

THE WEST'S WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND COLONIALIST FOREIGN POLICY

THE ASSESSMENT OF THE MUSLIM COMMUNITY IN BRITAIN

3 November 2002 / 28 Sha'ban 1423

***Hizb ut-Tahrir* Britain**

Khilafah Publications

THE WEST'S WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND COLONIALIST FOREIGN POLICY

THE ASSESSMENT OF THE MUSLIM COMMUNITY IN BRITAIN

3 November 2002 / 28 Sha'ban 1423

Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain

ISBN: 1 899 574 298

Khilafah Publications

Suite 298 – 56 Gloucester Road

London – SW7 4UB

E-mail: info@mindspring.eu.com

Website: <http://www.mindspring.eu.com>

Contents Page

Foreword by Dr. Imran Waheed

Executive Summary

Chapter 1 The West's Weapons of Mass Destruction

Chapter 2 The West's History of Non-Conformity with International Law

Chapter 3 The West's Love of Dictatorial Regimes

Chapter 4 How the West Represses the Rights of its Own Citizens

Chapter 5 The History of Western Colonialism in the Middle East

Conclusion

Appendices

**FOREWORD BY DR IMRAN WAHEED,
Hizb ut-Tahrir - BRITAIN**

'Statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by-and-by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.' [Mark Twain]

The dossier published today is unveiled as the drums of war are beating. The American and British war machine prepare to bomb the innocent people of Iraq in a colonial war and replace its corrupt Western inspired regime with a loyal 'Iraqi Hamid Karzai'.

On the 24 of September 2002 the British Government issued a shabby dossier entitled 'Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction', which was long on propaganda but short on real facts. The lack of facts came as no shock given that Tony Blair had said in August 2002, *'We haven't the faintest idea what has been going on in the last four years'*. This admission of ignorance however did not prevent the publication of the *'dossier of evidence'*, confirming that it was merely intended as a PR stunt in order to salvage public opinion for military action against Iraq.

It was not surprising therefore that the British Government's dossier was met with much scepticism and incredulity. This was especially the case amongst Muslims who have come to regard the 'War on Terror' as nothing more than a campaign to establish and strengthen Western hegemony and influence over the Islamic lands, their people and their resources in order to repress any semblance of Islamic political resurgence.

This dossier, 'The West's Weapons of Mass Destruction and Colonialist Foreign Policy', painstakingly catalogues the real motives behind the impending war on Iraq by studying the strategic, economic and political interests at stake for Western governments. In addition it charts the contemporary history of the world under the domination of the Capitalist ideology by outlining the West's use of Weapons of Mass Destruction [WMD], the West's support for a variety of unsavoury dictators and tyrants the world over and the disregard of the United Nations and international law by Western states. It presents a damning indictment and a shameful history of Western governments, the ideology of capitalism and its colonialist worldview.

Gathering intelligence and information about Western foreign policy is easy. The regimes of the Capitalist West are very open in stating the real objectives of their foreign policies and that is why this dossier is able to reveal *'the detailed raw intelligence'*. While some may hide behind claims of altruism, nation building, defence of human rights and democracy, the real objectives of Western foreign policy are unmitigatingly clear to all and sundry.

'The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.' [Rebuilding America's Defences: Strategies, Forces and Resources for a New Century]

The existence of a 'world order' or international law that controls the relations between the existing countries in the world, translates into the control of one country, or a small group of countries, over the rest of the world. This threatens international stability and the sovereignty of the weaker states. This has resulted in wars over the most trivial of matters. In addition, such a world order gives the powerful countries an excuse to shamelessly interfere with the most private of issues and the highest of values of other countries - establishing colonialism, insolence and tyranny, and imposing influence thereby enslaving entire nations; all in the name of international law and 'the world order'. The chasm between the rich and the poor, the north and the south and the first world and the developing world, continues to grow deeper and wider.

Resultantly, people in most parts of the world, Muslim and non-Muslim, see Western states not as beacons of freedom and opportunity, but as beacons of greed and self-interest; economic and military bullies that undermine the cultures of other nations; pirate nations at land and sea that become richer at the expense of everyone else.

The threat from Western colonialist states is therefore serious and current, and thus they must be stopped in pursuing their materialistic ambitions over the entire world. All people of conscience have a duty to act against this barbarism.

This dossier concludes with a clear, unambiguous message that is now carried by the majority of the Muslims in the world. A message for change, not just 'regime change' but for 'ideology change' – a change to the political landscape of the world. The world today needs to discard the decadent ideology of Capitalism, and all the ills that spring from it. In its place must return a just ideology that the peoples of the world need to understand and will then adopt after they see its practical implementation. This is the Islamic Ideology.

