Afghanistan! From Great Game to End Game: Implications of Development Narrative during Cold War

Dr. Rafida Nawaz
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan Pakistan

Syed Hussain Murtaza
Ph,D Scholar
Department of Political Science
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan Pakistan

Abstract

The paper is an attempt to validate the Arturo Escobar supposition that postcolonial peripheral states not only served as reservoirs of raw material and markets but also safe battlefields in the bipolar duel of the Cold War. It further, analyze the play of narrative and language games; providing mirrors to evaluate self/other; to reveal the real geopolitical interests of great powers; masked in games of truth like development-modernization and progress. The narrative is employed by the hegemonic states in a contest of hegemony; to construct (de)struct and re-construct the weaker states having geopolitical significance; to promote their respective geographical ambitions. Afghanistan, from Great game of the nineteenth century to Cold War endgame and its afterword "War on terror" is the stage of the great powers play; a laboratory to experiment discursive strategies of intervention and control; a space of dialectics between modernity and tradition and; a passive player in forward March of historical progress. Afghanistan remained a signifier of tradition, poverty, underdevelopment and conflict through all these epochs: an "other" to modernity, prosperity, development and peace, although the state was vital for a global contest of hegemony.

Keywords: Narrative, Development, Great Game, Cold War, War on Terror, Afghanistan

Introduction

Every society has a peculiar set of narrative that informs a self about its identity, belief and aspirations. Hence the structure of society is made up of statements about legitimate/illegitimate, right/wrong, true/false, etc. The discursive structure constitutes a series of language games providing self-image, aspirations, and world views. The paradoxical situations arise with the collision of language games. European colonization embedded a multitude of spaces, societies and people in an economic system each following a different pattern of norms. It was a paradox for non-western people living across the globe to internalize a different set of attitudes and beliefs, as human lives are organized and structured by their respective societies. The encounter of Europe with its other was problematic in multiple ways. As European Enlightenment narrative was not only a narrative but a meta-narrative establishing not only a relation between different and somewhat contradictory language games within European enlightenment, i.e. liberty, freedom, individualism, rule of law and limited government; lassies fair economy, mercantilism, and free trade etc.; but also establishing dialectical dichotomy, with other language games. Narrative about the orient was holistically constructed in discourses of tradition to establish a dichotomous relation with Non-Western world as Europe "other".

Modernity and Enlightenment, to Asad, remained a teleological project a problem-solving narrative with a promise that problems faced by humanity will be resolved in a pointed future on the horizon of time. (Asad 1993, 19) Lyotard is of the view that organizing history in form of progression towards freedom is at the base of a grand narrative of modernity. It can be conceived as a temporal march where desired, known future pulls us forward. To Lyotard modernity is an "utterance of sensibility", whereas Postmodernity is "incredulity towards meta-narrative" (Lyotard 1989, 314) Eurocenter remained a rule-maker and the rest of the world complying with the rules were rule takers

contributing to smooth running of the world-system, moving towards a promised future for the emancipation of humanity. Anti-Systematic movements (Wallerstein 2002) according to Talal Asad were branded as "reactionary trying to resist future…or turn clock back". (Asad 1996) Afghanistan was the space wherein post-cold war era one such anti-systematic movement rose. The question arises whether it was incredulity towards the mega-narration of modernity and European Enlightenment; a real beginning of the postmodern age or another language game in the contest of hegemony.

The main supposition of this study is that

In the history of the present, the anti-systematic movement of Taliban/ Islamists is the continuation of "orientalist" discourse, imaginatively and ideologically constructing non-western people according to a mega narration of Eurocentrism. This reactionary movement is a direct implication of the Cold War contest of hegemony. In the Cold War period, development narrative served as a sphere of identity construction and contestation of culture, where the two eastern-western European contenders of hegemony competed for each other for development and modernization of backward, uncivilized, poverty-ridden Afghanistan; or for cultural political and economic lebensraum in contest of global domination and in turn, Afghanistan served as a safe battlefield for the hegemonic contenders.

