

## **WAR OR AGREEMENT?**

*Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira*

*Folha de S. Paulo, August 3, 2009*

### **The Islamic people discovered that religion can be a major instrument to transform a people into a nation.**

In 2003, when the USA decided to make war on Afghanistan and Iraq, there was a protest against this latter war, but a United Nations support for the former one, because the Taliban government openly sheltered Al-Qaeda terrorists. Initially, with the fall of the Taliban nationalists, it seemed that the United States had won the war, but gradually the Islamic group reorganized in Afghanistan itself and in its neighbor country, Pakistan, and now, in spite of the increase in American troops in that country, there is no victory in sight. On the contrary, for many analysts the war will be indefinitely extended, since it is a war of national independence.

The new fact is the pressure from Pakistan, which has always been associated with the United States, for an agreement between the American government and the Taliban. According to the intelligence or espionage service of the Pakistani military, the war, currently waged partly in the Pakistani territory, threatens to destabilize the country. A report from the Pakistani intelligence service states that "The uprising in Pakistan strengthens even further the perception that there is actually a foreign occupation of Afghanistan. This will entail a greater number of civil casualties it will imply even further alienation of the local population. Therefore, a greater resistance to foreign troops".

What kind of deal with the Taliban could make sense for the United States? This country's basic criterion in its foreign relations is the criterion of national security, which includes economic interests. If the United States continue to perceive their national security as

incompatible with the existence of Islamic governments in Islamic countries - that is, of nationalist governments using Islam as an instrument of union and political mobilization - an agreement will be unfeasible. But there is no possible solution also because the Islamic people discovered something that the rich countries of today experienced since the sixteenth century: that religion can be a major instrument to transform a people into a nation, to build a State, and to accomplish its national and capitalist revolution.

If, however, the purpose is to neutralize terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda, an agreement is possible. In 2003 the Taliban was not sufficiently motivated to expel this radical terrorist group from its territory. The time, however, has passed. The United States and the other major countries made it clear that they are not inclined to accept governments that support terrorist groups. There is no reason, therefore, for Taliban leaders not to enter into an agreement, giving up their support to terrorism and leaving Pakistan in exchange for the withdrawal of foreign troops from their territory.

For the moment I don't believe in the possibility of such an agreement, despite the pressure from Pakistan. The United States have an outdated geopolitical vision of national security it is very similar to the vision prevailing at the end of the nineteenth century. They haven't realized that national liberation struggles can only have one stable end: the nation's independence. Nations seeking to become autonomous may accept for some time the control of their State by dependent and corrupt elites, associated with international interests, but sooner or later nationalist or patriotic groups will appear that, in order to achieve a true national independence, will take up arms and carry out their national and capitalist revolution. A revolution that is essential for that people and doesn't threaten the security of the rich countries.