiers to “target everything over 10, because everyone was considered an enemy collaborator.”²⁵

Eric Levitz says that President “Trump has rebranded U.S. foreign policy in his image. Which is to say, he has put the ugliest possible face on the American empire. For liberals, there is a strong temptation to insist that “this isn’t who we are.” But it would be more accurate to say: this is who *we’ve too often been*. This hateful sociopath, immune to all human sentiments, save fear and greed, devoid of all principles save a will to power, incapable of seeing the world from anyone’s perspective but his own. This is who we were to the peasants of Vietnam, and the people of Jacobo Árbenz’s Guatemala, Salvador Allende’s Chile, Mohammad Mosaddegh’s Iran, João Goulart’s Brazil, and so many other fragile republics yearning to breathe free. Trump’s great gift to the American people is that he has made our government’s ugliest features easier to see.”²⁶

Conclusion

Jake Sullivan, a former high State Department official, says “these days, I’m on a university campus as a teacher. My students have had a profoundly different upbringing. They were children of the global War on Terror—of Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib, drones, and, most of all, the Iraq War. Many of them aren’t naturally inclined to see American foreign policy through a lens of optimism or aspiration. I hear this in my classes, and I see it in surveys that reveal a strong generational divide over the idea of “American exceptionalism.” Large

numbers of young people question the merits of a unique American leadership role in world affairs. This is partly because they have seen the country's foreign policy so frequently fall short. But I suspect it is also because they have been exposed to a particularly arrogant brand of exceptionalism. Dick Cheney and his daughter Liz published a book called *Exceptional*, in which they boast of America's unmatched "goodness" and "greatness." In their telling, the Vietnam and Iraq Wars were sound strategic decisions. George W. Bush's administration's use of torture was right; its critics were wrong. Young people hear these kinds of arguments and say, *Count us out.*"²⁷

Sullivan acknowledges that times have changed for the young and old American generations. Each group, however, has a different outlook. And this makes it difficult to reconcile the outlooks and wishes of both parties. While the young generation seems to opt for change that transforms America into a force of good and peace, the older generation sees America as "the world's No. 1 sucker. "It's time, many believe, to stop shouldering the burdens and letting others enjoy the benefits. This is Trump's vision of "America first." He is hostile toward America's allies. He loves to goad and bully (and even bomb) other countries and says alarming and irresponsible things about nuclear war. He has pulled out of the Iran nuclear deal, the Paris climate agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and more. He is not preaching isolationism; he is preaching predatory unilateralism."²⁸ Though Sullivan says that Trump's approach is dangerous, he asserts that the United States can and should continue to have a global leadership role but suggests that there is a need for a new strategy.

"This calls for rescuing the idea of American exceptionalism from both its chest-thumping proponents and its cynical critics and renewing it for the present time. The idea is not that the United States is intrinsically better than other countries, but rather this: Despite its flaws, America possesses distinctive attributes that can be put to work to advance both the national interest and the larger common interest. In the wrong hands, American exceptionalism can be a dangerous idea. It can justify too much. It can admit too little. It can offend and alienate. But for proponents of an engaged and effective foreign policy, failure to own and define the idea is even more dangerous. Without a sense of greater purpose about the nation's work in the world, the U.S. will lose direction and ambition at a time when it badly needs both."²⁹

Regardless of what the defenders and critics of U.S. policy say, every American president was a war president since America's inception. "Since the United States was founded

in 1776, she has been at war during 214 out of her 235 calendar years of existence. In other words, there were only 21 calendar years in which the US did not wage any wars. The US has never gone a decade without war. The only time the US went five years without war (1935-1940) was during the period of the Great Depression.”³⁰ This is why the US was voted three times as the most dangerous state in the world. “Gallup International’s poll of 68 countries for 2014 found the US as the greatest threat to peace in the world, voted three times more dangerous to world peace than the next country. Among Americans, we overall voted our own nation as the 4th most dangerous to peace, and with demographics of students and 18-24 year-olds also concluding the US as the world’s greatest threat.”³¹

However, if one considers what the U.S. Secretary of State says, knowing that he is America’s face to the world, it would be hard to believe what US leaders say they do or promise to do. The Washingtonsblog.com site said, “The US has a history of lying to begin unlawful wars of aggression. This is business as usual when the history is comprehensively and objectively examined. U.S. leaders lie and then joke about killing millions. Their behavior is, therefore, best described as “psychopathic”, a threat to world peace.”³² And to spread their lies, the US mass media has become an institution to fabricate news and hide the truth from the public, and by falsifying the consciousness of the masses, the media make lies sound credible and believable. Mike Pompeo, former US Secretary of State said in a speech at A&M University in Texas on July 23, 2019: “When I was a cadet, (war college student) what is the cadet’s motto at West Point? You will not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do. I was the CIA director, we lied, we cheated, we stole. It reminds you of the glory of the American experiment”.³³ So the glory of the American experiment is lying, cheating, and stealing. Realizing that Pompeo is a committed Evangelical Christian, his words and behavior tell a sad story about Americans’ ethics and moral values. And despite these values and ethics, America’s leaders and politicians are asking us to trust them to lead us in this turbulent world.

During the last violent clashes between the Israeli racist colonialists and their Palestinian subjects, Joe Biden, the American president, Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, and other western leaders said repeatedly, “Israel has the right to defend itself.” However, not a single western leader said that the Palestinians, who have been colonized by Israel since 1948, have the right to defend themselves. In fact, throughout the history of western colonialism, no colonized nation was recognized as having the right to defend itself against aggression, exploitation, and enslavement.