The paper is divided in three segments

1. Great Game, Creation of Afghanistan and Duel between Tradition and Modernity
2. Development Narrative: A Cultural Face of Neo-Imperialism during Cold War
3. Cold War Geopolitics and Clash of Ideologies in Afghanistan

Great Game, Creation of Afghanistan and Duel between Tradition and Modernity

The enlightenment concepts like state, sovereignty, citizenship, civil society, human rights, limited government, the distinction between public and private spheres of human life, democracy, rationality and last but not least idea of progress and development formed the ecology of 19th century. These concepts were based on universal vision of human. The European colonizer exposed the colonized subjects to these conceptual discourses but in practice denied the colonial people the real experience and practice of these words. (Chakrabarty 2000, 4)

End of the 19th century and at the turn of the Twentieth century the Great Game between Great Britain and the Tsarist Russia gave birth to the states of Afghanistan and Central Asia. The hegemon Great Britain and its Eurasian contender, Tsarist Russia decided to cooperate due to changing international and European scenario. Though Afghanistan sovereign status was recognized by the two great powers of the time, it was not the end of British and Russian influence in the state that was previously a border zone. In 1907 an agreement was signed where Afghanistan, Iran and Tibet were divided among British and Russian spheres of influences. (Zadeh 2004, 2) The move was perhaps the first leading to a shift from direct to indirect control and initiation of neo-imperial strategies of control. After the Berlin Congress and the Scramble of Africa in 1881, it was the scramble of Asia where without taking regard of ethnic and group boundaries people were divided across new and old states. All the major ethnic and linguistic groups of this bordering state were divided across international borders. Pushtoons divided by Durand Line, Uzbek, Tajik and Turkmen across the central Asian states of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan, that later became the part of USSR and again got sovereign status with disintegration of Soviet Union with the end of Cold War. The Baloch population and region was divided in British India (present day Pakistan), Iran and Afghanistan. The Hazaras were the only ethnic group of Afghanistan that was not cross-sectioned by international borders. (Zadeh 2004, 2-3)

Afghanistan is the exemplary case study of the duel between Eurocentric narratives of modernity and tradition. Afghan history reveals that concepts are mere language games and discursive strategies of control and mastery over space and resources. The vested interests of great powers were involved to promote the narratives of freedom, liberty and emancipation. The efforts to develop and establish a modern state in Afghanistan were also curtailed by "reactionary movement" against reform in name of religion. Leaders of different ethnic groups further divided on to sectarian lines, in their zeal to gain and retain power and subjugate other ethnic groups in a local contest of power were the small players of the great game. The Great powers were playing the politics of truth on both sides. Thesis (modernity/ development) and its anti-thesis (culture/ tradition and religion) were employed and financed by great power.

British at the end of the Second Afghan war (1878-80) decided to informally control Afghanistan with the help of collaborators. Hence with the help of Sardar Abdur Rehman, they created a buffer state between British India and Tsarist Russia. Amir Abdu Rehman was aware of great power interests and was determined to protect the territorial and political integrity of the new state. He had to create a state out of anarchy. The anarchic situation in words of Amir was like, "every priest mullah, and chief of every tribe and village considered himself an independent king". Amir Abdur Rehman cannot be categorized as a modern state maker due to his claim that as Amir the honor was bestowed on him by Allah and he is not deriving his power from popular support of masses. But the sole purpose of such a claim was to declare any act against his authority as anti-Islamic to form the solid basis of his rule and overcome anarchy. (M. N. Shahrani 1986, 36) Despite Amir anti-foreigner stance, the Amir accepted finances, cash grants, subsidies, arms and ammunitions and technological assistance to raise an army from the British. By employing force, coercion and through marital alliances Amir was somewhat successful to overcome anarchy. To counter religious resistance he deprived religious aristocracy of their economic base by creating the system of *waqf* (state taking

charge of religious places and providing financial support to religious elites). On eve of Amir's death in 1901, Afghanistan was a state with recognized international boundaries, politically and administratively unified under centralized authority. Amir Abdur Rehman successor Amir Habibullah through his military might established peace and order in the whole country, though officially he declared himself the custodian of an Islamic country ruling through divine right. The modern education system was introduced during the period. He was anti-British having inspired by pan-Islamism. In 1919 Amir was assassinated and his son Amanullah declared himself King with the help of the army. (M. N. Shahrani 1986, 39)

The first efforts of modern state-making were made by King Amanullah, who after defeating great Britain in the last offensive (1919) proclaimed state's first constitution. It was the first Muslim sovereign state to adopt the modern doctrine of constitutional rule/monarchy, motivated by the socio-political and cultural development of Europe. The first state to recognize Afghanistan was the Soviet Union and it was also the first state to sign an agreement of financial assistance with them. As the wartime compulsions were no more there and ideology also caused a split in wartime consensus between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, the British considered it the beginning of a new war in Asia. King Amanullah rule was considered as threat in the region due to his linkage with Soviet Union. Furthermore, it was a potential threat that king with the help of the Soviet Union will support the struggle for independence in British India. King Amanullah efforts to modernize and develop Afghanistan on western lines raised frowns of British policymakers. The radical social engineering by the Amanullah constitutional monarchy like land reforms, equal education for both genders and modernization of institutions of higher education, stirred up the status quo of traditional society. The state modern policy affected almost all the strata. The feudal lords were furious about redistribution of land to landless farmers and poor peasants were unable to bear the burden of agriculture taxation. Social unrest and chaos caused by modern reforms gave British the room to maneuver. Anti-reform elements employed the narrative of religion to contest

