

Kana'an Electronic Bulletin is a joint effort of al-Mashriq al-A'mil Center for Cultural and Development Studies (Ramallah – Occupied Palestine) and Palestine Research and Publishing Foundation (USA). It is edited by the collective efforts of Ibrahim Makkawi, Adel Samara, and Masad Arbid. Kana'an Electronic Bulletin welcomes contributions that serve the pan-Arab (*qawmi*) project that aims at the realization of Arab unity, development, and socialism. Articles, of course express the opinions of their writers. They must be, however, in harmony with the general mission of the Bulletin. Although some articles present situations where we feel amendments are needed, we, however, refrain from doing that for reasons of academic honesty and due to the sensitivity of some writers. Please write to us or send your contributions to: mail@kanaanonline.org.

Volume III Issue 338

28 November 2003

Arab Popular Classes' Guerrillas Confront World Capitalism in Iraq¹

Adel Samara

Among a wide range interpretations and analyses of the reasons behind the aggression against the Arab people of Iraq carried by the U.S., Britain and others, including rulers of the regimes cross the Arab Homeland; the Marxist Arab-Nationalist school of thought has its own comprehensive and penetrating interpretation of such an aggression. It is a given right of all nations of periphery to produce Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) in order to protect their peoples and wealth from the expected aggressions of capitalism in the era of globalization. Consequently, this school of thought assumes that it is a high priority for the Arabs to protect themselves by WMD against two enemies: the Zionist Ashkenazi regime and the center of global capitalism² in general and the United States-Britain alliance in particular. The United State's ruling class rejection of the return of the UN inspectors of WMD to Iraq provides the world with clear evidence that the aggression against Iraq has nothing to do with the alleged weapons.³

From a Marxist Arab-Nationalist perspective, both aggressions of 1991 and 2003 have been expected to take place taking into consideration our understanding of the capitalist center interests in the Arab Homeland. While Iraqi oil remains on the top of these interests, the Arab market has been another goal.⁴ According to the steady and relative decline of the U.S. economy (see below) and the increased competition from the European Community, the only way for the United States to guarantee the dependency of the Arab markets is to occupy

¹ I wish to thank Kana'an's Editorial Board members for their insight and input in writing this essay.

² I intend to say that the center of capitalism, which includes the European Union and Japan as well, because these countries participated in the aggression against Iraq in 1991 under the pretext of the liberation of Kuwait. All the formal regimes know the fact that Kuwait is part of Iraq, it is protected by U.S. capitalism and it is protected for a reason which has nothing to do with human rights or its membership in the United Nations, but the U.S control of the Kuwaiti people's oil.

³ It should not be a surprise if the U.S. and British ruling establishments fabricate a lie and show some WMD they allegedly found in Iraq. The long history of lies of the bourgeois media will help them in doing just that.

⁴ The United States was trying to surpass the old colonialism in the Arab Homalnd since the 1950s. It rejected the Zionist/British and French aggression of 1956 against Egypt as a step in its policy to inherit these aging colonialists in the Arab oil and market. Its aim was never to support the Arab nation.

the area using its relative advantage, namely the military power.⁵ What the U.S. is looking for is to control and own the rest of the Arab oil by controlling the oil of Iraq.

Iraq is the first country that nationalized its oil in 1972. More important is the fact that the Iraqi regime started in 1998 to price its oil by using Euro instead of the U.S. dollar, which has been used as the currency of world trade since the Breton Woods agreement of 1945. The U.S. dollar was adopted later by OPEC members as the official currency used for oil trade since 1971. This made the U.S. dollar the de facto major international trading currency. The Iraqi decision to price its oil by the Euro was a critical challenge to the hegemony of the U.S. currency all over the world. It was a challenge to the institutional architecture for the world economy that made the U.S. dollar the international reserve currency – that is, the currency all countries agreed to accept as payment among nations. This system, in which the dollar was “as good as gold” officially, established U.S. hegemony over the global economy.⁶

Using the Euro instead of the dollar by the Iraqi government constitutes the most dangerous and direct threat to the U.S. colonial interests in the region and even in OPEC and the world trade. We refer to this “threat” as *al-Nahda*, the Arab renaissance project, which the Iraqi regime was trying to achieve.⁷ The achievement of this project will terminate the U.S. and other capitalist center interests in the Arab Homeland and will dismantle the Ashkenazi Zionist regime in Arab Palestine. Based on this analysis, we believe that when the president of the U.S. declared, after the occupation of Baghdad on 9 April 2003, from the U.S. war ship that: “The job is done”, he was right, because the job was clearly to destroy an Arab regime that was trying to achieve a pan-Arab unity. As long as the Arab unity is blocked, the foreign military and economic occupation will continue there.

