

CPB AND CPUSA VOICE SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATION OF AFGHANISTAN

Recently, an interview by the Communist Party of Britain with an anonymous Afghani “politician of the Left” (they allege he was a member of the long-dissolved People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan) was posted on CPB’s international bulletin, and further relayed by *People’s World*, the newspaper of American communist organizations like CPUSA.ⁱ The interviewee puts forth some very strong claims for a man who could not protect his country from Americans, so we found it fitting to review them and see how they hold up to the facts. The fellow says:

[The US retreat] is not really a retreat, I will explain why. The military bases are all still there, they are still maintained. The country is still occupied whether or not you have soldiers there.

The country is still occupied, yet without soldiers. Let us see how the Americans have managed to occupy the country by being pushed out of the country:

They have created a social base dependent on US capital. Essentially this is the old Mujahideen and pro-US administrators. This social base composes the majority of US aid and the country’s wealth. There are different fractions, people who have contracts for construction, logistics, petrol. There is lots of money flowing into specific social groups. Eg. Bagram air base needs petrol, a lot of petrol! This is contracted to a private business, with wide profits shared among this pro-US social blanket. This group will do everything it can to defend the USA and its interests.

“This group will do everything it can to defend the USA and its interests”, the ‘Afghani’ ‘socialist’ claims of the Taliban, who have just pushed the USA out of their country in a twenty-year campaign of armed struggle. His evidence? The Taliban hasn’t yet managed to nationalize every industry in the country that, when this interview was conducted, did not have a national state. Hence, they can only be puppets of the Americans lying dead in Afghani sand.

Here is what we should ask: were these petrol stations, etc., not already under the control of the occupation? So, is the new state of affairs under the Taliban an *improvement*, or is it not? Will there be more or less petrol kept for the Afghans under the new government? Our anonymous Afghan does not offer anything in the way of analysis there.

He goes on:

As mentioned earlier there is the creation of a system of administration which prevents the emergence of national or progressive forces.

Then fight for it. The Taliban did it. Is this man a coward? If the popular masses are rallied around him and his party, they will win.

That is the problem: the masses *aren't* rallied around him and his “progressive forces”. The masses are rallied around the Taliban, and the interviewee cannot acknowledge that fact, for if he does, then since the Taliban are US puppets, the masses are rallied around the US – thus the masses of Afghanistan are not victims of imperialism, but open supporters and even perpetrators of it. But of course, he cannot say this, because that would ring like a gunshot on the ears of those it is meant to deceive.

He mumbles:

There is a military pillar, a security force which does what the Americans say.

This is gibberish.

So the soldiers go, but the whole system of occupation has not gone.

What a very strong case he has presented! Let us review: the petrol has not yet been fully nationalized under a state that does not yet exist; there are rules that make it hard for his party to win, which is a problem because his party does not have much support from the people it claims to represent; and there is a “military pillar” with a “security force” which “does what the Americans say”, as evidenced by nothing.

Such is our anonymous ‘Afghani’ friend’s ‘evidence’ of Taliban-US cooperation.

We are treated also to this beautiful line where our Afghani “socialist” complains that the US did not intervene and ‘stop’ the Taliban (is this not precisely what they did? Is he not condoning the invasion of “his own” country?):

When they were in power they were very friendly with the USA, they talked, they had business negotiations on gas deals, and they committed the very worst atrocities. Terrible violence, huge massacres against the poorest ethnic groups. Killing people by putting them in cages in the desert without food or water. **The US allowed this to continue without doing anything.**

The implication being: “Why did the US do nothing to save us from the Taliban’s brutality?”

Why did this coward not do something to stop it? If the masses were being so aggressed, they would have immediately joined ranks with anyone who offered salvation. And yet, this miserable quisling sits here self-righteously telling us that it is the Taliban, and not him, who is welcoming the US with open arms.

But one major question has gone unanswered: why did the United States invade Afghanistan if the Taliban were on their side?

The Taliban was never anti-US overall, but they were unreliable. Afghanistan was a strategic location and the US wanted more direct control there. So understand that the US simply wanted to invade because it was in their geopolitical interests, and 9/11, all the war on terror was a pretext.

The United States propped up the Taliban, then tore them back down because they were “unreliable”. Further, Afghanistan is of interest to the Americans because it is a “strategic location”.

There are two glaring errors here.

First: in order to cloak the nonsensical claim that the United States invaded purely to install a more competent government, and not for oil, they must then claim that the value of Afghanistan is not in oil but in its “strategic location”. What does this even mean? What is “strategic” about it? It is only “strategic” because it helps the United States secure oil. Our quisling friend rambles about “strategic locations” to divert attention from the fact that the invasion has nothing to do with politics, and everything to do with economics, with imperialism. There is oil in Afghanistan – the US wants the oil. Therefore, they want a government which will allow them to have that oil.