government policies. Religion proved a catalyst for active politics. With the help of British finances, the movement got momentum and first sovereign, modern, and indigenous effort to develop the state of Afghanistan was aborted. (Emadi 2002, 23) Before the Second World War, the successive regime changes were the result of reactionary movements using religious slogans against modernity. On coming to power each regime adopted and followed modern strategies of state-building with the help of foreign aid. During the inter-war period all the major powers and contenders of hegemony, i.e. Great Britain, Germany and the Soviet Union remained concerned about Afghanistan and Afghanistan remained the main pillar of foreign policy of these powers. These powers affected the internal policy dynamics and repeated regime changes in Afghanistan. (Emadi 1990, 5-10)

Development Narrative: A Cultural Face of Neo-Imperialism during Cold War
Imperial rule was all about resources and markets, but it came with cultural humane values of emancipation from tradition and civilizes the backward people. People of Empire were posing resistance to the European Colonizer at the end of WWII. The Anti-colonial struggle was fought through narratives. The narrative of emancipation from foreign rule and 'hope of liberation', and end of Eurocentric hegemony formed the basis of the independence struggle. But in postcolonial age, the independent states of Asia and Africa were unable to pose any real challenge to Eurocentrism. Rather independence proved to be the continuation of neo-imperial rule and indirectly influenced by the western powers. (Asad 1996) The old strategy of spatial control for resources of colonies was now shifted to gain sphere of influence. The old policies of divide and rule were still there making the task of state-building for colonies more and more difficult. With independence came the dream of progress, modernize, develop and catch-up the developed states of Euro-center.

Though Europe was divided on ideological lines but the narrative about postcolonial states of the third world, as

backward, underdeveloped and in need of development was the same in First and Second World. In Lyotard view, Marxist ideology has a love-hate ambivalent relation with capitalism. Hence Marxist analysis remains complicit with the idea of economic and social change. Both ideologies produce systems based on the idea of development that leaves no room for any second sense for humanity. According to Lyotard, there are many roads to Rome but Rome is only one and that is the establishment of industrialized economies, enhancing wealth and material conditions. (Lyotard 1989, 314) The desire to gain influence or lebensraum in third free space, out of Eastern-Western zones of influences led to a contest of hegemony and clash of ideologies in the Third world.

Cold War remained cold but only in established poles. It was not only the war of words but coercive real wars; fought between the two ideological contenders or contenders of hegemony and global domination. It is to be considered that more than one hundred and fifty (150) wars were fought in the third world during the Cold War decades with direct or indirect influence of Power Blocs. War making in the Third World was a derivative phenomenon, as these countries were bonded with superpowers for the sake of economic and military assistance. In the post-second WWII era the process of 'Invention of Development' was indeed course to assemble 'New Market' for European industry and also provide with the 'Safe Battlefield' for the clash of two ideologies. The decline of colonial order and the rise of development were interlinked during the initial phase of Cold War. It was in actual the restructuring of relations between colonies and metropole. (Escobar 1995, 32) The aim was to make a world periphery that can be used as the reservoir for raw material so that the system remains unchanged with Post-Colonial shift. In margins of Euro-center, the development cannot be financed from indigenous domestic sources, hence for sake of development; the first solution for peripheral states was an alliance with any or both superpowers. The Language game of development was the rhetoric employed repeatedly in Post-WWII context to legitimize the intervention in internal sovereignty of *POOR* countries. Neo-Imperial intervention in

cultural, political, military and economic arenas was knitted by the narrative of development.

Development paradigm narrated the poverty in Latin America Africa and Asia with a quantitative measure of per capita income as a human dilemma. (Rehnema 1991) The societies were regarded as traditional, but poverty was declared as a transitory phenomenon; and it was promised that emancipation from hunger, disease, and poverty can be attained through modernization and economic development.