This complex relationship between the Arab people and the west, especially the United States, cannot be fully explained by its reduction to cultural and religious factors. This reductionism falsely describes the Iraqi resistance as the action of fundamentalist Moslems who are simply motivated by hatred towards the west and Christianity! In fact, the capitalist center has always pressured the Arab ruling comprador to encourage the Political Islamic (PI) currents against the Arab nationalist and communist currents. The capitalist center has a strong interest in the Arab people moving more and more towards fundamentalism as long as there are no efforts devoted to development, social liberation and transformation. Arab unity has never been on the agenda of the PI, and consequently, PI has never posed a threat to capitalism and its interests. The prevailing political fact in the case of the Arab nation, is that a backward Arab Homeland will never achieve unity in as-much-as-a fragmented and disunited Arab Homeland will never achieve economic and social development.

The service provided by some of the Arab dependent comprador regimes to the U.S. global empire has expired. The recent developments led the entrapment of some of these regimes between two bitter choices: either declare themselves openly as agents to the United States or insist on relative independence from this slave-master

⁵ While the capitalist western continuous war is still openly declared against the Arab nation since the early era of capitalist colonialism, there is a hidden war between the U.S. new colonialist power and the old colonialists of Europe. The era of globalization witnesses a continuity of this war as long as the EU is unifying and renewing itself to replace the United States domination.

⁶ For the effects of the Iraqi decision of replacing the dollar by EURO see, Kollengoden, EURO vs Dollar, in *Janashakti*, (Organ of CC of CPI (ML), vol-11 o.2 April-May-June 2003, p.p.8-13, and *Proletarian Era* (Organ of the Socialist Unity Center of India), Vol 35 No. 14 March 1,2003, p.p. 2-3, and Adel Samara, al-Mashroua' al-Qawmi wal-euro wahtilal al-a'iraq (The national Project, the EURO and the Occupation of Iraq, in Kana'an Review, no 115 October 2003, p.p. 15-26.

⁷ In the last interview of Muhamad Said al-Sahaf, the well known Iraqi Minister of media, he told the journalist of Abu Dhabi space channel 24th of October 2003: “ I still believe and committed to this project”. In fact, this project started in Egypt since 1830s, but since that time, the western colonial, and later imperial and now global capitalism launched a continuous war against this project. Some naive Arabs believe that the reason behind this war is cultural or religious. The closest friends of the western capitalist regimes are the most religious Moslem Arabs.

relationship in order to gain some legitimacy in the eyes of their own restless people. That is the reason why George W. Bush launched an attack against Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Syria (CNN 7-11-2003) despite of the fact that they all joined the U.S. aggressive coalition against Iraq in 1991 and provided the United States with all the facilities it demanded from them in its current aggression.

Western scholars and academics, particularly in the U.S., dwell on the nonsensical idea that “Arab people simply hate the U.S.” attributing most of their analyses to PI as the main source of this hatred. They bluntly avoid the most central questions such as: why the Arab people stood against the capitalist west during the era of Nasser of Egypt when PI was very weak at the present time? Why did they support Saddam Hussein and continue to support him, despite the fact that he is not religious and stands in sharp contradiction with their very religious rulers?

There is no doubt that Saddam’s regime was not a democratic regime. However, it was a secular regime. None of the Arab regimes, on the other hand is democratic, and most of them are not secular either. Women are still lacking basic human rights in these regimes. Despite all this, the U.S. and other western ruling capitalist class have been supporting these regimes for nearly a whole century. Comprador capitalist classes who are betraying the development and unity of the nation rule all Arab regimes. The liberal west and many leftists have never understood the fact that the Arab popular classes failed to achieve their project of unity, freedom and development, since they were defeated by the counter project, which is composed by the local comprador, the Zionist Ashkenazi Entity and the capitalist west.

Under these circumstances, the Arab popular classes found themselves confronted by two bitter choices: either to support the comprador traitor regimes or the P I fundamentalism (**Note:** What must be noted is that a new Political Islamic current is emerging in the Arab Homeland. It is the militant and open minded current, i.e. Hizbullah in Lebanon. There is large possibility that this phenomenon might emerge in Iraq). Since the dictatorship of Iraq did not betray the cause of the nationalist project, it gained the support of the popular classes despite the fact that this was never their ideal type of regime. It was clear enough that, as long as Saddam was defiant of the United States, the support of Arab popular classes for him was increasing. This is not because Arabs simply hate the United States, but rather because they resist the U.S aggression against the Arab nation⁸ on the one hand, and they did not develop the revolutionary socialist movement on the other. It is important to note that the reaction of the Arab masses to the United States is people’s resistance, not of mere aggression.

