

The Iron Law of Oligarchic Bureaucracy

Marc Wilhelm

Diablo Valley College

Abstract

The implementation of Operation Iraqi Freedom is the primary incident that triggered a chain of events finally resulting in the destabilization of Iraqi society we see today. America, ignoring the possible repercussions, destroyed Saddam Hussein's secular state machinery for a fear of socialism and replaced it with a predominantly Shiite administration. In modern society, economic factors are now the driving force of international politics, not raw power. Rather than promoting religious integration and unity, American foreign policy in Iraq exacerbated sectarian divisions and created a thriving breeding ground for Sunni discontent, from which Al Qaeda and now even ISIL have taken root.

The Iron Law of Oligarchic Bureaucracy

Introduction

To understand the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), one needs to be familiar with the American invasion of Iraq in 2003. Operation Iraqi Freedom provoked the sectarian divisions and a chain of events finally resulting in the destabilization of not only Iraqi society, but the entire Middle East we see today. The outcome from Western involvement was a political climate where Saudi-funded radicals could thrive. Britain has had a long history with Iraq that dates back to the creation of Iraq in 1920, when it was founded by Great Britain. Britain, before the United States (U.S.) was involved in the Middle East, had typically preferred radical Islamism to secular nationalism. When the U.S. took over, American officials took the same stand. The primary reason American officials took the same stand, is because of profit. American economic elites fear socialism, as it does not allow for massive individual profit like capitalism. In America, economic factors are the driving force of international politics. Political and military power are the direct result of underlying economic strength of the dominant class. The capitalist world economy perpetuates uneven development between advanced capitalist states and poor, less developed states. The world has maintained an international class structure in which the advanced industrialized states in the center of the world capitalist system dominate and exploit poorer states, occupying the periphery of this system. The transnational class coalitions represent the primary actors in international politics. States are important, but only as representation of power for the dominant class (Genest, 2004). For this reason, Radical Islam in the contemporary era is centered in Saudi Arabia. It's the most militant, radical Islamic state in

the world. America, ignoring all repercussions, destroyed Saddam Hussein's secular state machinery and replaced it with a largely Shiite administration. The U.S. occupation caused extensive unemployment in Sunni areas, by rejecting socialism and shutting down factories in the naive hope that the free market would create jobs. Under the new U.S backed Shiite regime, working class Sunni's lost hundreds of thousands of jobs (Chengu, 2014). Instead of attempting to promote religious integration and unity, American foreign policy in Iraq aggravated sectarian divisions and created a flourishing breeding ground for Sunni discontent, from which Al Qaeda, and now even ISIL, has taken root, all for the profit of the few.

While ISIL was officially founded in 1999 by the Jordanian extremist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. The history and chain of events that preceded it, fueling the disunity and turmoil, can be traced back to the First World War. The idea of a religious state for Islam, completely free from imperialism, is by no means a recent development. The Ottoman Empire dominated a monumental amount of the Middle East and parts of Europe since 1400. With nearly the entire developed industrial world preparing for war in the early 1900's, Arab's in the Middle East finally saw a glimmer of hope for freedom. The alliances for World War I were set, it was the central powers of Great Britain, France and America. On the opposing side was the German powerhouse allied with Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. A desire for change in the Arab world had been building up for many years, finally with the west on their side, the great Arab Revolt could begin. Led by Sherif Hussein bin Ali, the aim of the revolt was securing independence from the Ottoman Turks and manufacturing a single unified Arab state. It was by no means an easy, lossless victory for the Arab's; during the early stages of the Middle Eastern theater the Ottoman Empire was dominating. However, the revolt in 1916 significantly turned

the tables, with the help of the Arab's, the allies were finally gaining territory again in the Middle East. While many Arab's could not wait to fight for their freedom, many skeptics of the revolt felt that Arab's would just be trading one imperial power for another. The Arabs thought that the American government might be more receptive than the British to their demands for self-determination. Americans should be able to empathize, as they knew what it was like to be subservient to a massive colonial power. For Arabs, President Wilson's Fourteen Points, which advocated freedom and self-determination for races under the domination of the old multinational empires, was highly encouraging (Sifry, 2003).