Liberal modernization agents advocated that development occurs in successive stages, and present-day underdeveloped states are still on the original stage of history, a stage today developed countries have crossed long ago. To Frank, the argument about modernization lack historical substance and in no way present-day underdevelopment have resemblance with past of today developed centers. The present-day developed countries may be undeveloped but there were never been underdeveloped. (Frank 1989)

Development was not only the concern of academic discourses but the narrative also inspired the policy statement of US president in immediate post-WWII environment. Solution of problems of underdeveloped regions of the world was an essential component of US President Harry s. Truman "fair deal".

More than half the people of the world are living in condition approaching misery. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the suffering of these people. …I believe that we should make available to peace loving people the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life….what we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing. (Truman 1977, 60-61)

The statement was messianic in tone and stated the zeal to transform two-third of the human population by attaining the pursuit of material prosperity and economic growth. In the initial cold war ecology of the 1950s, it was an expression of a hegemonic will to intervene and influence. The dream of development was turned into a nightmare for the postcolonial world as it produced quite the opposite of what was promised, i.e. development. The resultant effect was underdevelopment and accompanied conditions of mass poverty, exploitation and oppression that take the form of structures. (Escobar 1995, 3-5) Underdevelopment theory as presented by Andre Gunder Frank (Frank 1989) does not take poverty as an arena to be constructively intervened and eradicated; rather they take underdevelopment as a resultant implication of development, an essential attribute of the process of development. (Shenton 1996, 9) The scholars of this school of thought aim to find the causes of why the process of development produces the opposite. These scholars are of the view that the process of dependent development is intrinsically linked with conflict and in turn, it is associated with great power rivalry. Frank sums up that system that generates conflict is inextricably bound with a system that creates underdevelopment. (Frank 1989) Development is about mapping, structuring and (Re)Making of third world from Post-Colonial perspective. It was the instrument of control and manage *Other* people, territories, environment and places making the spatial reach of power down to capillary levels. (Crush 1995)

Development narrative indicates the postmodern concept of power, where power cannot be located; it can only be felt. Borrowing from the Foucauldian concept of power Edward said defines power as,

Power is analogous neither to a spider web without the spider nor to a smoothly functioning flow diagram. A great deal of power remains in such coarse items as the relationship between rulers and ruled, wealth and privilege, monopolies of coercion, and the central state apparatus. Power in context of development is power exercised, power over. It has origins, objects, purposes, consequences, agents. There are also ascertainable changes

64

stemming from who holds power, and who dominates who. (Said 1994, 221)

Development narrative was not without identifying the problem and devising strategies to solve the problem. It was proposed in report of United Nations department of social and economic affairs that.

> "There is a sense in which rapid economic progress is impossible without painful adjustments. Ancient philosophies have to be scrapped; old social institutions have to degenerate; bonds of cast, creed and race have to burst; and large numbers of persons who cannot keep with progress have to have their expectations of a comfortable life frustrated. Very few communities are willing to pay the full price of economic progress." (UN 1951)

Embedded within the development narrative were recurrent depictions of 'traditional'. The groups, societies, classes, communities and territories were signified by the traits that give hint towards their low status in material conditions; and it was suggested that the hierarchically subordinated status will be shifted by adoption of modernity and development. Hence, being 'underdeveloped' meant a validated sub-ordinate position in history; and to adjust with assigned role; and not initiate the process of development and modernization. (Goulet 1977, xvii)

Developmentalism, (belief in the forces of modernity, science and technology) remains a modernist project, what Derrida signifies as "logo-centrism": a hierarchical ordering of places and subjects. Development according to Spivak is a hegemonic signifier and it was not only economic or territorial, but it was also a psychological exercise that constituted the subjects. (Crush 1995, 52-53) Hence development includes a comprehensive process including all six types of imperialism outlined by Galtung.

Type of Imperialism	Role of Peripheral Countries	Role of Core Countries
Economic	Raw Material, Markets, Cheap Labor	Processing, Capital, Technology
Political	Obedience, Imitation	Decisions, Models
Military	Discipline, Traditional Hardware	Protection, Means of Destruction
Communicative	Events, Passengers, Goods	News, Means of Communication
Cultural	Learning validation and Dependence	Modes of Creating Autonomy
Social	Reinforcement through Isomorphism	Model Social Structures

Table 1 Type of Imperialism and Role of Core and Peripheral Countries. (Galtung 1980 , 128)

Afghanistan is the exemplary study of the logo-centric hierarchy of traditional and modern, where development narrative can be considered responsible for conflict not only between cold war rivals but also local power contenders. If tested on Truman rhetoric, it was the space where forces of modernity had to fight with the darkness of tradition. On the contrary history reveals different facts that on both sides i.e., tradition as well as modernity there was a superpower fighting to gain control of space. Interestingly both superpowers were representative of enlightenment, freedoms and emancipation; and had a consensus on progress and development in material terms. Then why the superpowers were fighting a proxy war for which Afghanistan served as a safe battlefield? Was it all about control of trade routes, resources, markets for processed goods & obsolete technology, consumer of war economies; or in all bonding Afghanistan in their respective neo-imperial strategic order?