There is no doubt that some western academics and intellectuals understand well these facts, but they have a commitment to lie and fabricate reality putting at stake their own scientific and academic honor and dignity. What encourages them to maintain a positive image is the service they receive from many Arab comprador intellectuals and academics (including NGOs leaders) who import these fabrications, reproduce them locally, and sell them back to their western intellectual lords! This proves repeatedly the fact that the feeblest social groups in the Arab society are the intellectuals and the ruling elites.

I was informed by a reliable source in Amman (October 2003) that the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein sent a delegation to the United State’s ruling elite asking for a settlement in order to avoid the aggression. He told them that “if the issue is oil, you are already receiving it, and if it is Kuwait, it is already in your hand, what

⁸ Roger Owen, the British professor at Harvard asked me in December 1999 why the Arab students in Europe participate in class discussions and debates more than the Arab students in the United States? Roger was for a long time working in the University of Oxford. I said that, because they feel that Europe is less aggressive toward the Arabs than the United States. They came from countries which are ruled by police, they found that the rulers of their countries are supported by the United States ruling class.

more do you want from Iraq” The U.S. reply was clear and sharp: “we want Iraq a body without a head”.⁹ Accordingly, Saddam began preparing the popular resistance for the post-Baa’th’s regime. This may shed some light on the fast disappearance of the Iraqi army when the enemy’s forces entered Baghdad, and the immediate beginning of the popular resistance.

Many writers (i.e. Paul Sweezy) indicate that the Bolsheviks had lost most of their revolutionary cadres in the civil war and in the western capitalist aggression against the new Soviet socialist state in 1918. This was a reason of the degradation towards bureaucracy. Only history will tell if there was a decision by the Iraqi leadership to save the revolutionary militants for the guerilla war rather than being killed in unbalanced battle with the U.S. tanks and jet fighters. But this is not the main and only reason behind the swift defeat of the Iraqi army. There is enough evidence that the United States succeeded in recruiting many Iraqi high rank officers given the fact that the so-called Iraqi opposition was based in London and working openly for the United States for quite long time. The power of this opposition was never in its popular bases in Iraq, but rather in its ability, as Iraqis, to recruit spies and traitors to the U.S. We cannot also ignore the fact that part of the reasons behind the quick collapse of the Iraqi regime is attributed to its dictatorship and lack of mass support leading to the minimization of peoples’ participation in its defense.

It is important to note that London has been for a long time the base for many opposition groups and dissidents from all over the world. Many of these opposition movements became mere spies for the core capitalist regimes. In attracting and hosting these world opposition groups, London was never motivated to believe in the values of peoples’ freedom, especially when it comes to people of the periphery. The experience in the case of Iraq clearly shows that even when London occasionally gives refuge to freedom fighters, its motive remains to transform these fighters into agents working for the capitalist center. This is one of the well-known brutal tasks of the British colonial regime, the incubator of spies and renegades.

The aim of this article is not to analyze the reasons behind the Iraqi swift defeat; it is rather discuss the international confrontation currently taking place in Iraq between the Iraqi/Arab/Moslem and international guerilla freedom fighters on one hand, and global capitalism on the other.

Time for resistance ... the enemy is in Baghdad

There is an international consensus that occupation is an enemy to the people and that a foreign power is a colonial power. That is why occupied people will always resist occupation. The Arab Homeland has a special and long experience with foreign occupation and colonial heritage. The U.S. - British and their insignificant allies constitute an occupation in Iraq. The Arab people of Iraq know very well that the Iraqi opposition, who was brought to Baghdad on the U.S. tanks, is traitors. What mobilizes more people to support the resistance is the brutal oppression of the U.S. soldiers, the looting of Iraq¹⁰ and the Iraqi new appointed ruling council’s decision to consider the fall of Baghdad (9 April 2003) a national day!

While the Ba’athist cadres constitute the backbone of the resistance, there are several other factions, mostly Iraqi’s from a wide variety of ethnicities, who are involved in the resistance. According to people who have recently visited Iraq, the resistance is spreading all over the country. It is quite clear that the resistance is

⁹ By the beginning of November 2003, some news have been released from the US State Department to the media that Iraq sent a Lebanese businessman to negotiate with the Americans in order to avoid the war, but they arrested him.

¹⁰ According to the *Washington Post*, 4 billion US \$ disappeared from Iraq since the beginning of the occupation.

concentrated in the Sunni area, but this is due to the fact that the Ba'ath party is based mainly there. The Ba'ath believes that resistance is the fate of the Arab nation, and that it creates the new Iraq.