Second: regardless of intention, our Afghani friend says the United States invaded because the Taliban was “unreliable”. If the Taliban was “unreliable” for the United States, does that not mean that we should support it as a means of undermining the United States? Should we not support them in that capacity? Our nameless Afghani cannot fathom to think in these terms.

Then our poor friend tries to follow this logic to its natural conclusion, which fizzles out and ends in a miserably unconvincing conspiracy theory about Americans controlling both the Taliban and the Republic:

The people installed in Doha or Qatar are ‘official’ Taliban. You should know that these are all old Taliban commanders or important figures who were captured by the Americans, they went through Guantanamo Bay, or Bagram. When they were released they did not go back to fight, they now live in luxury hotels in the emirates. They are well paid for. These official Taliban people are at the disposal of the Americans. When you see negotiations, it is just the Americans negotiating with their own puppets, they are not so much negotiations as a friendly sharing of power.

A “friendly sharing of power”. One wonders if he thinks the exchange of gunfire between Taliban and the mercenary troops less than a week ago was a “friendly sharing of power”.

Sometimes guns get ‘lost’ and end up in hands of Taliban fighters, meanwhile the Afghan army cannot move without US approval. When there are negotiations between these two, it is essentially a rapprochement between two pro-US forces.

His evidence for Taliban being a “pro-US force” is that “guns get lost and end up in the hands of Taliban fighters”. It couldn’t be that the Taliban have *stolen* these guns, no – they must have been given these weapons by the US, who really want to be shot at and driven from the country with these same weapons. Now, he does not tell us why the US would bother having negotiations between two forces they own, which would be pointless. He refuses to explain why the US does this, because if he did, then he would be forced to admit that he thinks they do it to fool the

Afghani people – *and that the Afghani people are falling for it.* If the US controlled both sides, and the people support one of these sides, that would mean that the people of Afghanistan do not realize they have been devastated by the American invasion, they are simply too dumb to figure out who is fighting for their interests and who is fighting against them, and therefore all the Americans have to do is dress up two opposing sides and have them “pretend” to negotiate, and voila! The retarded Afghani Neanderthals will be duped into supporting the American invasion.

That is the logic of our “socialist” friend “from the PDPA”.

When one of the Taliban leaders went to talk with Iran, he was soon afterwards assassinated by drone strike. These people turn up dead when they do things the US does not like, and they understand this.

Now he says that the US literally launches bombs at Taliban leaders from the sky, and this is somehow proof that the Taliban is in the US’s pocket.

He then goes on to allege that the Taliban is merely a “conquering force” which has moved the American occupation in the north to combat Russia and China. This is adorable, seeing these shills try to play the anti-imperialist crowd, who they very obviously take for buffoons. Look at this drivel:

In one month, the Taliban took 60 cities in the north (provinces of badakhstan, kunduz), all areas where there are Uzbeks, Tajiks, Azraks, no Pashtuns. How is it the Taliban could take the cities without local support?

Perhaps because they *did* have local support. That is a fair assertion, is it not? Perhaps they *did* have support all this time, and *perhaps*, just *perhaps*, it was the large-scale withdrawal of occupying US troops that led to the immediate takeover of the Taliban, who already had the large-scale support of the masses? Perhaps this is why the Americans and their mercenaries were pelted with rocks and debris by civilians when fleeing the cities? By saying “How is it that the Taliban could take these cities without local support?” they have proven one of two things:

Either that the Taliban does have local support, or;

That the Taliban does not have local support, in which case, why would the US use them as puppets? The US already had a much, much more powerful army of unpopular foreigners stationed in Afghanistan. Why switch to the Taliban? Have they suddenly become “reliable” again?

Our Afghani’s logic is built on a house of cards, and merely breathing too close is enough to knock it down.

The US seeks to use the Taliban in this way, to threaten and destabilise Central Asia.

He says this after the “unreliable” (what happened to the US finding them unreliable?) Taliban have established cordial diplomatic relations with China and Russia.

To close it off, our quisling “communist” openly declares his support for British interference in his own country:

Britain always had a role to play in governing Afghanistan via Pakistan. We want the British government to see Afghanistan as what it really is, a secular multi-ethnic country. As I mentioned there is a dislocation of society into different ethnicities, the contradiction of ethnic groups is a plague. The British government always seeks to arrange itself vis-a-vis the Pakistanis, and the Pakistanis always play off the ethnic groups. To help the progressive forces in Afghanistan, please defend those who are persecuted inside the country, the comrades who are targeted and threatened with death for their activity.

“Please defend those who are persecuted inside the country,” cries this out-and-out traitor. Note the language – “persecuted inside *the* country”, not “persecuted inside *my* country”.

Why are CPUSA and CPB promoting this fellow, one wonders? The reader probably already knows why. We will not say here.

That is all we have to say on this matter.

J. VOLKER

ⁱ AFGHANISTAN, interview with a politician of the Left, CPGB International Bulletin, 8-17-21.