Cold War Geopolitics and Clash of Ideologies in Afghanistan
Present-day philosophies of governance are tied with political systems and beliefs with their respective notions of freedom. According to Lyotard Enlightenment narrative believe in the liberation of superstition through knowledge and science; Marxist narrative provides for a utopia free from exploitation by overthrowing unjust system and class division in world; while

capitalist narrative promises progress and a world beyond poverty through technology, industrial innovation and the free circulation of wealth.

The Cold War is attributed as a clash of ideology between two alternative narratives, i.e. Marxism and capitalism, both rooted in enlightenment mega narration of a world free from superstition and traditional dispositions. The postcolonial state elites were also drawn to promise of progress lacking indigenous resources for development, hence increasing their dependence on foreign powers. Governing elites of Afghanistan in Post WWII political environment broadened and extended their dependence on contending superpowers. Afghanistan due to lack of skilled workforce and financial resources was incapable to modernize it, hence it opted for dependent relations in all six dimensions outlined by Galtung, i.e. economic, political, military, communicative, social and cultural.

After WWII the two contenders of hegemony were fighting for economic lebensraum, clients and influence in Third World. The postcolonial state's will to modernize made these hegemonic contenders the empires by invitation, as postcolonial states like Afghanistan opened their space for these powers. Two options were open for Afghan governing elites in cold war geopolitics, either to join one of the opposing imperial giants or to remain neutral and try to beg from both. Afghanistan opted for the second course of non-alignment and tried to get maximum rent from both sides of the east-west binary. (M. N. Shahrani 2018, 5) The US established its embassy in Kabul in 1948 and George McGee of Truman administration declared Afghanistan geostrategically important country of South-West Asia. (Emadi 1990, 52) After WWII US expanded the sphere of its cooperation with Afghanistan to counter rising influence of the Soviet Union in-country and containing communism in South Asia. The declared US objective was to create western democracies in postcolonial South Asian states and establish an internal security mechanism in these states to counter the communist threat. (Emadi 1990, 53)

The Soviet Union started its influence in Afghanistan in the 1950s and supported it against Pakistan (a declared US ally) on the issue of Pushtunistan. The Soviet Union increased financial and military assistance to Afghanistan and established collaborative linkages with a segment of Afghan ruling junta that was in favor of trade with USSR. The Soviet Union the northern neighbor of Afghanistan made the country dependent militarily with modern weapons and technologies of war as well as training of military and security officials. (M. N. Shahrani 2018, 4)

During 1955-73 Afghanistan opted for Western cultural parameters in dressing, cousin and lifestyle with the help of economic assistance from both superpowers, and the period is considered the zenith of modernization in Afghanistan. (Emadi 2002, 22)

Country	Aid	Prior to 1st Five Year Plan	1st Five Year Plan (1957-61)	2nd Five Year Plan (1963-67)	3rd Five Year Plan (1968-72)	Total
USA	Economic	91.5	97.3	155.7	53.1	397.6
	Military	-	1.2	4.7	-	5.9
USSR	Economic	5.6	126.9	258.3	126.1	516.9
	Miltary	100	-	-	-	100

Table 2: US and USSR Economic Assistance (1949-72) in Millions of Dollars. Source: (Emadi, State, Revolutions and Super Powers in Afghanistan 1990, 74)

USSR sorted out a relation with Afghanistan that can be categorized as a mutual dependency as well as economic imperialism. Afghanistan was a market for USSR agro-industry and in turn, USSR was the buyer of primary agricultural products like fruits, cotton and cloth. Imperialism was also communicative in nature as USSR built trade routes reviving old silk route. Geographical proximity as well as the cultural links of Afghan ethnic groups across bordering USSR states like Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan provided landlocked Afghanistan a chance to establish with USSR. For reasons, Afghanistan was more bonded with neighboring superpower than the USA.