The tactics of the resistance, and especially the Baa'th party, is to prevent the colonial army from resting and feeling safe. The 'leopard' should keep the 'elephant' busy walking and jumping until it finally collapses. It must be exhausted on a daily basis. The enemy must be morally defeated as an introduction for its military defeat. The colonialists have never expected resistance to take place in Iraq. They assumed that it would be easily possible for them to rule the country directly by themselves, and that is why they dismantled the Iraqi state apparatus including the army and police. Their aim is to destroy everything. It is an economic-political law of capital to destroy and re-build as a mechanism for the management of its own crisis inside its country, and as a justification for looting the colonies. It is a capitalist re-construction at the cost of the Iraqi people.

The failure to estimate and predict the Iraqi resistance was more than miscalculation by the colonialists on a number of levels.

First: It is a miscalculation of the nationalist spirit and heritage of resistance of the Arab Iraqi people as a lever for resistance. They assumed that the Iraqis are a people with no history, no dignity and no patriotism. Second: It was a miscalculation of the situation because of the fabricated reports written by their agents, the Iraqi opposition.

As the Iraqi resistance gained momentum, the colonialists decided to re-build a new Iraqi army and police as an (Iraqi Contra), and to pull their army from populated areas to be stationed around the oil fields. Their army will interfere always by planes, especially if the resistance succeeds to liberate some areas.

On the other hand, the resistance is familiar with the U.S. tactics. It understands well that the majority of the U.S. soldiers are new immigrants from poor countries who came to the U.S. for its citizenship, and many mercenaries recruited by some weapon companies to fight in Iraq.¹¹ This is not new in capitalism's history of bloody wars. But, as long as the resistance keeps expanding in time and space it will succeed in hunting a large number of the Yankee soldiers.

The resistance tactic is to abort the colonialists plan to build a local traitor army, police and civil administration. That is why they strike harshly on defecting Ba'athists who work for the enemy as police force and civilians. Part of the reasons why the resistance attacked the UN headquarter is the latter's justification and supervision of the occupation of Iraq. It is clear that the Iraqi resistance is targeting all those who assist the colonialists. Accordingly, the explosions against civilians might be carried out by the colonialists themselves. That is why the United States declared that it will accelerate the training of the new Iraqi army on the one hand, and that it will replace its army in Iraq by new soldiers, which indicates that they will stay for a long time in Iraq. The main goal of the resistance is to keep the colonial army inside the populated areas exhausted and never feel, as these areas are 'save heavens' as they were promised and expected.

The other party that is in crisis is the religious leadership in Iraq, especially the Shia', most of whom have compromised with the United States and Britain since nearly two decades ago. They themselves miscalculate the Iraqi people's ability and will to carry out the resistance. They calculated that the colonialists will topple

¹¹ According to the division of labor among the new colonialists, the ruling capitalist class in Japan became the contractor who recruits mercenaries to fight against the Iraqi people. Japan declared (al-Arabia Setallite, 7-11-2003) that its government will pay 870,000 Euro to the family of any Japanese soldier killed in Iraq.

Saddam, and accordingly, they will easily inherit the power in Iraq. Bluntly, they stand in the camp the enemy. Many of the clergy leaders declared that their passive resistance, and warned that if the Americans will not transfer the power to the locals (i.e. for the clergy leadership), then resistance will start. But the immediate and effective resistance made the clergy tactics nonsense.

The U.S. media portray the image that many of the guerrilla fighters in Iraq are Arabs. It is legitimate according to the national factor of the Arab popular classes. While the Arab ruling regimes have supported the 1991 and 2003 aggressions against Iraq, participated in the siege, and now support the appointed council of collaborators in Iraq, the Arab popular classes remain clearly in the other camp, the camp of resistance. It is evident that whenever the Arab popular classes have the slightest freedom and opportunity to express their commitment and will, they would stand firmly for Arab unity, nationalism, and development – that is why they are fighting in Iraq today. I doubt that the anti Arab western academics, like Bernard Lewis, Samuel Huntington and Sami Zubaida will ever be able to understand such a deep commitment.

The continuation of the resistance will eventually lead to the deepening of the crisis of the colonialists to the point where it reaches mass social protest inside the United States itself. But why the United States will never withdraw its occupying forces before the loss of more and more blood? There are two main reasons for this. First: Capital does not care for the blood of the poor and lower classes. All the tutelage of human rights and the importance of the individual it talks about are mere lies. Second: The civil society under capitalism is contempt of capitalism's values. It is not a genuine civil society as long as its ruling class invades, destroys and sucks the blood of other nations. In such a situation, the real civil in the capitalist center society must revolt against its ruling class, or else it is anything but a civil society!

For Iraq, the only chance for freedom hinges in the hands of the military resistance to defeat the enemy and oblige it to withdraw before it imposes a local political regime to rule the country. Unconditional and unplanned pull out of the occupying forces will give the resistance an opportunity to fill the power gap. This time, the resistance should create a real and new Iraq, which would be re-shaped and reproduced by democratic forces of resistance paving the way for Arab unity, development and Socialism.

