

## I. Introducing American Grand Narrative of Democracy

The present research focuses on Megan Stack's *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar* (2010), a travelogue of a journalist on war in Middle-East Asian Muslim countries. As a travelogue, it is a recording of experience of the travelling. It is based on the travel of a journalist who is roaming all over the Middle East on the course of reporting to a newspaper, *Los Angeles Times*. The travelogue is based on the events of war on Arab land Muslim countries on the name of 'war on terror' after September 11. In the course of travel, she observes the land of war, talks to the people, and passes through the insurgency of the war. Whatever she observes from a journalistic eye that is recorded in the book. In this sense, it is a journalistic picture of ongoing 'war on terror' of Middle East. In particular, it depicts the destruction and impact of the war upon the Middle East and its dwellers.

After September 11, as a reporter of the American newspaper *Los Angeles Times*, Megan Stack goes to those various Middle Eastern countries. At that time, the USA invades Middle East on the name of 'war on terror': war against the terrorism, especially against the Al-Qaeda and other [militant](#) Islamists, and she draws out the minute details of war. She visits those people who were directly involved in the war and severely influenced from the war evidences. The war is naturally destructive and it definitely influences the people. More than that, ongoing war in the name of prevention of terrorism is the invasion of other countries under the rubric of 'war on terror'. By analyzing a detailed account of the war and war's influence on people, this study analyzes the American grand narrative of democracy for which America advocates repeatedly.

The primary purpose of the study is to keep out the spotlight on the severe traumatic and shocking experience of the common people of the Middle East Muslim

countries presented in *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar* on the name of democracy and peace, indeed, which is vain. Through a critical analysis of the narrator's detail of so called 'war on terror' of the twenty-first century this study explores the weakness of the western grand narrative of democracy, human right, sovereignty and peace and its failure. On the other hand, this study shows the so-called war on terror as a mere reflection and result of fear and questions the legitimacy of the ongoing war on the name of terrorism.

As the travelogue begins, we find the narrator in Afghanistan as a news reporter. In the post September 11 period, Stack was stationed in the world most contentious lands. When there was war, she was there in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Lebanon, Libya, Yemen and Saudi Arabia. She jots down the events as she gets in the battlefield, which makes a kind of restlessness and shows the real snapshots of survivors and not survivors at the same time.

In this book, the author has jotted down the realistic events and events of war throughout the Middle East. She neither directly questioned the invasive strategy of USA nor she suggested that the USA should not have done this or that. She only presents the events, experiences of people, destruction of material property, and restless lifestyle of people. In this sense, she silently questions the American promises of democracy and rule of people for people and laugh at it.

However, the publication of Megan Stack's *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar* is a continuation on the tradition of war literature, but her offering is a different exercise in understanding, and the entire better for it. As a correspondent for the *Los Angeles Times* for six years in the Middle East, she records, with great freshness and honesty. The impressions of a young American journalist thrown into war accidentally and her efforts to comprehend the world that September 11 set in motion.

Megan K. Stack has been highly influenced by the contemporary situation on the war land, as she has gone through the warfare in the Middle East, the invaded land by the super power America on the name of democracy. However, the detail of the war and its destruction is the evidence, which simply proves that American logic of invasion is false. The book covers the wound of war of that terrain's people from various dimensions.

Megan K. Stack deals with the social condition and social relationships along with its structure of the Middle East, and she portrays how social changes occur after the invasion and deals with various ills affecting on the Middle Eastern Muslim society. *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar* provides the picture of malpractices of military power of America. It is a good socio-religio-political criticism focusing on the war, destruction, conflicts and misery of people. About her travelogue, in *The Washington Post*, Susie, Linfield opines that Megan has presented the real thrill of the war, which is traumatic. She equally examines war on terror from the curious eyes. She further says:

. . . When it comes to Stark's own "education in war," she comes up short. She learns two main things. One is existential: that war is "dark and dangerous, that you could survive and not survive, both at the same time." The other is political: that America's war on terror is "hollow, it was essentially nothing but a unifying myth. . . . Mostly, I think, it was fear." These insights don't stretch very far, nor are they original or profound. And they are radically incomplete. For Stark must know that even if the United States withdrew all its forces from the Middle East, the vicious war within the Muslim world -the attacks on secularists, women, democrats, dissidents, writers, teachers, mosques, movie

theaters, hospitals, schools, marketplaces, Shias and Sunnis - would continue. Forget about democracy, pluralism and Human rights: This is war that -as Atwar Bahjat and so many other have learned -- has negated the very concept of civilian.(7)

Megan K. Stack, thus focuses on the war land. She depicted the snapshots of events rather than her feelings. As a journalist, she is conscious on the style of reporting, so she does not express her ideas but shows what is happening. In *The Independent*, Andrian Hamilton, a critic, opines:

. . . It's not a collection of her original filings – for which she won several awards – but a description of her experiences in the countries of the region as, in recollecting them after the event; she tries to make sense of both the story and her responses. Flung in at the deep end to cover the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 simply because she was on holiday in Paris and nearer to the action (that's how it still happens in the media), the 26-year-old Houston correspondent of the LA Times felt – rightly – that the hand of history had called her. (14)

As a journalist in war land Megan Stack sees the war and its effects. She not only merely sees the war but also records on the diary and brings it out in the shape of book and shake out the heart of the reader. One comes to the point from where s/he starts to question the American strategy.

Marla Stone, professor of history at Occidental College, along with the criticism of Megan's flaws appreciates the style, which includes the minute detail, which generates the traumatic experience. It shows that the American justification of the invasion is insufficient. She writes on *Los Angeles Times* as follows:

. . . Central concern is the way war transforms human experience. Stack proposes that it creates a liminal space between "surviving and not surviving." In the faces of those who have lived through suicide attacks, Israeli bombs or the Libyan secret police, she sees trauma and despair. Stack is a self-conscious narrator; even as she acknowledges the adrenaline rush of war reporting, she is honest about her place in the process as someone who can come in, "soak up the local color" and then return to the relative safety of her hotel. But when she witnesses the aftermath of a suicide bomb detonated on an Israeli commuter bus, she no longer has that luxury. (3)

Here, Stone makes the argument that Stack has presented the detail of warfare on the name of 'war on terror'. She even praises her self-conscious writing and being an American she dares to criticize the American steps.

However, there have been no attempts, as far as I know, to research the work from the point view of postmodernist narrative as a 'Critiquing American Grand Narrative of Democracy' from the lens of postmodern concept. Now this researcher aims to focus on the work from the perspective of deconstructionist postmodernist theory. It mainly goes through the deconstructionist postmodernist theory developed by Jean-Francois Lyotard.