Trade Type	Country	1st 5 Year Plan (1957-61)	2nd 5 Year Plan (1963-67)	3rd 5 Year Plan (1968-72)	Total
Exports	USA	52.9	45.5	5.6	104.0
Exports	USSR	73.3	105.8	22.1	201.2
Imports	USA	27.4	24.3	2.3	54.0
Imports	USSR	69.7	69.9	18.7	158.3

Table 3 Afghanistan Trade with US and USSR 1957-1972 (in millions of Dollars) (Emadi, State, Revolutions and Super Powers in Afghanistan 1990, 59)

Educational infrastructure in Afghanistan was established with the help of both superpowers. The scholarships were awarded by USA as well as USSR to Afghan students, but the rate of return to home was different from USA as compared to USSR. The students from USSR came back to country to develop infrastructure and join bureaucratic setup, while the people going to USA opted to live permanently abroad. Further both powers invested in development of educational institutions in country but their chosen fields were different as USSR was investing in developing in poly-technical institutes for lower-middle classes. Contrary to it USA was promoting the culture of *Madrassas* in rural areas of Afghanistan. Hence, the two contradictory ideological narratives were infused in Afghan populace, i.e. Socialism and Islamism. In Afghan establishment both pro-Soviet and pro-US tendencies were present but orientation towards Soviet Union were Stronger. (Ralph H Magnus, Eden Naby 1998) In fourth five year plan USSR exceeded USA in providing economic assistance, and it was the period when Afghanistan broke free from non-alignment and clearly aligned with USSR.

Country	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
USA	33.0	16.4	19.3	12.0	9.1	89.8
USSR	428.0	--	600.0	3.6	--	1031.6

Table 4: US & USSR Economic Assistance to Afghanistan 1973-77 (in Million Dollars) Source (Emadi, State, Revolutions and Super Powers in Afghanistan 1990, 75)

USA supported Islamic forces in the country during the period with the help of neighboring allies Iran and Pakistan. Though from the time of King Amanullah the ruling parties also

employed Islam to legitimize their rule, and shield themselves against the crisis of authority and legitimacy. Islam for rulers was an instrument to control illiterate and rebellious peasantry. But this time the narrative of Islam was employed successfully to counter the modernist-socialist regime in Afghanistan by neighboring states and United States of America. The demand of Islamists was to pressurize the state for Islam based reforms.

The movement started with objections to modernization trends in the country and detested women education, economic participation as anti-Islamic. The Islamists led women related agenda became the basis of opposition. The women were given participation in economic and political spheres after WWII but women related reforms touched their peak during 1960s and 1970s with various socio-economic development projects, hiring women as employees. From 1963-73, women from upper-middle-class background were participants of state machinery as bureaucrats, ministers and parliamentarians. Women were also employed in army and police. During the period the upper-middle-class families of Kabul discarded the veil and contested the male domination of Afghan society. The women movement in Afghanistan was far ahead from countries developmental stage. The Islamic parties supported by USA, the expressed champion of enlightenment and modernity. The issue of veil and Islamic dress for women were the pivot point of student movement in Kabul. At that point in time the Islamic parties never knew that in future these issues articulated by them, in near future will be used against them by their supporter USA. The pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan was doing efforts to establish Afghan state on modern lines. (Ralph H Magnus, Eden Naby 1998)

Communist rule in Afghanistan was doing nothing against the Eurocentric narrative of economic progress and state-making. They were converting the Afghans divided on ethnic, linguistic, tribal lines; nomadic peasant class into a modern nation with an aim of economic progress. But as the Afghanistan Communists were backed by USSR, it was unacceptable for USA and regional states of Pakistan and Iran who conceived it as a threat to their global and regional interests. The narrative of Jihad was

employed to counter USSR economic and political lebensraum. Every ethnic group in Afghanistan had a war fraction led by a war-lord with prime interest to gain power and establish their superiority over other ethnicities and they all were fighting Just-War fighting against a godless communist. (M. N. Shahrani 2018)

Soviet Union was disintegrated in 1991and Dr Najeebullah regime was overthrown in 1992, but the victorious Mujahidin were failed to establish a central authority in Kabul as ethnolinguistic and tribal cleavages dominated the Afghan landscape. Taliban a group predominantly Pushtun by ethnicity captured the capital Kabul in September 1996. Taliban rule was not accepted by Northern Alliance and a civil war began in Afghanistan again backed by regional and global powers. Taliban was allegedly backed by USA and Pakistan while Northern Alliance was considered to be a proxy of Russia, Iran and India. Though these powers were fighting with help of proxy Mujahid groups; it gave a chance of youth of rich Muslim states to come together and join an anti-systematic movement. The youth under the residue of frustration about their relegated status in world hierarchy came together in Afghan landscape. The event of recent history i.e., the defeat of world communist superpower gave the youth the required inspiration to fight against the USA, the hegemon and primus of Euro-center. As the Muslim world remains under the rule of collaborator kings and dreams of a better world promised by the development paradigm were never actualized, these rebels 'outside history' motivated by the promises of beyond (Foucault 1999) and begin a new phase of history without domination of Euro-center.