But this is not the end of the story!

The main strategy of Richard Meyers, the appointed chief of the joint U.S. forces since three years, was that the United States should fight from the space. Why is it that the coming wars are the star wars? Why should wars continue, intensify and be extended to the space? The reason is clear: capitalism cannot keep lying and deceiving without the industry of war. It is because the United States was preparing itself to re-colonize the earth and because peoples will eventually resist this colonization. The aggression against Iraq was, to a certain degree, a war from the space at least in terms of the U.S. domination of the sky. But finally, the American soldiers had to get down to earth, as the prolonged war dictates, and here is when the battle becomes different one.

If the United States were to be defeated on the soil of Iraq, this will not paralyze its star war machine. The United States will continue in its ability to destroy any other nation from the sky until its leadership surrenders, or until this other nation returns to the stones ages. This will be a lesson to any country, which will not donate willingly its wealth to the capitalist enemy. If this analysis is right, then humanity must expect a series of destructive wars to come.

Forcing the United States out of Iraq does not mean that the new Iraq will be safe of future aggressions. Then the rest of Arab Homeland will split into two camps: The ruling regimes will continue to open and make available their skies and borders for the U.S. military aggression against Iraq, while the Arab national liberation movement will stand firmly with Iraq. Again, the forces of the United States will remain in the region. The latest speech of George W. Bush was clear and even offensive (6 Nov. 2003), when he pretended that the United States will transform the Middle East into a democratic region. This form of cultural racism, expresses Bush's satisfaction with what he considers democracy in some Arab dependent countries, albeit a false sense of democracy. It is interesting how Bush openly criticizes his closest friends in the Arab Homeland, namely Egypt and Saudi Arabia.¹² This attack is motivated by the U.S. aggressive interests in the region, which include dismantling any Arab state that might be transformed into a central nationalist state if the popular classes reach power. This policy is imbedded in the U.S. policy of cantonization of the Arab Homeland. It is obvious that in the era of globalization, the United States is constantly looking for new regimes with absolute loyalty and submission to its hegemony.

In his speech, Bush acted as a feudalist while the Arabs are his tenants. This unlimited rudeness reflects two important points: The internal feeling of crisis within the U.S. ruling class and state department in Iraq on one hand, and the capitalist insistence to continue exploiting Iraq and the region by all means, on the other. The U.S. president's declaration that he will "democratize the Arab countries" stems from the U.S. ruling class' false sense white man's superiority and ideology of cultural racism ingrained in western capitalist society. Capitalist colonialism never developed or intended to develop the countries of periphery. Without development, (i.e. blocked development), democracy and democratic transformation becomes a sterile slogan that is unachievable. The discourse of "developing" or "democratizing" others, is an indication of a racist culture entrenched in a reactionary religious belief system. It is a discourse based on a strange mixture of political Orientalism, bourgeois anthropological mentality and an exaggeration of the military might¹³.

Who will pay and who will cash in?

It is not an exaggeration to sum up the history of capital (Lenin) as a history of wars about the division and re-division of the world's economy between the core states of the world capitalist order. Wars in the era of globalization have the same content and purpose of those during the era colonialism and imperialism. Both aggressions against Afghanistan and Iraq indicate that the United States is in dare competition with the European Union about the oil of the Arab Homeland and Caspian Sea. The occupation of Iraq is expected to lead to the U.S. monopoly of the Iraqi wealth, which is a competition with other core capitalist countries of Europe which has more investments in Iraq.

The United States is still experiencing a deep economic crisis. Walden Bello summarizes this crisis as follows: "The third moment of the crisis was the collapse of the stock market and the end of the Clinton boom. This was not just the bursting of the bubble but a rude reassertion of the classical capitalist crisis of overproduction, the

¹² It seems that history in the colonized Arab Homeland is repeating itself, but as a tragedy! Hussein bin Ali, the *Sharif of Mecca*, allied himself with the Allies in the World war I against the Ottoman colonialism, when he promised that the Allies will let him be he king of Arabs. But the Allies betrayed him. They inherited the Ottomans and the promise which they respected was the British promise to the Zionist movement to settle Jewish settlers in Palestine (Balfour Declaration). To a certain extent, the U.S. and British promise to their Iraqi agent Ahmad Challabi to replace Saddam as a president of Iraq. But they appointed him as one member (among other 25 members of the appointed ruling council over Iraq. Lately, after the resistance's Nasseriya suicide operation against the Italian occupation soldiers in Iraq and the and hunting of two U.S. helicopters (in the middle of Novemebr 2003), the U.S. decided to change all this council.