The Arab skepticism towards the west turned out to be just, the Allies did not keep their promises. Once again, the Arabs exchanged one imperial ruler for another. There were imperial special interests in mind of which they were ignorant. The two most powerful of these were oil and the Zionist hunger for a national home in Palestine. In 1920 after World War I, no country would have been able to predict how valuable of a resource oil became. Its' true that the automobile hadn't yet become the most desirable object in the century; although the war still made the powerful imperialist countries realize the strategic importance of oil. Germany's oil-laden navy had been immobilized in port after the Battle of Jutland in May 1916, largely because the British blockade caused a shortage of fuel. German industrial production was hindered by a lack of lubricants, and its civilian transport almost came to a halt. It was clear, then, that in any future conflict oil would be an essential weapon (Sifry, 2003).

World War I showed the world that wars are a terrible waste of lives and resources, thus, most people are in principle opposed to war. American Presidents, whether Eisenhower, Obama or Bush, appear to have no problem with war. American presidents being keen on war has little

to do with their ideology, but more to do with the American economic system. This system, America's unique version of capitalism, functions to make extremely rich Americans even richer. Without war, there will be no American companies reaping in ridiculous profits.

American capitalism's perpetual war phenomena actually originated during World War II. As far as most ordinary Americans were concerned, American military intervention brought not only full employment but larger wages than ever before. It was during the Second World War that the Great Depression finally came to an end. The end of economic depression resulted in a majority of the American people seeing an unprecedented degree of prosperity. Although, those who saw the greatest, most substantial benefits were American businesspeople and corporations, who witnessed legendary profits. Between 1942 and 1945, the net profits of America's 2,000 biggest firms were more than 40 per cent higher than during the period 1936-1939 (Pauwels, 2013). This monumental spike in profit was due to the United States ordering billions of dollars' worth of military equipment, failing to institute price controls, and hardly taxing corporate profits. This profit spike benefited the American business world in general, but in particular the economic elite of the globe.

When World War II was winding down, the coming unemployment was not what the American economic elite's feared. What did frighten these elites was that the golden age of insane profits finally coming to an end. Profit hungry corporations realized that Military state expenditures were the source of high profits. In order to keep the profits flowing and expanding, new enemies and new war threats were urgently needed now that Germany and Japan had fallen. Luckily the Soviet Union existed, a country which had been a particularly useful Ally. The Soviet Union was a nation whose communist ideas and culture allowed it to be easily

transformed into the new bogeyman the wealthy ruling class so desperately needed. In the ashes of 1945 the Soviet Union, a country that had suffered enormously during the war, did not constitute a viable threat at all to the economically and militarily superior U.S.A. (Pauwels, 2013). The Soviet Union both politically and economically had nothing to gain, but everything to lose from a conflict with America. However, corporate America desperately needed a new enemy to justify the growing expenditures for defense. This becomes the primary reason that the Cold War era was ushered in; not by the Soviets but by the American military-industrial complex. President Eisenhower named the restrictive elite of wealthy individuals and corporations that knew how to profit from war the military-industrial complex. In terms of sheer profit for shareholders, the Cold War exceeded expectations. America's beloved armed forces never relinquished a demand for more sophisticated tanks, planes, rockets, chemical weapons and most lethal of all nuclear Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM's). In this post-World War II era there was an unprecedented need for new equipment and supplies, and in order for America to meet production standards, they needed new factories and even more efficient technology. As a result, all productive facilities of the nation increased between 1939 and 1945 from 40 to 66 billion dollars. It was not the private sector that took on the financial burden for all these new investments, economic elites found this too risky. Instead, the public paid; the United States government invested 17 billion dollars in over 2,000 defense-related projects. In return, privately owned corporations were permitted to take these new factories in order to produce what was needed. In the end, when the war was over and the pentagon decided to divest itself of these investments, America's big corporations purchased them for half, and in most cases only one third, of their real value (Pauwels, 2003).

Essentially the system works as follows: any profit generated during the cold war was privatized to the advantage of an extremely wealthy elite. Although, its costs were ruthlessly socialized through taxes to the great detriment of nearly all other Americans. During the Second World War, America had witnessed a plentiful redistribution of the collective wealth of the nation to the advantage of the less wealthy echelons of society. But during the Cold War, while the wealthy and powerful accumulated massive wealth, the prosperity achieved by many other Americans during the Second World War gradually eroded, consequently the general standard of living declined slowly but steadily. In 1989, the year the Cold War petered out, more than 13 per cent of all Americans were poor according to the official criteria of poverty. The extremely minute percentage of ultra-rich Americans found this thoroughly satisfactory (Pauwels, 2013).

