

World War III:
The War of the Capitalist Core Against the Periphery
Iraq as a Case Study
By Masad Arbid and Adel Samara

INTRODUCTION

The Economic crisis was and still is the main factor behind colonial wars since the emergence of the Capitalist World Order (CWO). The under-consumption, which resulted in a decline in profit, led the ruling capitalist classes in Western Europe to compete for colonies as sources of raw materials, markets and cheap labor, thus launching wars against poor and undeveloped countries. Thanks to the emergence of the Soviet Union, which protected humanity against the aggression of the core capitalist countries, humanity had a chance to live in a temporary truce. What deceived humanity into believing that colonialism has been abolished is the success Western capitalist media and ideological campaign that claimed the ‘promotion’ and ‘defense’ of human rights, civil society, peoples’ right to self-determination and co-existence...etc.

Parallel to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a unipolar world order dominated by a one aggressive superpower, the core capitalist countries witnessed a severe economic crisis. The intensification of the economic crisis in the core, especially the United States, accelerated its decision for military aggression and re-colonization of Third World countries.

It is important to differentiate between the current return of colonialism and the preparation that preceded it.¹ The persistence of dependency, unequal exchange, and blocking development in the countries of the periphery (COP) are themselves either a continuity of colonialism or a preparation for its return. It is for that reason, that after nearly five decades of political and fragile independence many COP became *de facto* colonies, some without military invasion by a colonial army and some had ‘invited’ Western capitalist armies as it is the case of some Arab Gulf countries. Countries that remained defiant to US domination, like Yugoslavia and Iraq, have been invaded and dismantled.

In spite of all world opposition and criticism, the US ruling establishment occupied Iraq and embarked on the implementation of its agenda in that country, which first and foremost includes tightening its fist around the region’s oil, including Iraqi oil, and establishing military bases there.

The Marxist Arab-Nationalist school of thought believes in the right of self-defense for all nations in the periphery (COP) by all means including weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in order to protect their peoples and wealth from anticipated capitalist aggressions in the era of globalization. Therefore, it is a high priority for Arabs to protect themselves with WMD against two enemies: (i) the

¹ When Mossadegh of Iran nationalized oil in the early 1950s, and established a secular regime the US and Britain organized a coup d’etat against him and re-imposed their agent, the Shah. When Nasser of Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956, the British, French and the Ashkenazi Zionist regime in Israel collectively invaded Egypt.

Zionist Ashkenazi regime in Israel, and (ii) the center of global capitalism² in general, and the United States-Britain alliance in particular. The US ruling class rejection of the return of UN inspectors of WMD to Iraq provides clear evidence that the aggression against Iraq has nothing to do with the alleged weapons. Finally, this proves that the US and UK capitalist regimes were certain that there are no WMD in Iraq and the real issue is the return of colonialism. This raises the question of: whether the current cooperation/competition among imperialist powers will continue at the same level, or it will develop into an internal war among them?

THE CASE OF IRAQ

The Iraqi Regime

Since the sixties of the last century, the Ba'athist regime in Iraq and for various reasons had been a target for colonial powers and core capitalist countries. The Iraqi regime was a typical Third World state capitalist regime that guaranteed jobs for labor force, both males and females. In the Third World model this is a form of social security that compares to that of the welfare state in the core capitalist countries.

Although the wealth in Iraq was not distributed on an equal basis as the ruling party received the lion's share, the Iraqi labor force, however, found secured jobs and stable employment. Some might argue that the regime created jobs to avoid or reduce social tension, which is correct. On the same token, part of the nation's wealth was distributed among the people and was not 'smuggled' outside or 'sucked' by foreign companies. There was no social equality in Iraq, but the surplus was preserved within the country. This has not been the case in other COP including Arab countries, especially those rich with oil fields. Although the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988) remains debatable among many, the fact remains that a significant amount of Iraqi resources and wealth was wasted.