¹³ The best example of this blindness is the assassinated Zionist prime-minister, Rabin, who expressed his bitterness and wondering when the first Palestinian Intifada took place. He failed to understand why the Palestinian workers who worked in Israel hate the Isralies and resisting occupation!.

main manifestation of which was massive overcapacity. Prior to the crash, corporate profits in the U.S. had not grown since 1997. This was related to overcapacity in the industrial sector, the most glaring example being seen in the troubled telecommunications sector, where only 2.5 per cent of installed capacity globally was being utilized. The stagnation of the real economy led to capital being shifted to the financial sector, resulting in the dizzying rise in share values. But since profitability in the financial sector cannot deviate too far from the profitability of the real economy, a collapse of stock values was inevitable, and this occurred in March 2001, leading to the prolonged stagnation and the onset of deflation”.¹⁴

Under the pressure of the economic crisis in the United States, the high unemployment rate, the decline of the real economy, and the failure of the “new Economy” the U.S. came to a decision to surpass the EU and kick it out of oil producing countries by military might. What added more pressure on the United States’ capitalism is the increased power of the Euro and its competition with the Dollar.

“...Manipulation of the dollar’s value to stick the costs of economic crisis on rivals among the center economies and regain competitiveness for the U.S. economy. A slow depreciation of the dollar vis-à-vis the euro can be interpreted as market-based adjustments, but the 25 per cent fall in value cannot but be seen as, at the least, a policy of benign neglect. While the Bush administration has issued denials that this is a beggar-thy-neighbor policy, the U.S. business press has seen it for what it is: an effort to revive the US economy at the expense of the European Union and other center economies”.¹⁵

The state in the United States is a frank example of how the Multinational Corporations (MNCs) use the state for their own interests to the extent that the new wars are the wars of the MNCs. The U.S. Zionist journalist Thomas Friedman wrote four years ago in New York Times Sunday magazine: “The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley technologies is called the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps...without America on duty, there will be no America Online”.¹⁶

Why the company is capable to mobilize the army? If the army is mobilized independently of economics by the leadership of the state, does this leadership mobilize it absurdly? It seems that in the era of global capitalist development, the boundaries between state and capital became more important than during any other capitalist era. Both, the state and capital, are working jointly and openly. The wars of globalization, in Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq, left no doubts about this joint relationship between the state and capitalism.¹⁷

¹⁴ The Crisis of the Globalist Project & the New Economics of George W. Bush, by Walden Bello. Prepared for the McPlanet Conference, Berlin, June 27, 2002. The original version of this piece will appear in the Fall issue of New Labor Forum.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ A Manifesto for the Fast World," New York Times, March 28, 1999

¹⁷ “I spent thirty three years and four months in active services as a member of our country’s most agile military force- the Marine Corps... And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism... Thus, I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for capitalism... Thus, I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in ... I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras ‘right’ for American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested. During those years, I had, as the boys in the back room would say, a swell racket. I was rewarded with honors, medals, promotion. Looking back on it, I feel I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best *he* could do was to operate his racket in three city districts. We marines operated on three continents (cited in Huberman 1936:265-6, original emphasis. Quoted by (The Global Political Economy of Israel, Jonathan Nitzan & Shimshon Bichler, Pluto Press, London, 2002, p. 205). I wonder what the Marines might write now in Iraq!!!!

Until today some of the U.S. deliberately designed aggressions have been completed, albeit with high costs. The question, which becomes clear, is why does a country with the most debt all over the world and even throughout history take the adventure of launching several aggressive wars all at once? Why is the ruling class of the United States keep pretending and lying by saying that it goes to these aggressions for the sake of democracy? Who still believes this lie anymore?

The answer to these questions lies in the cold fact that war is business. Through war, the U.S. capitalist class spends large amounts of money on the war itself. The spending to finance the military establishment in addition to the short term results of the tax reduction led the U.S. GDP increase to nearly \$ 11 trillion. In terms of dollars, there is a growth in the third quarter of 2003. But it is passive because it is mainly a result of spending for war and not a result of luxury. In addition, there are no indications that this index is going to continue upward. Military and consumer spending are not indications and guarantees, which will encourage investors to invest in the real economy who are still worried.

