

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نپاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زیاتهای اروپایی

By Jorge Dioni

04.10.2021

## *Socialism or barbarism? Barbarism, of course*



Sources: The Tide

"Chaos, like involution, authoritarianism or fundamentalism are not a problem, but the goal. They died so that others would earn money, as always," reflects Jorge Dioni.

A group of soldiers pull out a coffin with the flag of the United Kingdom on their shoulders. The front page of the newspaper, a day after the Taliban's seizure of Kabul, is completed with a blunt headline: "What the hell did they die for?" There is a cynical

answer: you will know, which can be completed with the words of [Stefan Zweig](#): "It was the usual gang, eternal throughout the ages, which calls the prudent cowards, the weak the humanitarians, and then does not know what to do, bewildered, in the hour of the catastrophe that it itself had thoughtlessly provoked."

Twenty years ago, that same newspaper was one of the proponents of military interventions known as the War on Terror, an initiative that, like so many others, glorified the false heroism of sending others to suffering and death amid the praise of cheap optimism. Let us return to Stefan Zweig, on the First World War: "Almost all German writers believed themselves obliged, like the bards in proto-Germanic times, to inflame the warriors with runic songs and hymns so that they would give their lives with enthusiasm. Poems that rhymed *krieg* (war) with *sieg* (victory) and *not* (gloom) with *tod* (death) rained abundantly." In the case of the War on Terror, the words that used to be used in the articles were freedom and democracy. They were the usual ones of the Cold War because it is possible to interpret those movements within that conflict.

**Why has democracy failed in Afghanistan? What is the reason for the chaos? How is it possible for a group like the Taliban to sey power?** It is interesting not to think of chaos, violence, authoritarianism, involution or repression as an unexpected effect, but as the objectives sought, since they have been repeated on other occasions, such as Central America or the Arab world. The seemingly unsuccessful outcome of the War on Terror, as of the previous War on Drugs, ceases to be so if the name is not taken seriously and it is understood that both initiatives were not new, but **a continuation of the Cold War and even the colonial model. That is, the initial plan was the control of natural resources and the hegemony of an economic system. Everything else was – and is – irrelevant.**

The current president, Joe Biden, explained it clearly: the goal was never democracy, much less freedom or social advancement, but to protect America. That is, there were never any interests other than their own as a great colonial power. A model of indirect control of global ordinance, with the lowest possible economic and political cost, based on neoliberal schools. From what happened in Afghanistan, it is interesting how the new ruling power has been assumed unhindered, something that contrasts with the situation of other countries, where even alternative governments are recognized. If we think of human rights as those forced rhymes of poets, everything is better understood.

## A certain chaos

As **Quinn Slobodian** explains in *Globalists*, the neoliberal project seeks a reordering of the world after the end of empires in World War I and, above all, after the questioning of classical capitalism in the Great Depression. That is, it is important to keep in mind that this is not an economic system for a given country, but a global model that guarantees the key issues: private property, the circulation of capital or trade. Neoliberalism does not believe in the utopia of the self-regulated market, called into question in 1929, but in the need to protect it through an institutional structure segregated from the capacity of states to act.

It is about protecting financial capitalism from the threat of politics. The ideas of democracy, popular will or national sovereignty, classical liberalism, were a threat and there were several ways to solve it. First, violence, coup d'état or direct repression. However, it was no longer necessary when the stability of a country could be influenced through elements such as inflation, shortages or, above all, debt. That is, to press bloodlessly. The neoliberal project is to create an infrastructure of supranational institutions that makes states embedded within an international order that redesigns their own organization from outside. If this is not possible, the first option is returned. **Between democracy and barbarism, the latter could be a good option. A certain chaos that allows the functioning of the economic model is preferable to an order that puts it into question.** Thus, it is understandable what has happened with countries that placed half a century ago in the socialist orbit, such as Syria, [Iraq](#), Yemen, Somalia or Libya. Between socialism and barbarism, barbarism.

Nothing of the illustrated project. Democracy had been inefficient in safeguarding markets and both popular will and national sovereignty were a danger to the defense of private property or the circulation of capital. Neoliberalism is a process that does not include civilization or enlightenment, unlike its predecessor. Therefore, the model can be based on authoritarian elements, even if they are pre-austrian, such as theocratic states. Religion, nationalism or tradition could be symbols against redistributive models and figures such as the monarchy or the military juntas guaranteed these basic pillars. The spread of Islamism as a political project within Asia and the Arab world is best understood as a shocking force

on the ground against alternative projects. The same is true of evangelical churches in Latin America or Catholic fundamentalism in Eastern Europe.

### **Cyclone, Ajax, Condor**

The situation in Afghanistan has been reminiscent of *Operation Cyclone*, the government's program to recruit and train Islamic fundamentalists to overthrow the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, but nothing compared to the use of religious organizations in Indonesia, such as Muhammadiyah, during the massacres of 1965-1966. The Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) had two million members and, by 1962, had entered the government, where it had begun a policy of confiscations of Western property. The PKI was accused of wanting to give a coup d'état and the death squads, where the religious organizations that had declared holy war were integrated, murdered an uncountable number of people: between half a million and a million and a half.

Decades earlier, Operation Ajax had overthrown the Mossadegh government, the first democratically elected government in Iran and which had made the decision to nationalize the Anglo-Persian Oil Company in 1951. The instability of the Shah's government and the repression of the socialist Tudeh, the Party of the Masses, meant that the religious structure was the only one with the capacity to seize power. Theoretically, the government of *Ayatollah Khomeini* was an enemy of the United States, but Irangate showed something else: senior reagan officials facilitated the sale of weapons to Iran and used drug trafficking to finance insurgent groups that confronted the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. The War on Drugs, like the War on Terror, is best understood if the preposition is removed and interpreted as conflicts that use those elements.

Three years after Operation Ajax, Jacobo Arenz, another democratically elected president, was overthrown by another coup d'état with American involvement. In this case, the aggrieved multinational was the United Fruit Company. As in Iran, the deposed government had initiated land reform, questioned the power of extractive multinationals, and earmarked more funds for public services. As in Iran, the action did not give way to a stage of stability, but quite the opposite. In the case of Guatemala, successive military governments until the 80s and an internal confrontation that ended in the 90s, a situation similar to other Central American countries.

In South America, the *Operation of the Condor* was completed decades later with the performance of the neoliberal framework. Violence, the coup d'état, ceases to be necessary when a country can be influenced through an infrastructure of supranational institutions that redesign the functioning of States. It is not about making an exhaustive tour, but proposing another point of view to avoid surprises and blows to the chest. When something happens on many occasions, you have to stop seeing it as an unexpected effect. Chaos, like involution, authoritarianism or fundamentalism are not a problem, but the objective. They died for others to make money, as always.

Source: <https://www.lamarea.com/2021/10/01/socialismo-o-barbarie-barbarie-por-supuesto/>

Rebellion 01.10.2021