Conclusion
We live in a Eurocentric world system where West is powerful and according to Ziauddin Sardar real power of West reside not in its economic might but in its hegemonic position to shape, define and course the narrative. Development discourses originating in cold war ecology were not without this will to power. Development discourses gave the Eurocenter a spatial

reach in non-west with a moral idiom reminiscent of civilization mission of colonial age. The narrative propose that

There are nations who embraced western technology enough to be developed; there are other nations on a slightly lower scale of civilization that are developing and there are still others steeped in religion and tradition who reject all forms of liberalism and secularism and thus doggedly remain underdeveloped. (Sardar 1999, 44)

In a similar expression Thomas Barnett in his famous book Pentagon's New Map divided the world into two groups, i.e functioning core and non-integrating gap. Barnett doesn't hide the intentions of global domination in discursive formation like development, and believes in forced integration into a global economy that according to him can provide opportunities to individuals living in Gap to improve lives and consider it as an alternative to terrorism, violence and conflict. He believes that US military must be the only force that can intervene in Gap mostly comprising of Middle East and South Asian states. (Barnett 2004)

Development narrative gave the Eurocenter power to intervene and change polities and societies to fit in a given mould. Michal Watts is of the view that development is a science of action for orientalist discourses, while Islamism is a counter-response of transforming religion into cultural politics by the Islamic "other" in western media discourses. For Watts "multiplication and reproduction of Osama imagery", in media discourses makes September 11 not only a national security concern but a puzzle of development. (Watts 2003) On the same note Wallerstein categorize Islamism/Talibanization, as an "anti-systematic movement" resisting U.S. led capitalist globalization. The movement to Wallerstein itself is the by-product of media representations that were previously restricted to the Western audience, are now global in reach penetrating to non-western traditional strata spread across the globe. These representations are responsible for evoking counter-responses in form of narrative construction based on Islam proper space in world. Hence there is an endless chain of responses and counter-responses. (Wallerstein 2002)

The State of Afghanistan that was the backdrop of this anti-systematic reactionary movement prior to 1979 had a history of building state institutions on modern lines; develop economic infrastructure of the vast undeveloped wilderness; and attain the momentum for economic growth and progress as well as to

transform traditional societal structure with modernity. The history of Afghanistan during the Cold war years revealed that undeveloped space was used for experimentation of development narrative. Even the narrative of women emancipation was employed in an attempt to modernize the remotest space. As the Afghan state was trying to establish itself according to the needs of World system, it lacked the resources to develop and sorted for aid from both superpowers by keeping itself nonaligned in the contest of hegemony.

Through aid, both superpowers tried to get economic, political, cultural and ideological lebensraum. Different ideological rhetoric like socialism found space in efforts to build a state on modern lines and create national loyalties in place of primordial ethno-lingual identities. Some groups treated Islam as people and nation-building force. Hence, we find echoes of all kind of narratives like the women movement, socialism, and Islamism involved in ideological dialectics in Afghan space. All these voices had their masters at backstage contesting for their peculiar interests through proxies and collaborators in Afghanistan.

The state due to its geopolitical and strategic significance always attracted the Great powers involved in the Great game of global domination. Creation of the state of Afghanistan itself was the result of Great Game between Great Britain and Tsarist Russia. In Cold War geopolitics it served as safe battlefield for the clash of two ideologies. Though the real aim of Afghanistan state like other underdeveloped states was economic growth and progress, but they were unable to sustain development activities through homegrown (re)sources, and had to opt for foreign aid and in this manner, the great game between new masters of world continued in post-WWII scenario. During War on Terror, it became the site of duel between tradition and modernity.

The state of Afghanistan served as an arena of intervention by contenders of global hegemony in name of civilization, modernity and development, yet all the indigenous efforts to establish a modern political system was resisted, detested and contested in name of tradition, culture and religion by the local power contenders backed by some regional and international power player for sake of its regional and global designs. Narrative remained an important strategy of control and mastery

over people and land is a signifier of orientalist syntax of traditional, mysterious east, as underdeveloped, regressive and poor.

References

1. AHMAD, JAVID. 2004. "Securing Afghanistan's Future: Accomplishments and the Strategic Path Forward." *United Nations Development Program* . Afhganistan : UNDP. 1-122.