Using part of the domestic wealth, the Iraqi regime built health care, education and technological-scientific base.³ More important, is that the Iraqi regime started in 1998 pricing its oil in Euro instead of US dollar, which has been used as the currency of world trade since the Bretton Woods Agreement of 1945. The US dollar was adopted later by OPEC members as the official currency for oil trade since 1971. This made the US dollar the *de facto* major international trading currency. The Iraqi decision to price its oil in Euro was a critical challenge to the hegemony of the US currency worldwide and to the institutional architecture of the world economy. This system, in which the dollar was "as good as gold" officially, established US hegemony over the global economy.⁴

² The term 'center of global capitalism' includes the European Union and Japan as well. These countries also participated in the aggression against Iraq in 1991 under the pretext of liberating Kuwait. All regimes are aware of the fact that Kuwait was part of Iraq and is protected by US capitalism for reasons which have nothing to do with human rights or its membership in the United Nations, but with the US control of the oil in Kuwait.

³ According to the WHO, in 1990 Iraq was among the first Third World countries behind the core countries in health care services. It was the first country that nationalized its oil in 1972.

⁴ 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 No. 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

Using the Euro instead of the dollar by the Iraqi government constituted the most dangerous and direct threat to US colonial interests in the region, the OPEC countries, and the world trade.

Last but not least, the Iraqi regime was a threat to the US and other western capitalist regimes, because one of its goals was to achieve *al-Nahda*, the Arab renaissance project and a pan-Arab unity. So long as Arab unity is blocked, foreign military and economic occupation will continue. The Arab renaissance project and the struggle for its realization present a main threat to the interests of the US, the capitalist center in the Arab Homeland, and the Ashkenazi Zionist regime - Israel in Arab Palestine.

Some analysts argue that the US administration decided easily to go to war as it was deceived by its Iraqi agents who assured it that there will be no Iraqi resistance.⁵ Should one believe that the CIA is such a naïve and ill informed organization! The US rulers, however, will successfully use this 'theory' to avoid the US public blame as the UN inspectors, (many are spies), failed to find WMD. Also the US warmongers might act 'ignorant' so as to avoid the accusation of unjustifiable sending young American soldiers to be killed in Iraq.

There is no doubt that Saddam's regime was not a democratic one. However, it was secular. On the other hand, none of the Arab regimes is democratic, most of them are not secular, and they are supported by the US capitalist ruling class. Women still lack basic human rights in these regimes.⁶ Despite all this, the US and other western ruling capitalist classes have, for nearly a whole century, supported Arab comprador regimes that betrayed the development and unity of their nation.

Under these circumstances, Arab popular classes found themselves confronted with two bitter choices: (i) either to support the Arab comprador traitor regimes, or (ii) to accept political Islam (PI) fundamentalism as an alternative. Since the rule of Saddam Hussein was neither fundamentalist nor comprador and did not betray the cause of the nationalist project, it gained the support of popular classes in spite of the fact that this was never their ideal model of regime. This is not because Arabs simply 'hate' the United States, but rather because they resist the US aggression against the Arab nation on the one hand, and because they did not develop the revolutionary socialist movement on the other.

US Policies in Iraq

The occupation of Iraq resulted in the destruction of the Iraqi social and economic establishments, associations, ministries, (except the Ministry of oil), universities, and museums, and in the theft of its ancient historical treasure. By protecting only the Iraqi Ministry of oil and the oil fields, the US emphasizes the fact that the war against Iraq is a war for oil. It also goes to prove that it

al-a'iraq (The national Project, the EURO and the Occupation of Iraq, (Arabic), in Kana'an Review, No 115 October 2003, p.p. 15-26.

⁵ One of the agents is the former 'Trotskyist' Ahmad Jaa'far (his other name is Samir al-Halial and his new name Kana'an Makkiya).

was planned since the defeat of British colonialism and much before the collapse of the Iraqi monarchy in 1958, and oil nationalization in 1972, or even the conversion of Iraqi oil pricing from US dollar to the Euro. The nationalization of Iraqi oil was followed by similar decisions in several oil producing countries in the region and the rest of the world. One year after the nationalization of Iraqi oil, its price jumped tenfold. During that period, and due to the threat of the Soviet Union, it was difficult for the US and other imperialist powers to re-colonize oil producing countries.⁷

Today, Iraq is under a ‘mixed system’ of classic colonial and capitalist globalized occupation. It uses and deals with several methods: chieftains and social classes, plundering the Iraqi wealth through privatization and capturing the market through coercion and direct theft. The exchange with Iraq will be based on the old colonial manner “armed un-equal exchange”, i.e. under the cannons of the military occupation.