In this book, Middle Eastern people are depicted as peace lover. They are in favor of peace. But the devotion like suicide bomb shows how crazy they are about the nationality. The detail of difficult situation and destruction shows the failure of so called theory of democracy which America is trying to establish . It shows that it is acceptable to those people of mid east. On the other hand, it criticizes the American strategy of war, is it really for the democracy? Does war solve the problem and

establish the democracy? It shows that America itself is the cause of failure of own theory of democracy.

A critical reading focuses on the painful and vivid account of war on terror and its destruction. In Megan Stack's *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar*, author has presented the detail account of war in the Middle Eastern Muslim countries on the rubric of 'War on terror' after September 11. The researcher will raise the question why she is presenting the war and its destruction and pain in such detail and what propose of such mere detail is. On the premises of such vivid sketch, this dissertation paper will question the American grand narrative of democracy.

Though, in the book, there is not any comment against American action but in the deep level, it is a deep criticism of American strategy. It proves that the unspoken sound is louder and more powerful. It silently shows the American oil politics on the name of democracy. In this book *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar*, Megan Stack questions the American grand narrative of democracy, sovereignty, human right, civilized society and peace by exploring journalistic account of the ongoing war and detail life style of the general people who are either involved in the war or closely observed the war and its destruction.

American invasion is shown as the cause of the war. The invasion is based on the rubric of 'war on terror'. Ultimate goal of the war is defined as the establishment of democracy in Middle East. The theory of democracy is developed on the base of enlightenment philosophy, in which America is defined as land of freedom. Where basic rights of human being defined as life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Democracy, according to American definition, is the one and only system of governance and it has not any alternate. It is defined as myth and mystified as the heavenly ruling system. America claims democracy is the path leads to the summit of

human civilization. It pretends to be the follower of democracy and its motto; 'Live and let to live'. The sense of freedom is placed high value in democracy. It is related to the idea of liberty, which makes the individual the foundation of society, and is buttressed, by the idea of equality, which holds the belief that everyone should be given fair chance to succeed. A dominant discourse about democracy believes the issue of equality, liberty and justice but they are never granted to the people of the grass root level in practice.

Stuart Hall argues that democracy is the best governing system among ruling system. Thus, there is no alternative to democracy as advocates of democracy argue. In such a system, it is believed that people are endowed with maximum opportunities to exercise the freedom of self-determination to live under laws of their own choosing. Only a democracy helps the people to protect their fundamental interests. For such fundamental rights American historical document Declaration of Independence address as: Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness. Everyone wants certain things: survival, food, shelter, health, love, respect, security, family, friends, leisure and satisfying work, which are defined as basic needs of life. Anyone wants to exert some control over the factors that determine whether and to what extent you can satisfy you shape your life in accordance your own goals, preferences, tastes, values, commitments and beliefs. Thus, democracy protects this freedom and opportunity better than any alternative political system that ever has been devised. Such norm of democracy is accepted as the universal norm and is developed as the grand narrative of Democracy.

America advocates on behalf of democracy. But in reality, American invasion invades the sovereignty of other countries and practices the superpower.

On the basis of such strategy, one starts to question that is America really doing all these for the sake of Mid-eastern people and promotion of democracy? On the one hand, America advocates on the behalf of humanity, human right, democracy and civilization and on the other hand, it shows intrusive behavior/strategy on sovereignty of other countries. The author presents the mere account of war on the Middle East in the name of war on terror, which make difficult for America to justify that it was necessary. It shows the impact upon people who are directly or indirectly involved in war in the one or other way. This research assumes that the invasion of America on Middle Eastern countries on the name of war on terror was ironical. By analyzing that account of war, this study shows the reality of war and its deconstruction. The present thesis critiques the American representation of Middle East; the epicenter of terrorism. But ironically, the invasion itself turns to be the terror of the people of the middle east. The hidden intention of invasion is the oil politics, not the promotion of democracy.

America, its strategy and Americans' desire is to conceptualize a metanarrative of American myth, with no critique and no opponent. They try to justify Americocentrism through other grand narratives like freedom, democracy and human rights to interfere in global system to make it consistent with American interests. In this sense under the grand narrative of democracy, all the social institutions such as law, education and technology combine to strive for a common goal for all humanity: absolute knowledge or universal emancipation and it quest the right of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. But in reality the grand narrative of democracy became forcefully imposed burden.

Although this study makes a significant use of concepts developed in postmodernist concept of historiography, it does not offer a comprehensive analysis of

postmodernist theory. Rather an analysis of traumatic account of the victimized people from the so called 'war on terror' in Middle Eastern Muslim countries on the twenty-first century and evaluate the grand narrative theory of democracy. Since the major objective of the study is to show the sorrow, pain and mental wound and effect of the ongoing war on the people, which is in their own native land and to justify the war in the name of 'War on terror', is hollow. It was nothing more than myth of fear. It will question how the war in the name of terrorism and invasion over other's sovereignty can strengthen the democracy. In doing so, it uses significant concept of postmodernism developed by Lyotard.

This research through postmodern approach and relying on Jean-François Lyotard's theory tries to show that these concepts during the modern time became grand narrative and had been used by the dominant powers specially Americans to legitimize their dominance while all the postmodern era is defined by "incredulity toward metanarratives"(Lyotard xxiv). It means that in postmodern era all the values are localized and relative, they are not absolute and universal. In this way, nobody can claim that one has special right to leading the others and impose its values and interests on the others, the path that American government is used to act throughout the world, especially in Middle East in the name of democracy.

In this sense, borrowing the postmodern concept developed by Lyotard, in his book *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge* (1984), this study will redraw the horizon of American grand narrative. For Lyotard, the global spread of capitalism and the rapid developments in science and technology since world war have put an end to grand narratives. This change effects not just research and development, but identity itself. Located in a multiplicity of language games that no longer follow a single metanarrative, an individual's identity becomes dispersed: the

social bond in linguistic and cultural, but is not woven with a single thread. It is a fabric formed by the intersection of at least two (and in reality on indeterminate number) of language games, obeying different rules.” With the destruction of the grand narratives, there is no longer any unifying identity for a subject or society. Instead, individuals are the sites where ranges of conflicting moral and political codes interest and the social bond are fragmented.

Lyotard sees the grand narratives themselves as having always been politically problematic; for example, the political ideas of reason and freedom from superstition provided a moral basis for colonial domination through capitalist expansion and missionary terrorism in Africa and the Middle East. He thus argues that the best means to resist the globalization of grand narrative and its dominance is by increasing the fragmentation of language game. In other word, through the fragmentation of language game we should question the so-called universal grandnarrative of democracy and establish the local narrative.