2. Asad, Talal. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

3. Asad, Talal, interview by Saba Mahmood. 1996. *Modern Power and the Reconfiguration of Religious Traditions* (February 27).

4. Barnett, Thomas P.M. 2004. *The Pentagon's New Map War and Peace in the Twenty First Century.* Barkley : Barkley.

5. CALAMUR, KRISHNADEV. 2018. "The Atlantic." *https://www.theatlantic.com/.* September 11. Accessed January 06, 2020. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/09/9-11-us-troops-afghanistan/569803/.

6. Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Post-Colonial Thought and Historical Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press .

7. Crush, Jonathen. 1995. *Power of Development* . London : Routledge .

8. Emadi, Hafizullah. 2001. *Politics of the Dispossessed Super Powers and Development in Middel East* . Westport : Praeger Publishers .

9. —. 2002. *Repression, Resistance and Women in Afghanistan* . Westport: Praeger Publishers .

10. —. 1990. *State, Revolutions and Super Powers in Afghanistan* . New York : Praeger Publishers .

11. Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* United Kingdom: Princeton University Press .

12. Escober, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development.*

13. Fanon, Frantz. 1968. *The Wretshed of the Earth.* New York : Grove Weidenfeld .

14. Foucault, Mitchel. 1999. "Is it Useless to Revoult?" In *Religion and Culture*, by Jeremy R. Carrette, 131-134. New York: Routledge.

15. Frank, Andre Gunder. 1989. "Development of Underdevelopment." *Monthly Review* , June .

16. Galtung, Johan. 1980 . *The True Worlds: A Transnational Perspective* . New York : Free Press .

17. Goulet, Denis. 1977. *The Cruel Choice: A new concept in the theory of development* . New York: Atheneum.

18. Lyotard, Jean. 1989. "The Lyotard Reader." In *The Lyotard Reader*, by Andrew Benjamin. Oxford: Blackwell.

19. Manzo, K. 1991. "Modernist Discourse and the Crisis of Development Theory ." *Studies in Comparitive International Development* 3-36.

20. Naby, Eden. 1986. "The Changing Role of Islam as a Unifying Force in Afghanistan." In *The State, Religion and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan*, by Ali Banuazizi & Myron Weinner, 124-154. New York: Syracuse University Press .

21. Nawa, Fariba. 2006. *Afghanistan Inc.* . Investigative Report, Barkeley: Cropwatch .

22. Pilger, John. 2001. "The Real Story Behind America War ." *New Statesman America*, December 17.

23. Ralph H Magnus, Eden Naby. 1998. *Afghanistan, Mullah Marx and Mujahid.* Boulder, Colarado: Westview Press.

24. Rashid, Ahmad. 2002. *Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam In Centeral Asia* . Yale : Yale University Press.

25. —. 2001. *Taliban: The Story of Afghan War Lords* . Oxford: PanMacmillan .

26. Rehnema, Majid. 1991. "Golbal Poverty: A Pauperizing Myth ." *Interculture* .

27. Said, Edward. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York : Vintage Books .

28. Sardar, Ziauddin. 1999. "Development and Location of Eurocenterism." In *Critical Development Theory*, by Ronaldo Denis o Hearn. Dhaka: University Press Limited .

29. Shahrani, M Nazif. 2018. *Modern Afghanistan: The Impact of 40 Years of War.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

30. Shahrani, M. Nazif. 1986. "State Building and Social Fragmentation In Afghanistan: A Historical Perspective ." In *The State Religion And Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan* , by Ali Banuazizi & Myron Weinner, 23-74. New York : Syracuse Universitty Press .

31. Shenton, M. P. Cowen & R.W. 1996. *Doctrines of Development* . London: Routledge .

32. Truman, Harry S. 1977. "The Trueman Doctrine." In
American Defenese Policy, by John E. Endicott & Royw
Stafford Jr. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
33. UN. 1951. *World Economic and Social Survey 1951.* World
Economic and Social Survey, New York: Department of
Economic and Social Affairs.
34. Wallerstein, Immaneul. 2002. "New Revolts Against The
System ." *New Left Review*, November .
35. Watts, Michael. 2003. "Development and Governmentality."
Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography 06-34.
36. Weinner, Ali Banuazizi & Myron. 1986. "Introduction ." In
*The State, Religion and Ethnic Politics: Afghanistan, Iran
And Pakistan* , by Ali Banuazizi & Myron Weinner, 01-20.
New York : Syracuse University Press .
37. Zadeh, Pirouz Mojtahed. 2004. *Small Players of the Great
Game* . London: Routledge .