The history of colonialism and imperialism proves that the intentions of the colonial powers have always been to steal the resources of the weak nations and undermine their traditional cultures and prospects, which made imperialism a violent, destructive, and utterly inhumane project. All forms of hegemony are unjust and must therefore be ended; otherwise poor and weak nations are unlikely to see political freedom or social, cultural, or economic progress. The world's leading intellectuals who expressed their commitment to peace, social justice, and cultural diversity, and religious freedom, need to join ranks and articulate a humane alternative to all forms of hegemony; the need is for strategies to end great powers self-serving competition, free the poverty-stricken and enslaved poor peoples of the world from their chains and enable them to develop their economies and cultures and join the advanced countries of the world.

Since my motto is, "Knowledge not shared is Knowledge wasted, and knowledge shared is knowledge multiplied" I ask all readers to recommend every article and book they like because it will help others increase their stock of knowledge. We all share the responsibility to make our world more hospitable to peace, social justice, and freedom; a lofty goal we cannot reach without spreading knowledge and awareness in every corner of our mother earth.

Prof. Rabie is a distinguished professor of International Political Economy; he attended 5 universities and taught at 10 others on four continents. He has published 52 books in addition to over 100 scholarly papers and 1,500 newspaper articles. Books are 15 in English, one in Albanian, and 36 in Arabic. English Books include four published by Palgrave Macmillan between 2013 and 2017: *Saving Capitalism and Democracy*; *Global Economic and Cultural Transformation*; *A Theory of Sustainable Sociocultural and Economic Development*; *The Global Debt Crisis and its Socioeconomic Implications*. Arabic Books include 3 poetry collections, 2 novels, and a story; the rest is mostly academic books and collections of ideas and reflections. Prof. Rabie is president of the Arab Thought Council in Washington, DC, a member of the Arab Thought Forum, and a fellow of the Alexander Von Humboldt Foundation since 1992. Grants and scholarships financed his education from high school to receiving his Ph.D. in 1970; grants covered studies in Jordan, Egypt, Germany, and America. He is the winner of the State of Palestine Lifetime Achievement Award for scholarly publications and several other awards. His writings and positions reflect a strong commitment to peace, social justice, freedom, human development, as well as social, cultural, economic, and environmental sustainability.

-
- ¹ American Exceptionalism; (http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/American_exceptionalism)
- ² Ibid
- ³ David Frum, Requiem for American Exceptionalism, *The Atlantic*. March 21, 2015
(<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/03/requiem-for-american-exceptionalism/388381/>)
- ⁴ Monroe Doctrine, the Wikipedia
- ⁵ The office of the historian; Monroe Doctrine, 1823
<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/monroe>
- ⁶ Daniel Immerwahr, *How to Hide an Empire*, Bodley Head, 2019. P. 77
- ⁷ Ibid; 95
- ⁸ Noam Chomsky, *Who Rules the World*, (Metropolitan Books, 2016) P. 34
- ⁹ Ibid, P. 37
- ¹⁰ See Nicolas, Guyatt, *Providence and Invention of the United States*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007) 1607-1876
- ¹¹ Ibid, Chomsky; p. 34-7
- ¹² Ibid; 32
- ¹³ Eric Levitz; American Exceptionalism Is a Dangerous Myth, *Foreign Policy*, Jan. 2, 2019
<https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/01/american-exceptionalism-is-a-dangerous-myth.html>
- ¹⁴ Ibid
- ¹⁵ Ibid, Chomsky; *Who Rules America*; 45
- ¹⁶ Mawuna Remarque KOUTONIN, France/Afrique: 14 African countries forced by France to pay colonial tax for the benefits of slavery and colonization, January 30, 2014
- ¹⁷ Palash Ghosh; Mali: when France ruled West Africa, *International Business Times*, January 15, 2013
<https://www.ibtimes.com/mali-when-france-ruled-west-africa-1015854>
- ¹⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5BE5XN9UfpQ>
- ¹⁹ Ibid
- ²⁰ Noam Chomsky, *Hope and Prospects*, (Haymarket Books) p. 267
- ²¹ Office of the Historian; The Philippine-American War, 1899–1902
<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/war>
- ²² Keanu Sai Ph.D. NeaToday; The US occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom, 10/01/2018

<https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/us-occupation-hawaiian-kingdom>

²³ Office of the Historian; the Philippine-American war, 1899-1902

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/war>

²⁴ Dana Williams, The American Invasion of the Philippines, and the Precedent it set

<http://danawilliams2.tripod.com/philippines.html>

²⁵ Zinn, Howard *A People's History of the United States: 1492-Present*, HarperCollins, 1995, 290-291

²⁶ Eric Levitz; American Exceptionalism Is a Dangerous Myth, Foreign Policy, Jan. 2, 2019

<https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/01/american-exceptionalism-is-a-dangerous-myth.html>

²⁷ Carl Herman, 2014 Gallup International poll: US # 1 threat to world peace, Washingtonsblog.com

March 21, 2014 (<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2014/03/2014-gallup-international-poll-us-1-threat-world-peace.html>)

²⁸ Ibid

²⁹ Ibid

³⁰ Danios: Make war, not love: USA not at war for only 21 years of its entire history, Redline, March 2, 2015

<https://rdln.wordpress.com/2015/03/02/make-war-not-love-in-its-whole-history-usa-only-not-at-war-for-21-years/>

³¹ Carl Herman, 2014 Gallup International poll: US #1 threat to world peace, March 21, 2014

<https://peacefromharmony.org/?cat=enc&key=651>

³² Mike Pompeo says we lied, we cheated, we stole;

<https://www.msn.com/en-us/health/medical/mike-pompeo-says-we-lied-we-cheated-we-stole-in-cia/vi-AAEKX7U>