As this study focuses on the war experience as depicted from a journalistic eye by the narrator in *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar* in terms of postmodern concept, it raises a question on the basis of western practice of historiography. West (America) defines the Middle Eastern Muslim territory as the epicenter of terrorism and started the invasion on the name of stopping terrorism and establishing democracy and sustainable peace, but in reality the invasion itself became terrorism to the Middle Eastern general people. In this way, analysis of traumatic account of war land, this study will show the problem in grand narrative of American democracy.

To sum up, this thesis encloses introduction in the first chapter. The introduction part includes general introduction of research and framework, the writer's introduction, her works and issues that she deals with text introduction and

researcher's focus in this research. Discussion of the methodology merged with textual analysis in the second chapter includes methodological discussion to establish a perspective to study *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar*. This chapter gives the analysis of postmodern critic of grand narrative of democracy with the reference to the theoretical concept of Lyotard, based on the text; *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar*. This portion of the task serves as a core of this study. Likewise, the third chapter is the conclusion of this research, in which, based on arguments and explanation put forwarded in the second chapter, finding of the research will be concluded.

## II. Critiquing American Grand Narrative of Democracy in *Every Man in This Village is a Liar*

*Every Man in This village is a Liar* is a travelogue of a journalist in the Middle East where there is brutal invasion, injustice, heavy corruption and corrupted political system. In this place, people's pains are always unheard and victimized by events of war. It is a realistic map of Middle East from journalistic eyes. It shows that how the country is going towards the destruction and how the fundamental rights of people are snatched on the name of war on terror. The invasion by United States of America (USA) is defined as the invasion for the sustainable establishment of peace, prosperity, and democracy. But in reality, the black drop of blood, pile of corpse, ruined debris, damaged roads are the outcome of the war. This journalistic description picture shows that it is burden over the Arab world. The minute details of the war land prove that the basic norms of democracy are snatched. People are suffering from such insurgency of war. It shows that American advocacy for the good governance and democracy is failed.

The travelogue is unfolding of the cheerful and false notion of an American invasion in the Middle Eastern territory after September 11, 2001. The justification of American strategy becomes frail because of the gloominess of war and devastation. Basic norms of democracy such as freedom, peace, rule of law, sovereignty are violated and inevitable right of human beings such as life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are snatched. The basic norms of democracy assume people as greatest power of a state, but there the Middle East people, are compelled to live under the shade of gun and smoke of gun power. Their life style is miserable and the details of war show that the sovereignty of people is dismissed.

In the text, *Every Man in this Village Is a Liar*, there is not any specific main

character because it is a record of a daily life of a journalist who is travelling throughout the territory. As a travelogue, it includes realistic people as character who comes into contact with the writer. In other words, it presents the multiple characters and multiple events, which are real and pathetic. It shows the experience of guerillas to native journalists, doctors to warlord, rulers to nonprofessionals, businesspersons to homemaker, and driver to student. In short, it presents the real picture of entire Middle East. Therefore, it is the serial picture of a journalist's travel experience, which sketches out the representative voice and condition of the then society. Her detail records of raw pain of suicide bombings and killings of people questions the American claim of invasion as endorsement of democracy without a sound.

Democracy, as America defines, is one and only the best political system. In democracy, people are sovereign. Therefore, people are supposed to be most powerful. In other word, it is a political system run for the people by the people. Equality is the essence of democracy. With the norms of equality, it is supposed to select the representative in legislature. Elected government should secure the basic rights and guarantee the fulfillment of people's basic needs. While defining the equality of all people, in a very famous historical paper *The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America*, Thomas Jefferson opines, "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness."(13) To secure these rights, government is elected by the people.

Michael Saward, in his article, *Democratic Theory and Indices of Democratization*, defines democracy as political system of equality. He assumes, in democracy, all people are capable to decide what they want. He further says,

Democracy is to start from an assertion that all people are equal in some important respect, since it follows from this that all should be treated equally in certain specific political respects. The most straightforward way to assert such a foundational equality is to say that, for example, we all have an equal capacity for self-determination, or for rationality, or for making life-plans. Once an acceptable principle of political equality is forged, it can be used to define and to justify democracy. (8)

Self-determination is supposed to be an essence of democracy. Moreover, it is believed that the government is accountable and responsible to the people and their right.

Robert Dahl, in his book, *Democracy and Its Critics*, states that democracy consists of the following qualities:

Elected officials control over government decisions about policy is constitutionally vested in elected officials. Free and fair elections, elected officials are chosen and peacefully removed in frequent and conducted elections in which coercion is comparatively uncommon. Right to run for office practically all adults, Freedom of expression. Alternative information, alternative sources of information exist and are protected by law. Associational autonomy to achieve their various rights , including those listed above, citizens also have a right to form relatively independent associations or organizations, including independent political parties and interest groups. (120)

This definition stipulates some attributes of elections and lists certain freedoms deemed necessary for elections to be democratic that are dubbed as primary political

rights integral to the democratic process. In this sense, Dahl's definition allows us to clearly distinguish political democracy from other kinds of political system. His definition provides an important basis for thinking about democracy as a political regime of people.

Based on all above definitions we can say that free and fair election, right of life, rule of law, inclusive representation in legislature are the basic norms of democracy. Sovereignty is supposed to be a super power, which is used by people to determine political system. Nation and nationality is right of people. In the course of political practice, these norms of democracy become universal political theory and it formed a grand narrative. Assuming all the above norms as the foundation of democracy, the USA claims itself as the frontier of democracy.

To go through the meaning and understand the concept of metanarrative, sometimes also known as a master narrative or grand narrative, is an abstract idea that is thought to be a comprehensive explanation of historical experience or knowledge. According to John Stephens, it "is a global or totalizing cultural narrative schema which orders and explains knowledge and experience"(1). The prefix 'meta' means 'beyond' and is here used to mean 'about' and a narrative is a 'story'. Therefore, a metanarrative is a story about a story encompassing and explains other 'little stories' within totalizing schemes.

The concept of grand narrative, in particular what Lyotard called the "emancipation narrative", concerns the kind of metanarrative which talks, not just about "one damn thing after another", but sees some kind of interconnection between events, an inner connection between events related to one another, a succession of social systems, the gradual development of social conditions, and so on – in other words, is able in some way to make sense of history. More particularly, when

pronounced as it usually is, with a sneer, the “grand narrative”, the “narrative of emancipation” (60) is all those conceptions which try to make sense of history, rather than just isolated events in history, concepts like “class struggle”, socialism and capitalism, productive forces and so on. In this sense, the theoretical base of metanarrative demands the singularity, totality and autonomous truth. However, in contradiction Lyotard believes that the singularity, totality and autonomous nature of truth have got multiplicity, and open structure.