“According to the Financial Times, the total estimated cost of the U.S. intervention in Iraq so far is, at \$ 138 billion, precisely where the former White House economic adviser, Mr. Lawrence Lindsey, declared it was heading. Among other reasons, Lindsey was fired at the end of last year for forecasting that the Iraq war would cost \$ 100-200 billion. The actual figure is likely to be much higher. Currently, with the US finding little support in terms of men, materials and money from countries other than Britain, it is estimated to be spending \$ 3.9 billion a month to finance its occupation”.¹⁸

However, while the economic activity within the United States remains passive, the MNCs are doing their business and extracting the blood of the Iraqi people. We can safely say that the business of war is doing well, despite the fact that the local economy is not showing any sign of recovery! Most of re-construction contracts in Iraq are bestowed to U.S. MNCs, and on top of them Bechtel and Halliburton.¹⁹

“On July 31st, Halliburton, the second biggest oilfield service company in the world and one of the largest private contractors in Iraq, reported that work in Iraq had boosted its revenue and helped it swing from a loss to record second-quarter net income of \$ 26 million. Mr. Dick Cheney was the chief executive of Halliburton from 1995 to 2000 before he became U.S. vice-president and its activities have been controversial because it's of German subsidiary, German Halliburton Company (GBH) had contracts with Libya even though the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act passed in 1996 by the U.S. Congress has kept U.S. companies out of Libya.

On May 30th, Halliburton had announced that it had finalized a \$ 6 million agreement to settle 20 lawsuits alleging that the company used deceptive accounting practices when Mr. Dick Cheney ran the company. Halliburton's role in Iraq has been controversial since the U.S. Army's Corps of Engineers awarded it a contract worth \$ 7 billion to extinguish oil-well fires and undertake emergency repairs without calling for bids from competitors”.²⁰

¹⁸ War and Terror and the World Economy by C. P. Chandrasekhar & Jayati Ghosh Global News Wire - Asia Africa Intelligence Wire, 23 September 2003 (www.globalresearch.ca 24 September 2003).

¹⁹ The United States as the robber of the Iraqi economy donates to companies of each participant state in the aggression according to its role in the destruction of Iraq. That is why, some Polish companies got some contracts.

²⁰ War and Terror and the World Economy by C. P. Chandrasekhar & Jayati Ghosh Global News Wire - Asia Africa Intelligence Wire, 23 September 2003 (www.globalresearch.ca 24 September 2003).

From a practical point of view, all western capitalist regimes were part of the coalitions of aggression (1991, 2003) against Iraq, with various degrees of involvement between one regime and another and from one aggression to the other. After the first aggression, the United States had tightened its grip over the Arab oil countries, while the other aggressors paid higher price during the attack than what they cashed. In the second aggression in 2003, the same western capitalist regimes participated in the coalition, by several different means.²¹ What uncover the real face of these regimes are their maneuvers after the occupation of Iraq. These countries, especially France²², Germany, Russia, Italy...etc are now negotiating with the United States for the share of their companies in the re-construction of Iraq. They would agree to send soldiers to Iraq pending on the guarantees of their share in plundering Iraq. But historical facts tell us that colonial powers have never shared with other colonial powers what they steal from the wealth of the colony. They compete in the manner of dog-eat-dog. The reason why the EU countries and Russia did not send their soldiers to Iraq had nothing to do with human rights perspectives, or subjugation to the pressure of their civil societies. The reason is in the fact that the United States wanted for itself the entire bottle of Iraqi blood, and this is precisely the reason the United States will remain in Iraq until its defeat there.

Where the Iraqi economy stands?

Where does the Iraqi economy stand in such a situation? The Iraqi economy is controlled by the U.S. State Department. While the colonial power pretends that it is working hard to re-build Iraq, it is in fact hijacking Iraq's economy. The United States controls the Iraqi oil, had opened the Iraqi public sector for foreign capital to buy its companies and assets in exchange for cheap prices. Privatization in general and of Iraq in particular, is a clear example and proof how privatization, especially in periphery, is a cover for a new form of colonialism. It legitimizes MNCs in the capitalist core to acquire assets in the Countries of periphery (COP). Under the U.S. colonialism, Iraq will be a case that resembles both Russia and the West Bank/Gaza Strip (WBG). It is similar to Russia in terms of subjugation to a reform shock therapy, which had brought a regime of crony/mafia capitalism that had either sold or inherited the public sector for nothing. It is similar to the WBG in terms of a ruling elite appointed by the colonial power and it is crony as well. The United Nations had mandated, through the World Bank, Igor Gidar as an expert to Iraqi economic "reform". Gidar was one of the key people in "reforming" the Russian economy after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Some of the results of Gidar's reform policies include that large amounts of the Russian capital were smuggled to banks in Washington in the form of money laundering, the creation of tens of thousands of mafia gangs, five million Russians infected by HIV, the reduction of the GNP to fifty percent of its size before 1990, and the decline of males age average to 55 years.²³ Despite all of that, the United States shamelessly claims that it had brought democracy to Russia.

²¹ The government of Japan declared that it will pay 870,000 Euro to the family of each japeese soldier killed in Iraq. (al-Arabiya Setallite 7 Nov. 2003). The issue is why japan is doing that? Is thee a religious onflict with Islam? If the Iraqi resistance movement assinated a Japeese citizen or kidnapped a Japeese plane, does that mean that Arabs and Moslems hate Japan? But moreover, is there any doubt that by so doing, Japan is launching two forms of war against the Arabs, a war of humiliation and a fiscal war at the same time!

