

LIBERATION IMPERIALISM? IMPERIAL WARS AND THE PRECEDENCY OF IRAQ

ALNASSERI, SABAH

*An imported and the people by an imperial war
into the body bombed “democracy”*

ABSTRACT

1. The debate on whether we have to do with an imperial or imperialistic age, is not a purely academic exercise. Beyond the structural relations it relates to strategic questions of the political conjuncture: Questions of the analysis of the current situation, the global resistance, the estimating of the balances of power and relations of forces and possibilities of the change in an emancipative global sense.

2. I would not like to go on in details here on the problematic, which adheres to this debate, because this is not the object of this paper. Rather I would like to make a few notes in so far, as they are of importance for this object.

3. First of all both terms, Empire (Hardt/Negri) and Imperialism should not be misunderstood in a positivistic sense. Neither the imperialism term represents a historical residual category still states Empire a completely new historical situation, a global break. Both terms express a global crisis situation before the background of a revolutionary condition: Both promise a revolutionary way out of the crisis. To that extent both determine this phase as the highest stage of capitalism (Lenin), which can “pass” by a radical or revolutionary change into communism.

4. But Empire, understood as a global power constellation, expresses better in contrast to imperialism the new global constraints, the hollowing out of the nation—state, new subjects and new forms of resistance/struggles, remains the perspective of the Empires however metropolitans perspective in as much as it conceive the global structures, the development of multiple centres of power, the subjects, forms and conditions of political practice and resistance in a genuine metropolitan sense — even if it reflects peripheral and semi peripheral processes, these however are redundant to the term Empire.

5. Know imperialism or imperialistic chain, if it is understood as a global configuration of the capitalist power relation, can on the other way better grasp the uneven development, the hierarchy and the power asymmetry in the capitalist world system (Wallerstein) and the urge and the necessity for the expansion of capitalism in other areas and different, to date not yet commodificated social and nature relations, which one can determine with Marx as *previousⁱ* accumulation. This is a condition of existence of the reproduction/regulation of the capital relation in worldwide scale.

6. This is important to that extent, as it does not only have to do with our object directly — the Iraq war seemed to questioned the thesis of Empire and at the same time to verify those of imperialism, while the post war order seems to represent the contrary —, but is also of strategic importance: It is a warning of a hasty promise of the collapse of capitalism and an underestimation of the possibilities of the reproduction of capitalist power relations.

7. In short: Both terms have their analytical justification, provided that they are conscious about their analytical and political borders. In this sense both can function as guidance for a radical action.

8. So that the matter of Empire and Imperialism would not remain abstract, one has to analyse the concrete world with an concrete case. To this we go now.

9. envoy, to unpleasant tasks and clearing up of dirt work. Here a world power intends with the support of the willing a new restructuring by the creation of fait accompli with self—righteous and/or convinced doctrine, a neoconservative revolution in worldwide scale!
 10. Iraq, that is the experimentation field and the test attempt of this imperial strategy.
 11. That is why: No pasaran!
-