In the present age, the totalitarian idea of knowledge is questioned. Postmodernism attacks the ideas of stability, totality, autonomous being and the possibility of grounding our knowledge in certainty and truth. Postmodernism argues that the knowledge and truth is culturally determined and created by the various discourses of the power and language games. In this way, for Lyotard, postmodernism is heralded by the legitimation crisis in the grand or meranarratives that had, thus far, provided the framework of the human understanding. Rather than the futile and totalitarian consensus, Lyotard argues for a spirit of dissensus, insisting on the equality and justice of all localized language games. A language game is a system of rules and conventions, which frame and govern a particular discourse.

Knowledge is developed through the narration. Therefore, narrative knowledge is knowledge in the form of story telling. In the tribal times, myths and legends formed knowledge of this type; that such-and-such a mountain was just where it was because some mythic animal put it there, and so on. The narrative not only explained, but legitimated knowledge, and when applied to the social relations of their own society, the myths functioned as a legitimation of the existing power relations, customs and so on. Through the continuation of narration different types of narrative knowledge is developed. The unified concept of this particular knowledge is known

as grand narrative such as Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Marxism, capitalism, democracy all are developed as grand narrative. As power determines the knowledge and truth through the language games, America also defines democracy as a one and only political system.

The notion of grand narrative was criticized by Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. In this text, Lyotard refers to what he describes as the postmodern condition, which he characterized as increasing skepticism towards the totalizing nature of grand narrative. His theoretical norm suggests the rejection of grand narrative, but it does not mean blind rejection and ignorance. In Lyotard's term post modernity is "incredulity towards meta narrative" (xxiv). As a language game, he does not believe on the totality and universal truth.

In the course of development of human civilization, various little narratives of democracy were developed and practiced as narrative knowledge. In the primary phase, democratic political system was theorized and practiced in ancient Greek civilization. Then after it was established as a successful political system in England. Now, democracy and democratic norms and values are thought as the one and only political system. It is generally believed that people are endowed with the maximum opportunities to exercise the self-determination that is to live under the law of their own choosing. Only a democracy helps the people to protect their fundamental interests. Everyone wants certain things: survival, food, shelter, health, security. Thus, the universal norms of democracy protect the freedom and opportunity better than any alternative political system that has ever been devised so it has become the grand narrative as the political theory Marxism. In a short period democracy is accepted as the one and only ruling system. It is rapidly expanded through the world and developed as the grand narrative. Two decades ago, only a quarter of the countries of

the world were practicing the democracy. Since then, democracy has rapidly expanded throughout the world. Today more than one hundred and twenty countries have accepted it. As a ruling system, it is known as the multi party system and right of choosing own leader through the free and fair election by the citizen. In this way democracy developed as the only form of government in the world that is widely viewed as morally legitimate. It is the only form of government that is capable of fully satisfying international covenants on civil and political rights. In this sense, Democracy is the best form of ruling system.

It seems or at least American nation and government desires to pretend they are on peak in all of modern values, which are pure, unconditional and universal. Americans (nation and government) believe that they are the best, unique and exceptional. In better word, Americans desire to conceptualize a metanarrative of American myth, with no critique and no opponent. They try to justify their Americocentrism through grand narratives like freedom, democracy and human rights to interfere in global system to make it consistent with American interests. In the contrary, postmodern thinkers argue that our era is the end of grand narratives. There is no difference between grand narratives: enlightenment reason, science, religion, truth, and justice as some universal concepts, or a big country like the USA, which is claiming, and is willing to be the exclusive narrator of the world. Postmodern thinkers claim that all the grand narratives are in dead end and in contemporary era all, the concepts are relative and localized. This thesis questions the grandnarrative of democracy on the basis of Jean-François Lyotard's theory of metanarratives in postmodern era and Michel Foucault's theory, which detected the relation between truth and power.

During the past decades, US rhetorically and for several times declared that US not only is deserved to lead the world but also it is their responsibility to lead the world and altering this leadership is dangerous for the world. It is nothing unless American metanarrative which is imposing itself on the world and legitimizes itself relying on grand narratives of Freedom and Democracy.

Modernism has several aspects such as in economic; utilitarianism and capitalism , in politics; liberal democracy and freedom of speech, in science; positivism and empiricism, in religion; Protestantism and Puritanism or in better word, freedom of religion and secularization of religion, and in other aspects; individualism, reasonability and rationality based on enlightenment philosophy, bureaucratic system , and social movement for changing the structures of the society. All of the above features were valuable against the traditional values which were no longer valid. Americans had a great role in shaping modern world through developing science and industry, establishing the first new Liberal Democracy and initiating the first nation-state around the world, proving freedom of speech and religion. That is why American nation and government desire to pretend they are on peak in all of modern values which are pure, unconditional and universal.

Americans, since the first day of establishing the USA, believed that they should reach to fulfillment the American Promise to be the best and unique in fulfilling the human dignity and liberty at first for the Americans and at the second stage for the people of rest of the world. It means Americans are exceptional and have an exceptional duty to correct all nations' mistakes and emancipate all the human beings. On the other words, Americans believe they have responsibility of establishment of democracy in all over the world. American government has tried to justify this supremacy and uniqueness relying on freedom and democracy as absolute

and unconditional concepts. In this way, they could legitimize their political, cultural and military interventions in the international system. But it is essentially paradoxical to force other people to civilization, freedom and democracy and American history since the beginning days. Moreover, the main question of this paper is about this paradoxical situation, which Americans involve with since infancy until now. In better word, Americans desire to conceptualize a metanarrative of American democratic myth, with no critique and no opponent but it becomes weak with its own behavior.

They try to justify their Americo-centrism through the grand narratives of democracy; freedom, peace, sovereignty and human rights to interfere in global system to make it consistent with American interests. This paper through postmodern approach and relying on Jean-François Lyotard's theory tries to show that these concepts during the modern time became useless. Such grand narrative which are used by the dominant powers specially Americans to legitimize their dominance are unproductive while all the postmodern era is defined by “incredulity toward metanarratives”(xxiv) . It means that in postmodern era all the values are localized and relative. In this way nobody can claim that has special right to lead the remaining others and impose its values and interests on the others, the path that American government is used to act throughout.

