

Op/Ed: Afghanistan expected to become a Third World dictatorship

By Edward Campbell

MISSOULA, Jan. 29 (Al-Masakin)—After the United States government had come to the conclusion in early 2009 that America had lost the war in Afghanistan it was debated among the American intelligentsia, former administration officials and think-a-tankers—the DIA, CIA, State Department, Joint Chiefs, former advisers to the President, Middle East experts, and assorted Georgetown University talking-heads—‘What is to be done?’

Following through on this question per the ‘law of the excluded middle,’ or ‘law of the exclusion of the third term,’ *ex necessitate* the question was initially broken down into two options, option (a) stay the course or option (b) disengagement. These two proposals, however, became much more complex when the counter-logic of the proverbial ‘third position’ was introduced into the debate which precipitated the principle question into three more complicated options: (a) stay the course, (b) limited re-engagement with an exit strategy, and (c) disengagement.

Option (a) came to be known as ‘the liberal-western civilizationist strategy,’ which held, in effect, that the United States ought to remain in Afghanistan until it became the 51st State, or an American protectorate, if you will, an option to which I, inter alios, ascribed.

Option (b) came to be known as the ‘status quo strategy,’ since it aimed at repeating what America has always sought to do in such situation and held that America should re-



engage Afghanistan and only stay in Afghanistan until the country could be stabilized and security could be handed over to a government installed by, and favorable to, the United States. This option was advanced by individuals such as Marvin G. Weinbaum of the Middle East Institute in Washington, D.C.

Option (c) came to be known as ‘the Chaositan strategy’ which held that America ought to withdrawal from Afghanistan completely and immediately and allow the country to destroy itself, only to re-engage Afghanistan if, when, and to the extent, that the country became a problem for the United States. This option was

advanced by political conservatives such as former head of the Osama bin Laden Tracking Unit for the CIA Michael Scheuer.

Option (a), an imperialist option, would have required a long-term financial and military commitment by the United States in Afghanistan. It would have provided jobs to Americans, particularly for the intellectuals who had advanced this option, and jealously eyed them. It was generally believed to be the most humane option since it was thought to advance Afghanistan culturally and politically, but would not permit any possibility of the Taliban ever returning to power, and Afghanistan could never in living memory ever once again become a launching pad for terrorism. This option was feared since it was suggested that America might need to engage the help of Afghan communists in the fight against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda.

Option (b), an imperialist option, would have required less military and financial commitment

by the United States in Afghanistan, and was thought to grant near immediate gratification to campaign promises made by President Obama and would, furthermore, assuage the distress of anti-war complainers. But would also require the United States to engage in negotiations with a so-called 'moderate Taliban' be needful of power and security sharing agreement between an American installed government such as the Karzai regime and a Taliban which had renounced violence and defected from Al-Qaeda.

Option (c), the only anti-imperialist position, was, remarkably, advanced by the Neo-conservatives! It was thought to be both in humane and irresponsible, for it was feared that the Taliban would return to power, human rights would pancake, and Afghanistan would once again become a launching pad for terrorism.

The statement made by Secretary of State Clinton Jan. 28 to the effect that an agreement has, or soon will be, reached with the Taliban indicates, however, that this question, in the mind of the Administration, has become resolved unto option (b). An option I prefer to call 'the Third World dictatorship strategy,' since in the end of it all the aim to repeat what America has always tried to do in times of such crisis, which is to install a puppet dictatorship; initially advanced by Weinbaum, and euphemistically floated in the press, as the so-called "normal low-income state" option.

That is to say, the Administration has demonstrated that not only has logic failed them, that the pre-election mantra, read brainwash, about "change" was hot air, that they have failed to learn from history, but also that they care little for the future of American security and the American people, and nothing at all for the people of Afghanistan.

EHC / EHC

Al-Masakin News Agency
<http://almasakin.ning.com>