Accordingly, the US and Britain had already began re-shaping class order (de-classing and re-classing) of the Iraqi society. The nationalization of oil is eliminated by privatization, which will continue to harm the huge bureaucratic governmental/public sector resulting in millions of unemployed workers. Zionist companies will also have their shares in the privatization process of Iraq, which will certainly assist in achieving the main goal of the current Zionist regime: *integration into the Arab Homeland through domination*.⁸

The third party that is participating in designing the economic future of Iraq is the IMF and the World Bank. The IMF had already recommended to “dollarize” Iraq, converting it into a US colony. For consulting in the ‘management’ of Iraq, the financial twins (IMF and World Bank) appointed Igor Gidar, one of the ardent supporters to neo-liberalism who applied the shock-therapy policy, which finally brought to Russia a system of capitalist mafia.⁹

Under the brutal US colonialism of Iraq, the Iraqi social fabric will be disintegrated. Even before the privatization of Iraqi factories and oil, the Iraqi army and working class are thrown jobless to the streets. Privatization is a de-classing of the Iraqi working class: simply there will, no longer, be workers but thousands of idle and unemployed individuals. Additionally, education, health care and other public sector services will be privatized in Iraq, which will place tens of thousands of scientists, professors, and professionals out of work. Unemployment, poverty, privatization and the malaise of the secular current will all push the Iraqi women backward to confine her to a domestic role as a

⁶ The Iraqi appointed ruling council is preparing to implement an Islamic law against women which will take women and their social struggle back many centuries.

⁷ In 1950's the United States had manufactured special bombs to destroy Arab oil fields, should the Soviet Union dominate the area. In 1980's, the United States designed the so-called Carter's Doctrine which included the preparation of special US forces to occupy the Arab Gulf. However, this did not become necessary since the dependent rulers of the Gulf countries opened their land for more US military bases.

⁸ It is not surprising; therefore, that the Israeli minister of finance has recently requested Israeli capitalists to withdraw their capital from investing abroad and to return to Israel. It seems that the aim is to be prepared to invest in Iraq. By doing so, Israel hopes to achieve the “Greater Israel” in an economic sense.

⁹ The other difference, of course, is that Russia is not occupied.

housewife and a *return to 'the mosque'*. This is already beginning to take place in the daily life of the Iraqis.

The case of Iraq is now a 'typical' example of the US plans for the region. The comprador/mafia has been brought back by the US army to rule Iraq. They will own or may buy the national assets for little money if any at all. The Iraqi mafia might get loans from foreign banks to buy local assets, share it's ownership with foreign companies, or distribute these assets among themselves under the supervision of US colonialism. Most dangerous of all, however, is that this capitalist mafia will share its ownership of the national assets with the Foreign Direct Investments (FDI), which might buy the lion's share. Iraq will be, therefore, dominated by the direct foreign investment as well as direct foreign army.¹⁰

The Iraqi economy will constitute the economic base for US capital, and the strategic position of Iraq will serve as a military base for the US ruling class. One of the main differences between classic colonialism and the current one in the era of globalization, is that we now witness the emergence of a multi-national capitalist class that is structured to fit the world capitalist order: an order that is polarized and composed of (i) a true bourgeois of the US and other core countries, and (ii) a lumpen-bourgeois of the COP. In that regard, Iraq is a striking example of the '*multi-national capitalist class*' where the local capitalist class, that 'manages' the administrative affairs, will be protected by a fascist police, while the international capitalist class will be protected by US military.

Where does the Iraqi economy stand in such a situation? The Iraqi economy is captured by the US ruling capitalist class. While the colonial power pretends that it is re-building Iraq, it is, in fact, hijacking the Iraqi economy. The evidence is clear: the US controls Iraqi oil and 'offers' the Iraqi public sector for investment by foreign capital at a low price. Privatization, in general and that of Iraq and COP in particular, is clearly a cover for a *new form of colonialism*. It gives legitimacy to the multi-national corporations (MNC) in the countries of capitalist core (COCC) to acquire assets in COP.¹¹

Who Will Pay and Who Will Cash in?

The United States is still experiencing a deep economic crisis.¹² Due to the pressure of this crisis, high unemployment rate, decline of real economy, and the failure of the "New Economy", the

¹⁰ An obvious example of that mafia is Ahmad Chalabi, a banker who was sentenced in absentia for 21 year-imprisonment by Jordanian authorities for banking fraud.