Larry Diamond in *Developing Democracy* states, “Democratization is generally a good thing and democracy is the best form of government. However, democracy is not an unmitigated blessing”(29). Diamond argues that democracy is not the form of government that guarantees the best form of governance. Diamond traces the history of democracy and states, “Dating back to Aristotle (and to Plato, who had even less sympathy for democracy), the key shapers of democratic political thought

have held that the best realizable form of the government is constitutional government, in which the freedom is constrained by rule of law” (29). He further states that:

Locke, Montesquieu and the American Federalists asserted, only a democratic government, restraining and dividing the power of majority can protect individual freedom. Even if we think of democracy as simply the rule of the people, as a system of choosing government through free and fair electoral competition at regular intervals, governments chosen in this manner are generally better than those that are not. They offer the best prospect for accountable, responsive, peaceful, predictable, and good governance. (30)

Here, Diamond seems to focus that rule of law, individual freedom and free and fair electoral competitions, equality, right of survival, human rights are the assets of the any democratic rule which can be in no way compromised. Any democratic society can be judged how democratic it is from the way it conducts its elections. Unless and until these norms are rigged, the society and the rule cannot be democratic. Stack in the travelogue tries to portray the Middle East society and the vivid sketch of war land, brutal invasion of USA and pitiless exploitation of Islamic laws and unstable political system.

Megan K. Stack, through her real presentation of people wants to show the whole tragedy of ongoing war in the Middle East in the name of establishment of democracy. Security of 'life, liberty and pursuit of happiness' is the basic norm according to the American definition of democracy, But in reality, in the Middle Eastern land there is no such condition. People are not feeling the security of life. The

fear of death is roaming around the sky and shining in the face of people. Stack narrates in the text as:

I was still not there. I had survived, I was alive. The shadow of death had passed over my body. But I had left myself there, in the salt and blood and crazy sunlight. I was stuck there and I didn't know what to make of pasteurized Jordon, dark and lush and humane, the whisper and tinkle of a summer terrace. Spark and blasts burst up from the horizon, fireworks set off by laughing men on dark hilltops, fading even as they bloomed, their crashes ringing in the valleys, up to the stars. (245)

In her observation, she finds the people in the grass-root level never feel secure. American invasion was done for peace and establishment of democracy, but they are feeling terror and passing of death over the head. It criticizes the validity of invasion of democratic super power, USA. It bitterly mocks how people in lower strata are promised for peace and security of life but are never fulfilled. They are given the cheque, which is never cashed. They get the dream of democracy but it never fulfilled. The detail of the destruction proves that America itself is not going to establish democratic system in the Arab land rather it is playing a language game.

The fair and good governance is the asset of any democratic rule. If the elections are conducted fairly, it is believed that every level of people is heard. In time of very limited education and political consciousness, when the authority could be confined to narrow elite, liberal autocracy was possible. In an age of widespread communication and political consciousness, people expect political participation and accountability much more than they did in the past. Marc F Platter in *Liberalism and Democracy* writes, “There is a powerful association between democracy and liberty:

countries that hold free elections are overwhelmingly more liberal than those that do not” (175). Platter also sees the free and fair election is the only way to guarantee freedom to the people. It means, democracy is a system of governance in which, country’s political leaders are chosen by the people through regular, free, and fair elections.

In democracy, people have a choice between different candidates and parties who want the power to govern. The people can criticize and replace their elected leaders and representatives if they do not perform well. The people are sovereign, they are the highest authority, and government is based on the will of the people. In *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, democracy is defined as "rule by the citizen in general... in modern society the sovereignty of the people in general, expressed not directly by a vote on individual questions, but through representative."(98) It means that in democracy, people are superior. They elect their representative in to convey their message and demand on legislature. Elected representatives at the national and local levels must listen to the people and be responsive to their needs. But in contradiction USA itself has appointed the warlords in Afghanistan. Warlords like 'Zamam', 'Hazrat Ali' and 'Abdul Qadir' are exploiting the people of grass root level who should be free for the elect their own leaders according to the universal norms of liberal democracy. The US appointed warlords are operated from the American fund. The USA appointed war lards are responsible for America because they are backed by US money. They are doing all the brutal exploitation for the money not for the emancipation and abolishment of non-democratic system.

Megan K. Stack, in the travelogue, shows how the war and its brutal devastation are going on. America is playing the game of power. American strategy is to play inside the brotherhood and peace of Middle East. Stack sees the politics of

warlord, who is known as heroin trafficker of Jalalabadh, Afghanistan. She further writes “He was an enemy of Taliban, funded by the US government, making a play for power in the vague, new order that had begun when American soldiers toppled the Taliban government.” (5) He is the leader of tribal loyalist. It shows that America is ruling over the peace of Afghanis people by funding the tribal leaders and inspiring for the tribal war. It is against the sovereignty of Afghanis. If America really wanted to establish the rule of people in Afghanistan, America should make environment of election and participation of people in legislation. But in opposite USA is pumping the warlords with the power of money.

There is death in every step. People are not safe in their own land. The land should be covered with the plants but the expression like “the land is rich with poppies and land mine” (26) shows that people are not able to harvest and move freely. "I had seen US warplanes drop bombs on village of mud brick and children killed . . . the future of broken land becoming the moral responsibility of my country"(34). Careless bombard of US Warplanes proves that USA is not serious about the right of life of people. It is blind with power.

The instance shows how America is buying the parties and leaders by the money. The leader should be chosen by people in democracy, but here leader is controlling the people by snatching the right and ruthless behavior. Theoretically, competing parties must have a reasonable chance to let their views known to all (potential and actual) voters. In order to be a real choice, the election must also be free, in that citizens are not coerced when making their voting decisions and when voting. In order for the election to be egalitarian, each vote should count equally, and be counted as such without fraud, irrespective of the social position, party affiliation, or other qualifications of each one. But here leader is chosen through the American

power and guided by the American fund. Education, health, communication, is the basic needs of human life. These basic needs should be supplied for the every people. It is the basic norms of democracy. The Afghan sky was full of American fighter Jets. Situations like “There is no other airplanes in the Afghan skies: there was only the war” (10), and “B-52 sliced a white gash into the sky” (11) proves that the black war jets are thundering over the skies as the death. The right of news and notice is snatched by the U.S. power. The report of Stack from the war land is bitterly criticized by Defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld as “This is a false story” (12). It shows that the real news does not come on the media; it is controlled by the U.S. power. It is against the norms of democracy. The travelogue shows how the law and the legal institution are biased to the people according to their class and power. It shows how the elites control the law and system with their power and money.