²² At a post G8 press conference, Chirac declared with supreme cynicism that he had not changed his view that the US-led invasion of Iraq was "both illegitimate and illegal ... But now, the situation being what it is, we have got to work together. It is easy to wage war on your own; it is much more difficult to build a peace on your own." Even Singapore, declared in November 2003, that it will send soldiers to Iraq to protect its interests (emphasis added) in Iraq and to fight terror!

²³ An eye witness in Iraq told me that the young woman sold for \$200, and in the main yard of Baghdad al-Ferdaws and al-Mutanabbi street there are desks with signs stating: " Killer for money and the payment is due three days after the murder". It is an Arab tradition that when a person pass away, his family accept people for mourning for three days.

According to *New York Times*,(26-8-2003 A -10) Bremer, the US colonial ruler of Iraq told the appointed Iraqi counsel that : “Iraq must open its industries for foreign investment...Iraq must create an open economy in an area which protected its markets for a long time and dominated by a dogmatic socialist doctrine. The prosperity of Iraq in the future depends on to what extent it will succeed to attract foreign investments”. Bremer gave the foreign investors the right to transfer their profits to their own countries. It is an irony that Bremer’s instructions came at the same time of the failure of the WTO’s meeting in Cancun-Mexico where the COP objected to the core’s protection of their agricultural products, a protection by subsidies.

It should be noted that the foreign capital in Iraq is under consent attacks launched by the resistance movement. Many foreign businessmen have been killed in Baghdad. Iraqi who deals with Israeli companies are targeted for execution. Foreign companies have never invested in the real economy in Iraq; instead they are concentrating on the service sector which is mobile sector and breed high profits in a short period of time.

In the global era of capitalism, there is no doubt that the Arab nation must fight on two fronts. In Iraq, the resistance must continue, as it would eventually be supported by Arab and international fighters. Many revolutionary youths are expected to volunteer in Iraq looking for a role in the world revolution against capital and the empire of globalization. Most of these youths are not fundamentalists as the US Empire pretends. This was clear when they volunteered before the aggression started. In the rest of the Arab Homeland, more efforts must be devoted to strengthening the campaign of boycotting the U.S. and other aggressor’s products. This is in addition to the empowerment of anti-normalization movement against the Zionist Ashkenazi regime and the countries that support it.

Under the occupation and the crony collaborator appointed ruling council, Iraq doesn’t have a patriotic local regime. This opens the way for the power of people, for popular councils to manage the daily life of the people and to develop the new strategies of survival and subsistence. The WBG first Intifada experience (1987), Development by Popular Protection, DBPP might be a good paradigm to start with as a guide.²⁴

²⁴ The alternative to the wishful thinking of self-reliance under a comprador regime is “Development by Popular Protection” (DBPP). The DBPP model is based to a large extent upon ‘The Self-reliance and De-linking Model’, but it must transcend it according to the needs in the socio-economic field. The DBPP concept was essentially derived from the experience of the Palestinian intifada-1987. It relies on the power of the popular classes through popular activities represented by labor movement, grassroots organizations, women’s unions, student, and youth movements. This is its first condition. Its second condition deals with concentrating on consuming local products and boycotting those imported from the imperialist center. To satisfy their needs, popular classes move towards establishing cooperatives, the third condition. Members of the cooperative must also cooperate with the marketing net so as to terminate the merchant’s monopoly. This is the fourth condition. The fifth condition eliminates dependence on foreign or non-governmental finance. This model will, afterwards, develop the consciousness of consumption as its sixth condition. Political parties are considered revolutionary pioneers only to the extent that their members are able to institute this model without imposing themselves in a bureaucratic manner. If a political party is able to practice its role popularly, in a pioneering and democratic manner, this party will be empowered by peoples’ support. This is the seventh condition of DBPP. In order for the popular parliament to design an appropriate economic policy, an annual national conference, the DBPP’s eighth condition. This conference should be held so that the popular masses may voice their opinion, review past policies and performance, and develop future plans. The Palestinian intifada - 1987, itself, was a popular democratic environment because it was initiated, politically and economically, far from any regime or political party leadership. Finally, in another step of its development, its ninth condition, this model moves to absorb the non-official (non-governmental, non-institutional) sector, or at least to coordinate with it. (For further reading on DBPP, refer to Adel Samara: **Epidemic of Globalization: Ventures in World Order, Arab Nation and Zionism**, Chapter One “*From Globalized Public Sector to Development by Popular Protection*” pp.1-25, Palestine Research and Publishing Foundation, USA, 2001.)