¹¹ According to, 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 that protected its markets for a long time and that was dominated by a dogmatic socialist doctrine. The prosperity of Iraq in the future depends on the extent to which it will succeed to attract foreign investments" (*New York Times*, 26-8-2003, A -10). It is an irony that Bremer's instructions came at the same time as the WTO meeting in Cancun-Mexico was collapsing when COP objected to the core's protection of their agricultural products, a protection by subsidies.

¹² The crisis can be summarized by: (i) stagnation of US corporate profits since 1997, (ii) classical capitalist crisis of overproduction that was related to overcapacity in the industrial sector, (iii) the third moment of the crisis was the collapse of the stock market and the end of the Clinton boom that occurred in March 2000. See "The Crisis of the Globalist Project &

US decided to surpass the EU and 'kick it out' of oil producing countries by means of military might. The strength of the Euro and its competition with US dollar, applied more pressure on US capitalism.

The US is a frank example of how multi-national corporations (MNC) use the state for their own interests to the extent that the new wars are actually wars of the MNC. Why is a corporation capable of mobilizing an army? If the army is controlled by the state independently of economics, does the state mobilize it absurdly? It seems that, in the era of global capitalist development, the boundaries between the state and capital have relatively disappeared. 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.

Thus far, some of the US deliberately designed aggressions have been successfully completed, albeit the high cost. The question that follows is: why does a country with the highest debt in the world and throughout history, take the risk of launching several wars simultaneously? Why does the US ruling class continue to pretend and lie stating that it goes to these wars for 'humanitarian missions' and for the sake of democracy? Who believes this lie anymore?

The answer to these questions lies in the cold fact that *war is business*. Through war, US capitalist class spends large amounts of money on the war itself. The financing the military establishment in addition to the short-term results of the tax reduction, resulted in GDP increase in the US to nearly \$11 trillion.¹³

However, while the economic activity in the United States remains passive, the MNCs are doing their business and exploiting the Iraqi people. One can safely state that the business of war is doing well, despite the fact that the local economy has no signs of recovery! Most of re-construction contracts in Iraq are bestowed to MNCs in the US, with Bechtel and Halliburton on top.

From a practical point of view, all western capitalist regimes were part of the coalitions of aggression against Iraq (1991 and 2003), with various degrees of involvement. After the first aggression against Iraq (1991), the US tightened its grip around the Arab oil countries, while other aggressors paid higher price during the attack than what they cashed out. In the second aggression against Iraq (2003), the same western capitalist regimes participated in the coalition in different means.¹⁴ The maneuvers of these regimes after the occupation of Iraq, uncovered their true face. They

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 2004 issue of New Labor Forum.

¹³ "According to the *Financial Times*, the total estimated cost of the US 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". See "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).

¹⁴ The government of Japan announced that it will pay 870,000 Euro to each Japanese family in the event of the killing of a Japanese soldier in Iraq. (al-Arabiya Setellite 7 Nov. 2003).

are now, especially France¹⁵, Germany, Russia, Italy...etc, negotiating with the United States the shares of their companies in the 're-construction' of Iraq. In other words, they would agree to send soldiers to Iraq pending guarantees of their shares in plundering that country. EU countries and Russia refused to send their soldiers to Iraq because the US would not share the plundering of Iraq and this is precisely the reason why the United States will remain in Iraq until its defeat there.

It is Not a Religious-Cultural Conflict

From a Marxist Arab-Nationalist perspective, both aggressions against Iraq (1991 and 2003) were expected to take place considering the interest of the capitalist center in the Arab Homeland. While Iraqi oil remains the leading interest, the Arab market has always been another one. In face of the steady and relative decline of the US economy and the increased EU competition, the only way for the United States to *guarantee the dependency of the Arab markets* is to militarily occupy the area. The US is seeking is to control and own the rest of Arab oil by controlling the oil of Iraq.