Democracy is a system of rule by laws, not individuals. In a democracy, the rule of law protects the rights of citizens, maintains order, and limits the power of government. All citizens are equal under the law. No one may be discriminated against on the basis of their race, religion, ethnic group, or gender. No one may be arrested, imprisoned, or exiled arbitrarily. No one may be denied their freedom without a fair and public hearing by an impartial court. No one may be taxed or prosecuted except by a law established in advance. No one is above the law, not even a king or an elected president. The law is fairly, impartially, and consistently enforced.

In democratic system all the citizens are equal and they have freedom of life. But in the travelogue, Megan states the brutality of Israelis army against the Palestinian people. She writes the experience of a Palestinian woman as follow:

. . . Israelis soldiers arrested her for membership in an underground Palestinian political movement. That was back in the bad old days of the first intifada. *Break their bones...she was tortured for the days, beaten, abused, threatened with rape.* One day a particularly brutal Israeli interrogator wounded her breast with a nail, left it bleeding. She pulled her blouse aside and showed me her scar, deep and permanent.  
(40-41)

It shows the brutal exploitation of the Palestinian people by the soldiers of US supported Israeli government. It is against the sovereignty of people what America validates as the universal norms of liberal democracy. People are free to join an organization in democracy. However, the women are brutally misbehaved for joining a political movement.

In democratic political system, right of life is preserved as basic right. One should get appropriate situation and nursing while their childhood. Government should guarantee the good care of every child if s/he is in danger. Stack presents the statement of Israelis Defense Minister like this:

That is what Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin told the Israelis soldiers, or so the story goes. Some Israelis insists this was a command to be soft with the Palestinians. *Break their bones but doesn't kill them, beat them but don't shoot them.* . . . Israelis soldiers systematically break the arms of little boys, one by one, working their way through a village, so they couldn't throw rocks. Israel is merciful; Israel is brutal. (41)

The brutal word picture of boy's exploitation shows the lawlessness situation and misuse of power. This shows the action against the basic norms of democracy. It is a great satire and mockery against the American dream of liberal democracy.

Americans believe that the American government is doing all these for the promotion of democracy in the Middle East. They think, indeed, the United States is vigorously promoting democracy abroad. American invasion on the name of War on terror is legitimized as the appropriate step towards the war on terror. It is believed that the invasion of America is securing the motto of democracy like: citizen participation, government responsiveness, and patterns of public policy-making and their consequences. But in reality, in the Middle Eastern world, the motto of democracy is dismissed. In the democratic system, sovereignty of a nation is regarded as the prime factor. But in reality, there is no more practice of democracy, the invasion itself is violation of sovereignty of country.

It is supposed that invasion is done for the promotion of democracy. But in reality US pumped money is increasing the war rather than solve the problem and establish the peace and democratic system. Stack writes, "people treated like animals" (54). The common people of Middle East think that all the action of invasion are not done for them but to fulfill the personal interests of super power of west. A man in Iraq says with Stack, "all the world was putting its hand on its eye when Saddam killed us. Why now? Where is food? Where is medicine?"(55). He further says, "Bush want to make this a civil war. They make no safety. They intend to. They know everything. Iraqi People, we know nothing about democracy. Until now we've had a knife over our head"(55). The expression of the man presents they are not mentioned as human being. USA, which is running the project of invasion, was silent when the brutal Saddam was killing the people. Now they are invading on the name of democracy but the people do not desire any imported system to rule over them. They do not believe USA. They think that they are not for the interest of native people. If America was doing, all for democracy there should be some reformation and there

should be some symptoms of peace, prosperity and development. It shows that it is great mockery of grand narrative of democracy.

People are not safe because of war. Stack says, "People were raped and sodomized; waterboarded, electrocuted, cut, beaten, frozen, burned"(120). It shows the worthlessness of life of people. Killing of people is very normal in Iraq. The life of the people is worthless in this time. The people are killed as the animal. Neither they get secure life nor do they get appropriate funeral after the death. Stack draws the picture of mass killing as follow,

When the battle was over, the neighbors said, U.S. soldiers had wrapped the dead in body bags, dumped them down into the soldiers' trenches and bulldozed the earth back over them. But the graves were shallow, and after a few days the stink of decaying flesh rose from the ground, winding around the houses like lace. (57-58)

It shows the worthlessness situation of human life. American army kills the civil people on the name of terrorist and buries the corpse in the mass graves. This situation proves that the right of life is snatched though America says that all is for the democracy. Stack notes the reaction of civilian after the carnage. It reads as, "They said, 'we will fight the American here'" (57) It proves that America is increasing own enemy in vain.

The civil life of the Middle East seems to be very unsecure. Security of life is the essential norms of democracy. In this travelogue, Stack shows the real picture from journalistic eye. She never says that the life is unsecure. But the picture of the war land shows that the life is not secure anymore. She writes, "Rocket launchers lay in the grass like forgotten toys. The neighbors were afraid to touch them." (58) The land of Iraq is full of arm and ammunition. It shows the ample use of the power. This

thrills to the people and violates the rule of war. Children are being victim of war though they are not involved in the war. She writes, “There are a few hand grenades lying around. My nephew picked one up the other day. These kids haven’t got a clue, they just think it’s an amusement park” (58-59). The innocent children are victimized. It is against the essential value of democracy. It proves that the values of democracy are dismissed by the so-called war on terror. The author, in Chapter six, quotes the criticism from a civilian about the America. The man says, “The American do what they do not say, and they don’t say what they do” one of the men said.”(83) It is the representative voice from Libya. It proves that believe upon America and Americans is going to be dim. American says it is doing all this for the betterment of the people but people do not believe to America.

Megan K. Stack portrays the picture of the suicide attack. The depiction of the image after suicide bomb attack is heart rendering. It seeks heart as a thrill story. A police officer, who came in the trap of suicide bomb, really shocks the heart. Stack gives the details of the trapped police officer's condition as follow," His face was cracked, and blood had seeped into the cracks and dried there. It didn’t look like a face anymore; it looked like a broken plate that had been plastered back together with blood for glue. There were only his eyes, glittering with fever. (100)The depiction of the situation of post suicide bomb attack seems like a detail of an imaginary thrill story. However, it is a real event. It happens day by day in Middle East. It is argued that the people of the Middle East are thirst of blood. But if we think deeply it is the result of the invasion on the name of democracy. If the few numbers of leaders have the misunderstanding and they want to fight, the grass root people should not be tortured. The misunderstanding of the leader should be solved through the peaceful negotiation. But in practice, the democratic super power, America invades on the

sovereignty of other countries; it proves that the invasion is the action against the democracy itself. If the invasion could really stop the so-called terrorism and formed the democratic system, why the violence is going on after the long period of invasion? It shows that the invasion is mysterious myth under the rubric of 'war on terror'. It is not the solution but a problem itself.