Nevertheless, all wars must eventually come to an end, and in 1989 the magnanimous Cold War finally expired. America lost its useful Soviet enemy, and urgently needed to manufacture a new enemy and new domestic threats to justify military spending. George Bush Senior found his threat, Saddam Hussein appeared on the scene in 1990 like a Deus Ex Machina. Saddam in the past had been treated as a good friend and he had been heavily armed to wage a nasty war against Iran. After all, it was the United States of America (U.S.A.) and allies such as Germany who originally supplied him with all types of weapons. George Bush Senior unleashed the Gulf War, where Baghdad was relentlessly carpet bombed and Saddam's unfortunate recruits were massacred in the desert. The Iraqi capital lay wide-open, but the Marines' triumphant entrance into Baghdad was suddenly abandoned. Saddam Hussein was purposely left in power so the threat he was supposed to form might be invoked again in order to keep America at arms. The collapse of the Soviet Union showed how inconvenient it can be when a superpower loses a

useful foe. That's why the preposterous project of a peace dividend needed to be swiftly buried, and military expenditures could remain the generator of the economy and the result is sufficiently high profits. Those expenditures increased relentlessly during the 1990s. In 1996, they amounted to no less than 265 billion dollars, but when one adds the unofficial and indirect military expenditures, such as the interests paid on loans used to finance past wars, the 1996 total came to approximately 494 billion dollars, amounting to an expense of a staggering 1.3 billion dollar per day (Pauwels, 2013).

The military-industrial complex thrived throughout the Gulf War. The issue in the post-tech boom era proceeding the Gulf War is the occasional public pressure for peace or a peace dividend. A public interest in peace makes it significantly tougher to keep the Military industrial complex going. Which is exactly why Bush declared war not on a country, but on terrorism. Terrorism is a purely abstract concept which one cannot really wage war against. There is no way to constitute what a definitive victory looks like against terrorism. What the popular catch phrase "war on terror" really means, is the U.S. is now able to wage war worldwide for as long as they want against whomever they define as a terrorist. Thus the problem of the end of the Cold War was resolved, as there was a justification for increasing military expenditures. In 1996, a total of 265 billion dollars in military expenditures was already record breaking, but thanks to George W. Bush the Pentagon was allowed to spend 350 billion in 2002 (Pauwels, 2013). The main reason for fighting this particular war was Iraq's large reserves of oil that the US oil trusts desperately desire. The Iraq War is also a powerful example to any other Third World countries who refuse to work with an American superpower.

Now, in the contemporary era, Under America's Commander-in-Chief (CIC) Barack Obama, combating terrorism in the Middle East is nothing new. Obama claims that his highest priority as CIC is the security of the American people, nowhere does it say anything about special interests. Obama's four point plan for combating the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant begins with an immediate justification. According to Obama's foreign policy experts, ISIL is not actually an Islamic state as it profoundly claims. ISIL is mainly not a sovereign state because no religion condones the killing of innocent civilians, especially so when most of these innocents are Muslim. ISIL is simply taking advantage of sectarian strife and Syria's Civil War to gain territory on both sides of the Iraq-Syrian border. ISIL is not recognized by any government or the people it subjugates, consequently, it is purely a terrorist organization. If ISIL were to remain unchecked and uninhibited, ISIL will become a threat beyond just the Middle Eastern region and be a threat to American citizens, facilities and interests (Obama, 2014).

The American counterplan for ISIL is as follows: Step 1: America will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIL in joint operation with the Iraqi government. Obama will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria and Iraq. Any person, terrorist or not: if you threaten America, you will find no safe haven. Step 2: Increase America's support to forces fighting ISIL on the ground. On June 1st, 2015, America deployed several hundred American service members to Iraq to assess how to best support Iraqi security forces. Now that Iraq has formed a more stable government, America will send an additional 475 service members to Iraq. However, these American forces are not here for combat, but they are needed to support Iraqi and Kurdish forces with training, intelligence and equipment. As for Syria, America has been ramping up its military assistance to the Syrian Rebels. America cannot

rely on a regime that has lost its legitimacy and terrorizes its own people. Step 3: America will continue to draw on our substantial counterterrorism capabilities to prevent ISIL attacks. In cooperation with UN partners, America will cut off funding, improve intelligence, strengthen defenses and stem the flow of foreign fighters into and out of the Middle East. Step 4: America will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization. This includes Sunni and Shia Muslims who are at grave risk, as well as tens of thousands of Christians and other religious minorities. We cannot allow these communities to be driven from their ancient homelands (Obama, 2014).