This complex relationship between the Arab people and the West, especially the United States, cannot be fully explained by reducing to some cultural and religious factors. This reduction would falsely describe the Iraqi resistance as action of Moslem fundamentalists motivated by hatred towards the West and Christianity! In fact, the capitalist center has always pressured the Arab ruling comprador to encourage currents of Political Islam (PI) against Arab nationalist and communist currents. The capitalist center has an enormous interest in moving the Arab people more and more towards fundamentalism so long as their *efforts are not devoted to development, social liberation and transformation*. The goals of Arab unity, development, social liberation and transformation have never been on the agenda of the PI, and consequently, PI has *never posed a threat to capitalism nor to its interests*. The prevailing political fact in the case of the Arab nation is that a backward Arab Homeland will never achieve unity, and a deeply 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 US global empire has arrived to an end. Recent developments seem to indicate that some of those regimes are trapped between two bitter choices: (i) either to openly declare themselves as agents to the US, or (ii) to insist on some relative independence from this slave-master relationship in order to gain some legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of their own restless people. This is the reason why George W. Bush launched an attack against Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Syria (CNN 7-11-2003) despite the fact that they all joined the US-led coalition in its war against Iraq in 1991 and provided the United States with all the facilities it demanded the during 2003 aggression.

¹⁵ At a post G8 press conference, Chirac declared with great 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!

Western scholars and academics, particularly in the US, dwell on the nonsensical idea that “Arab people simply hate the US” arguing that PI is the main source of this hatred and by so doing ignore some central questions such as: why did the Arab people stand against the capitalist west even during Nasser’s era in Egypt when the PI was much weaker than now? Why did they support Saddam Hussein and continue to support him, despite the fact that he was not religious and stood in sharp contradiction with their very religious rulers?

Time for Resistance

History of peoples under occupation has been consistently a history of resistance, a right that has been protected by international legitimacy. Today, Iraq is occupied by US-British forces and their insignificant allies. What had, in addition to military occupation, fueled the Iraqi resistance is the brutal oppression of the US soldiers, the looting of Iraq¹⁶ and the decision of the appointed ruling council of Iraq to declare the fall of Baghdad (9 April 2003) a ‘national holiday’.

Following the US aggression against Iraq (1998) during the Clinton administration, it became obvious to the Iraqi regime that war is, undoubtedly, coming. In addition to the US military superiority, only history will tell if it was the decision of the Iraqi leadership to preserve Iraqi militants for resisting the occupation rather than being killed in an unbalanced battle with US tanks and jet fighters.

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 in order to be stationed around oil fields. The response of the Iraqi resistance was to abort the plan of occupying forces to build a local traitor army, police and civil administration by striking Ba’athists who would collaborate with or work for the enemy whether in police or civil duties. The main goal of the resistance is to keep the colonial army within the populated areas, and thus keep it exhausted and unsafe.

In an attempt to ‘discredit’ Iraqi resistance and attribute it to “external factors”, the US media portray many of the Iraqi fighters as ‘Arabs’ and ‘internationals’. While Arab ruling regimes supported the 1991 and 2003 aggressions against Iraq, participated in the siege, and now support the appointed so-called “Ruling Council” of collaborators in Iraq, the Arab popular classes remain clearly in the other camp, the camp of resistance. This goes to indicate that Arab popular classes stand firmly for Arab unity, nationalism, and development.¹⁷

In spite of the fierce Iraqi resistance and the escalating opposition to the occupation of Iraq within the US, the US will not withdraw its forces from Iraq before sustaining significant human loss. The anti-war movement in the US will take time before palpable results can be achieved. There are at

¹⁶ According to the *Washington Post*, US \$ 4 billion have disappeared from Iraq since the beginning of the occupation.

¹⁷ It is unlikely that anti-Arab western academics, like Bernard Lewis, Samuel Huntington and Sami Zubaida, will understand such a deep commitment.

least two reasons for that: (i) capital does not care for the human loss of its citizens from the poor and lower classes, and (ii) under capitalism, civil society surrenders to capitalist values. There can be no genuine civil society when its ruling class invades, destroys and exploits other nations. In a situation like this, true ‘civil’ forces in the society of capitalist center must revolt against its ruling class, or it is anything but ‘civil society’!

For the Iraqi people, as history has always recorded, freedom lies in the hands of the military resistance to defeat the enemy and force its withdrawal. It is only after seizing power, that the Iraqi people will be able to create a free and new Iraq, re-shaped and reproduced by democratic forces of resistance paving the way for Arab unity, development and socialism. It should come as no surprise, as has been the case on several occasions, that colonial occupiers might, at one point, offer some concessions to the Islamist groups within the Iraqi resistance, thus strengthening their position against the secular, nationalist and socialist groups. This necessitates that the Iraqi resistance maintains internal democratic cohesion and the ability to create a united front.