In the political practice, it is universally accepted Democracy is defined, basically, as government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. In some forms, democracy can be exercised directly by the people; in large societies, it is by the people through their elected agents. It is supposed the democracy is a 'government by the people' or 'popular self-government'. In *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanley I. Benn writes about the governance:

To rule is, generally, to prescribe conduct for someone else. There is a sense; it is true, in which moralists speak of ruling oneself, when by a kind of metaphor they speak of reason governing the passions. Again, a former colony becomes self-governing when its people is no longer ruled by outsiders; but this is not inconsistent with its still being ruled by native masters. (256)

This argument focuses on self-governance as the essence of democracy. It means, when a nation becomes independent while making decision then only a nation becomes a democratic nation and that is a practice of democracy. In democratic system, everyone has the right to participate in government. This participation can occur by either direct or by representative vote. In a direct vote, the people approve public policy themselves. But while a country is guided by outsiders it can't be democracy. Israel is guided by American money and its direction; it means Israel is under the hegemony of America. It means, value of self-governance is violated. Such

dependency proves that America is not promoting democracy in Israel rather paralyzing it.

People of Iraq never blame to Saddam Hussain's government for their pain and suffering. Remembering the event of 1991, a Shiite man says, "We have been killed not by Saddam . . . but by America"(71). In 1991, the first Bush administration urged Iraqis to rise up against their government. The Kurds and Shiite started the grass root insurrection again Saddam, expecting the Americans to back them up militarily. However, in result they did not get any support from the America at that time. It proves that, America really does not wants to form the democratic government and practice the public participation in Iraq. At first, it did not support the public movement to cripple the tyranny government of Saddam, but later itself invaded on the name of war on terror. It proves that the objective of invasion is different rather than establishing liberal democracy. It mocks against the strategy of great democratic super power and it is so-called mission of democracy.

In chapter nine, "We expect something better", Stacks presents the snapshot of the stir against the invasion of USA. The young people of the Iraq are supporting what America called as dictator. For whom America is stereotyping as dictator, people are respecting as leader. It shows that the double identity of a single person, Where both of them are truth in the different context. People of the Arab world are supporting their leader form heart. Author has presented the expression of the young demonstrator as follows,

With our soul, with our blood, we will sacrifice for you. O Saddam.

This is shouted in every Arab country; only the name changes. We will sacrifice for you, O Mubarak, we will sacrifice for you, O Rafik, we will sacrifice for you, O Bashar, we will sacrifice for you, O Islam, O

Nasrallah, O Sheikh Yassin. In every Arab country, crowds of young men rush into the street to holler about sacrificing soul and blood for a dictator. It is a cave art of political discourse, done as automatically as American students pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic. (113)

It proves that, those who are known as dictator by America have public support. They are on the power because they have public support. It shows that the civil people love their leader and the ongoing political system is appropriate for them. While the US officials are trying to prove the invasion as the mission of democracy, people of grass root level are protesting against it. In the travelogue, Megan K Stack the concept of grass root people. She writes:

People shouted about the Americans and spat on the ground to clear their mouth of bile. The American would take over all Arab lands. There was no more United Nations, no more decency, no more rules. This is terrorism! They are terrorist! George bush is a terrorist! The American wanted land and oil, they hated Muslims, and they were doing it all for Israel. This is new face of colonialism. American power would redraw the boarder. And the Arab wouldn't stand for it. They would fight to the bitter end. (110)

It shows that the invasion on the name of democracy is going to be vain. Public of the Arab land think that invasion is done for self-purpose of USA not for establishment of the democracy. They think that it is a mere oil politics. On the one hand, America claims that the invasion is done to secure public right and on the other hand riot of the public shows, invasion as the burden. Invasion has become the cause of the sanction of the public right. While talking about invasion of America, Nora, a

translator says "I interview people every day, all over the Arab world, and I never meet anybody who thinks the American invaded Iraq because they don't like dictator" (121). It shows that the Arab world thinks that the America has the secondary purpose. It means the Arab world does not believe in the logic of America. They think that the cause of the all destructions, torture, and suffering is America. In nutshell, they think that war, torture and destruction can't establish the democracy. It proves that, the motto of democracy fails here.

In Yemen, Stacks sees the extreme violation of human right. She finds people who were tortured by USA funded government. She gets government as "police station now for the United States" (147). Government is no responsible for citizens but for USA because it is running from the American money. Democratic leader nation of the world compel to the second country to torment citizen. Megan Stacks further knows and writes:

America had given Yemen plenty of money and military equipment ... More American cash flowed to Yemen after September 11. There are rumors that Bin Laden might been hiding here, embedded among his tribe. Nobody believe it. And yet when you got to Yemen, torn by civil war and crippled by poverty, you felt yourself so far off the map, so deep in a lawless land, that anything at all seemed potentially true.

(147)

In the theory of democracy, stability, peace and development is essential. Democratic grand narrative defines all these as the truth, but in the Arab land sound of arm and ammunition is truth. It mocks upon the grand narrative of the democracy. Human right is the most essential in democracy. American grand narrative urges that every citizen should get right to live peacefully. But here in the war land, people are arrested

and detained or opaquely incarcerated. In Yemen Stack talks with Mohammed Naji Allaw. He narrates the lawlessness situation "Yemenis were being held in Yemeni prisons without charge because American wanted them in custody." (148) It is a extreme of impunity. Amin Mashrigi is a poet who writes poems and recites in the countryside. Stacks has cited the poem in her travelogue. He writes about the reality of the Yemen. He says, "Democracy is for people who have money. If the poor man becomes democratic, they accuse him of dishonesty" (156). It proves that, though the government of America loudly says that it is responsible to the people and believes in the equality of all people, in reality, they are behave on the basis of economic status. It is a vivid example of duality. In official level, America defines democracy as a system of equality but in the level of practice it is based in the economic status.

They all said no. Oh no, never! The Lebanese have learned their lesson.