As of fall 2015, there is an apparent gaping flaw in Obama's four point plan. The first being Russian ground troops being deployed. Vladimir Putin, Russian president and staunch longtime supporter of the Al Assad Regime, has deployed 150,000 of Russia's toughest Special Forces, the Spetsnaz. What this means is that he is not afraid to kill any terrorist in the region, including the free Syrian Army, the rebel army America is supporting. This scenario should sound familiar, America supports an army to eliminate terrorism. Then after their enemy has been vanquished, America is already backing a new terrorist group to maintain the sectarian strife. Vladimir Putin's ground troops are by no means holding fire against the free Syrian army (Gutteridge, 2015). Obama is going to have to step up and enforce his four point plan or step down and let Putin handle the conflict.

The American invasion of Iraq in 2003, is compared by many Iraqis to the Mongol invasion of a thousand years past. Thousands of people killed, millions of refugees and millions of other displaced persons. Not to mention the destruction of the archeological artifacts and

wealth that date Iraq back to ancient Sumeria. U.S. Civilian director of Iraq at the time, Paul Bremer, had the ancient Roman tactic of divide and conquer in mind. Part of the brilliance of this invasion was the immediate institution and forceful installation of sectarian divisions. By separating the sects, Sunni, Shi'a, Kurd, from each other, consequently set them at each other's throats. Within a few years, there was a brutal sectarian conflict incited by the invasion, exactly what the United States had planned (Chomsky, 2015). Therefore, ISIL is a direct result of American Foreign Policy in the Middle East. ISIL serves three purposes for the United States: to attack its enemies in the Middle East, to serve as a justification for U.S. military intervention amidst the globe, and at home to convey a powerful manufactured domestic threat. Terrorism is an excuse to justify the economic elite's war profits, and now even mass surveillance (Chengu, 2014).

The American people need to see the imperceptible, faux War on Terror for what it really is: a pretext for upsizing and maintaining an oversized U.S. military. The most powerful decision making groups in U.S foreign policy are the Israel lobby, which governs U.S. Middle East policy, and the Military-Industrial Complex, which profits from conflict worldwide. There have been thousands of American lives killed and millions more in the Middle East; although, the wars have also raked in billions of dollars for America's economic elite. More than seventy American companies and individuals have gained up to \$27 billion in contracts for work in postwar Iraq and Afghanistan over the last three years. Nearly 75 per cent of these private companies had employees or board members, who either served in or had close ties to, the executive branch of the Republican and Democratic administrations, members of Congress, or the highest levels of the military (Chengu, 2014). In reality, the only way America can eradicate

terrorism, is if it stops arming terrorists and giving the motivation to attack America. Essentially, the War on Terror is terrorism; only it is conducted on a massive scale by people with jets, missiles and drones.

References

- Chengu, G. (2014, September 19). How the U.S helped create Al-Qaeda and ISIS. *Counterpunch*. Retrieved October 14, 2015, from <http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/09/19/how-the-us-helped-create-al-qaeda-and-isis/>
- Chomsky, N. (2015, February 16). Noam Chomsky: America paved the way for ISIS. *Salon*. Retrieved October 14, 2015, from http://www.salon.com/2015/02/16/noam_chomsky_america_paved_the_way_for_isis_partner/
- Genest, M. (2004). *Conflict and Cooperation* (2nd ed.). New York: Wadsworth.
- Gutteridge, N. (2015, October 7). End of ISIS? Putin sends in his most ruthless Special Forces killers to finish off jihadis. Retrieved October 14, 2015, from <http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/610143/Islamic-State-ISIS-Putin-Spetsnaz-Syria-special-forces-airstrikes>
- Obama, B. (2014, September 10). Statement by the President on ISIL. Retrieved October 14, 2015, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/10/statement-president-isil-1>
- Pauwels, J. (2003, April 30). Why America needs war. *Global Research*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from <http://www.globalresearch.ca/why-america-needs-war/5328631>
- Sifry, M. (2003). *The Iraq war reader: History, documents, opinions*. New York: Touchstone.