Forcing the United States out of Iraq will not mean that the new Iraq will be safe from future aggressions. The rest of Arab Homeland will be polarized into two camps: on the one hand, the ruling regimes will continue to open their borders to US military aggression against Iraq, while the Arab national liberation movement will, on the other hand, stand firmly with Iraq. There is evidence that the US colonial forces will remain in the region for an extended period of time. George W. Bush was clear and even offensive in his 6 Nov. 2003 speech when he pretended that he will “democratize Arab countries”. This stems from the US ruling class ideology of cultural racism and white man superiority that is ingrained in the Western capitalist societies. This discourse of “developing” or “democratizing” others is entrenched in a reactionary religious belief system and it based on a strange mixture of political Orientalism, bourgeois anthropological mentality and an exaggeration of military might. On the contrary, capitalist colonialism never developed or intended to develop the countries of periphery and without development democratic transformation becomes a sterile and unattainable slogan. It is interesting, however, to observe how Bush openly criticizes his closest Arab allies: Egypt and Saudi Arabia. This attack is motivated by the US interests in the region, which include dismantling any Arab state that has the potential to transform into a central nationalist state if popular classes seize power. This policy is embedded in the US 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.

Will Cooperation among the Colonial Powers Continue?

It is not an exaggeration to sum up the history of capital as a history of wars aimed at dividing and re-dividing world’s economy among the core states of the world capitalist order (Lenin). Wars in

the era of globalization have the same nature and purpose as those during the eras of colonialism and imperialism. Aggressions against Afghanistan and Iraq indicate that the United States is in dire competition with the European Union for the oil in the Arab Homeland and Caspian Sea. The occupation of Iraq is expected to result in the US monopoly of Iraqi wealth, thus competing with other European core capitalist countries that already had more substantial investments in Iraq.

Sharing the resources after blundering colonized countries is not the nature of colonial capitalist powers. This reminds us of a special feature of globalization where the core capitalist countries *are not equal in military might*: the United States is in a position to impose its will over other core capitalist countries and grab the lion's share and 'distributing' the remainder among the 'second rank' imperialist powers. None of these powers is capable of competing with the US. In other words, so long as there is no other strong capitalist superpower to stand against the US domination, the plunder of Iraq, and probably other countries, will continue as dictated by US terms, i.e. it is a joint, but unequal, plunder.

Among the main factors that facilitate and encourage the plunder and re-colonization of COP is the uniqueness of the current era, the era of globalism where: (a) the ruling classes in the COP (mainly comprador capitalism) that betray national interest of their own nations and welcome re-colonialism, (b) many opposition movements in the COP are mere agents of the core capitalist ruling classes, and (c) the absence of another capitalist power that can 'compete' with the one world superpower.

This proves, without doubt or illusion, that people's war is the sole and practical challenge to this never ending capitalist aggression for plunder and exploitation.¹⁸

Finally, the resistance in Iraq, if successful, will pave the way for the popular classes in countries of the periphery to stand and defeat other core capitalist aggressions. In fact, the victory of Iraqi resistance will make the enemy hesitate before attempting aggression against other COP. This will also pave the way for the popular classes in the COP to stand up against their own oppressors, their ruling comprador capitalists. The coming years will, therefore, be vital to decide on the future of the world.

If the Iraqi resistance fails, it will fail for a limited period. During this period, however, the core capitalists will expand their aggression to other COP. The US global empire will continue to impose its conditions over its allies, which will provoke more 'restlessness' among these allies, and finally, will open the way for a new internal core rivalry which might end in a destructive world war.

¹⁸ The alternative to the wishful thinking of self-reliance under a comprador regime is "Development by Popular Protection" (DBPP). This model relies on the power of the popular classes through popular activities represented by labor movement, grassroots organizations, women's unions, student, and youth movements. (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.)

Again, it seems, we are faced with the great challenge: humanity or capitalism. Humanity should strengthen its struggle to save itself from the barbarism of capitalism. Peoples of the world should stand against capitalist regimes as a step to save humanity from the plaque of capital. This started before the aggression and occupation of Iraq and it must continue now and in order develop into a real challenge.