The war was not really our war, not of us. It was America and Israel and Syria and Iran, meddling from outside. War takes money, and we can't afford another war. We are too tired to fight. This new generation will be better. War is impossible. (163)

It shows that the tired Lebanese are fade up from the war. They are not ready for further war. They think that the ongoing war is based on the personal ego of USA and other countries. They think that the invasion of USA in the several countries on the name of democracy is vain. The invasion proves that the war is waged not for democracy. If it was for democracy it would not go against the grass root people. Therefore, the people of grass root level think that the war is destructive and unnecessary for them. Lebanese people think, "We are looking to our children and we don't want them to suffer like we suffered"(167). It proves that that the system Hariri established is satisfactory for them. They do not want any specific political system but

a long-lasting peace. Megan K. Stack further takes expression of a Lebanese who think that their real enemy is America and its invasion. He thinks the real root of terrorism lies in the American strategy. He says, "Bush we hate you . . . all our disaster come from America," and "America is the source of all our terrorism" (168). It proves, the so-called invasion is burden for those people. They are not in favor of it.

American definition and its promise of democracy claim the peace and freedom as the essence of democracy. In contrast, American invasion in Middle mocks its own promise. In the text, descriptions of conditions like " Road are death", "Sky is Fear", "People are scurry down into the scorched earth like moles," "Hospital are empty of medicine," "There is no enough food or clean water" (237) depicts the condition of lawlessness and impunity. In the text, we find the exploitation and misuse of power by US army. Those army who are appointed for security of people are killing those who are helpless. Stack describes the slaughter of a twenty years old boy named Mohammed. He was a son of active journalist named Raheem. She further narrates: "Raheem's son got killed. US soldiers shot him in the chest"(246). The killing of the boy was merciless. When the boy was shot down and were injured he should get medical treatment. But here narration of situation seeks the heart. She narrates:

It took Mohammad two hours to die. The soldiers had sealed off the neighborhood and closed all the roads. Nobody could take him to the hospital. They said later that if he'd gotten to the hospital, they could have saved him. But movement was impossible, and so he bled to death in a convenience shop. (246-47)

Killing of a armless man in a street as a dog is ridicule to the democratic system. It inhumanly seizes the right of life. It simply proves that American invasion in Arab

land will never fulfill the motto of democracy. It is terrorism in itself. The invasion which is supposed to be helpful to people to secure their basic needs and fundamental right is burden itself. It mocks the strategy of the USA, which claim the freedom and equality as the fundamental right of people. In addition, it proves that America does not do what say and does what it does not say. USA officials proudly claim that they are doing the entire incursion for abolish and eradicate the terrorism and establishment of democracy.

Right of life is essence of human right. Any government should guarantee the security of life. It is a basic dimension of democratic system. But here in the text, Stack presents some statistics of human disaster:

Iraq Body Count says, that around 100,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed since the invasion. There is a graph with red spikes, like a picture of shattered windows and broken bones. Nobody knows how many Afghans have been killed; it is thousands and thousands of people; by some estimates, tens of thousands. In Iraq 4,349 U.S. soldiers have died, and 873 in Afghanistan, and more all the time. (250)

It proves that what a ruthless and tragic are happening. Tens of thousands of people's life is gone on the name of democracy. It is only a formal statistics of death. She further says, "That is not counting the death of local people who are tallied as combatants, or wading into the question of whether they were or weren't"(250). It proves that there is no value of civil people. They are excluded from the list of deaths. It really questions the value of American invasion in the Middle East. Establishment of democracy is not possible on the pile of death body.

Stack, in her travelogue, writes about the effects of war on the psyche of those involved, about how gazing into the abyss of war creates a vacuum in the people

themselves. Her pathetic description of Middle East proves the invasion is layer. She further writes:

War on terror isn't anything but the sick and feeble cringing in an asylum, babies in shock, structure smashed. Baghdad broken. Afghanistan broken, Egypt broken. The line between heaven and earth, broken. Lebanon broken, Broken peace and broken roads and broken bridges. The broken faith and years of broken promises. Children inheriting their parents' broken hearts, growing up with a taste for vengeance. And all along, America dreaming its deep sweet dream, there and not there. America chasing phantoms, running uphill to nowhere in pursuit of a of a receding mirage of absolute safety (242).

It shows that the American mission of war on terror is only insignificant. American war against the terror and establishment of democracy is like chasing phantoms. This expression states out the war on terror is running uphill the nowhere. The American assertion of endorsement of democratic system in Middle East does not accomplish.

The deformation of American grand narrative is seen in the travelogue *Every Man in this Village Is a Liar*. America defines the grand narrative of democracy as a universal political system. But the evidences of the text proves the universal condition of democracy; freedom, equality, sovereignty of people, rule of law, free fair and frequent elections are dissolved by the war waged by America.

However, the writer does not directly question the invasion of USA. The detail account of ongoing war and insurgency and its catastrophic results proves that American definition of democracy, as a universal political system is a mere language game constructed by the power. Prescribed political system by a foreign power never gets adjustment in native land. There should give the chance to public to find out the

appropriate political system. USA is fighting for more than one decade from 2001, there is not seen any reformation in Middle East. It can be said that democracy does not comes from the muzzle of the rifle. It cannot be constructed from the pile of death body, blood and tear. It is only possible through the negotiation, peaceful pressure, and free, fair and frequent elections. If we want to establish peace and prosperity in the Middle East we should give chance to choose the political system to people themselves. People power should be institutionalized through civic freedoms that entitle people to govern their lives, allowing them to follow their personal preferences in governing their private lives and to make their political preferences count in governing public life.

### Works Cited

- Blackburn, Simon. "Democracy" *Dictionary of Philosophy*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Dahl, Robert. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press 1989.
- Diamond, Larry. *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Hamilton, Adrian. *Review of Every Man in this Village is a Liar by Megan Stack*. London: *The Independent*, Friday 10 September 2010.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America, In Congress, July 4, 1776." *The Essay on Creation of Knowledge*, Eds. Shreedhar P. Lohani, Rameshwar P. Adhikari, Abi N. Subedi. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996.
- Lingfield, Susie. Review of *Every Man in This Village Is a Liar by Megan K. Stack*. *The Washington Post*. Sunday August 8, 2010.
- Liotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge*. Trans. S. Malpas, London: Routledge Publication, 2003
- Platter, Marc F. "Liberalism and Democracy." *Foreign Affairs*. 77.2, 1998. Foreign Affairs Press, 1984.
- Saward, Michael. "Democratic Theory and Indices of Democratization". *Defining and Measuring Democracy*. Eds. David, Beetham. London, Sage Modern Politics, 1994, 6-24.
- Stack, Megan K. *Every Man in This Village Is A Liar*. London: Bloom Berry Publishing , 2010.
- Stone, Marla. *From the Front Lines, an Account of War and Disillusionment*. Los Angeles: *Los Angeles Times*. [June 20, 2010](#).
- Waugh, Patricia. *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006