The Muslim Community invites you to study, contemplate and seek change, for it is the people of conscience who need to stop Capitalism.

Dr Imran Waheed
3 November 2002 / 28 Sha'ban 1423

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. On the 24 September 2002 the British Government issued its now infamous dossier entitled 'Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction'. The much awaited dossier contained a litany of myths, half truths and falsehoods as well as providing another opportunity for recycling old propaganda stories. The following points seek to expose some of the main myths and half-truths.
2. Britain and America claim religiously that they are simply interested in disarming Iraq, yet this is contradicted by the words of a top US Senate foreign policy aide who said in May 2002, *'The White House's biggest fear is that UN weapons inspectors will be allowed to go in'* [Time Magazine 13 May 2002].
3. Britain and America seek to justify their unholy war by arguing that they are seeking to replace a savage and brutal regime. However what the West seeks is an Iraqi 'Hamid Karzai' who would be loyal to them rather than to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people. As Richard Haas, currently in the US State Department, said in 1991 whilst working on the National Security Council, *'Our policy is to get rid of Saddam not his regime'* [Cited in Andrew Cockburn and Patrick Coburn, 'Out of the Ashes The Resurrection of Saddam Hussain' p.37].
4. The US and Britain claim that an attack on Iraq is justified as she has not complied with the UN inspections regime since 1998. However, it has been America and her allies who ensured that the undeserved UN weapons regime failed in 1998. They did this through provocative actions and the use of the then UNSCOM head Richard Butler. It was not Iraq but Butler, under US pressure, who actually removed the inspectors from Iraq in December 1998 following a meeting he had with US Ambassador Peter Burleigh. Butler ordered the pullout despite his admission that Iraq was only actually in breach of five out of three hundred incidents [Richard Butler, 'Saddam Defiant' p.224 and AP report 17 December 1998]. Butler failed to even notify the UN Security Council, whom he supposedly reported to, that he was taking out the inspectors. After the bombing of Iraq began, the Russian Ambassador to the UN admitted that the crisis had been *'created artificially'*, whilst the Chinese representative at the Security Council said Mr Butler had played a *'dishonourable role'* in the confrontation [Guardian 18 December 1998].
5. The United States and Britain claim that the UN inspections regime has failed in its mission as Saddam has continued to, in their words, *'cheat and retreat'*. However what they fail to mention and which was conspicuous by its absence in the British Government's dossier was the infiltration of UNSCOM by Western and Israeli intelligence. A string of revelations were exposed in July 2002 by former UNSCOM head, Rolf Ekeus who admitted he had been comprehensively duped when he led the organisation. After his resignation, Scott Ritter, a senior American weapons inspector, said that he worked closely with a man he called 'Moe Dobbs'. He was a 'CIA Special Activities Staff' and covert operations specialist who, using CIA technology, relayed intelligence information direct to the US National Security Agency at Fort Meade for decoding and translation. In his memoirs Ritter also reveals that he met with Israeli intelligence and that they too provided him with frequency scanners and digital recorders to record coded communications from Iraq [Scott Ritter, 'Endgame' p.135 and Dilip Hero 'Neighbours Not Friends' p.103-4]. Would any nation allow inspectors into their country who on the surface of it were masquerading as UN personnel but in reality were agents working for foreign intelligence agencies?
6. Britain and America have repeatedly argued that Iraq's possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction and its desire to acquire a nuclear capability somehow illustrates a kind of default evil intention that requires countering. However any astute nation or state including America and Britain seeks to have such weapons for either defensive purposes

or to further their foreign policy goals. As is discussed in Chapter 1 the West has systematically used its own WMD to do exactly this. What Britain and America fail to mention is that Iraq is situated in a precarious strategic position, facing potential enemies in the form of Israel as well as being threatened by the presence of large numbers of Western forces in the Gulf and operating in the no fly zones. Israel itself possesses nuclear weapons and apparently developed a mustard gas and nerve gas production facility in the Sinai as long ago as 1982. US Military analysts Anthony Cordesman and Ahmed Hashim make exactly this point when they state, *'It is also dangerous to assume such efforts [to develop Weapons of Mass Destruction] can be linked to the survival of Saddam Hussain and the Ba'ath elite. Most future Iraqi leaders are likely to have somewhat similar fears and ambitions at least in the near term. No Iraqi leader will be able to ignore the efforts of Iran or Israel or the potential challenge posed by the US and its allies in the Southern Gulf'* [Cordesman and Hashim, 'Iraq Sanctions and Beyond' p.336].

7. America and Britain have made continuous arguments that the current Iraqi regime has repressed its own citizens, specifically with regards to the treatment of the Kurds and the Shi'a. We will in Chapter 3 expose this argument by illustrating the closeness of the Western nations with some of the 'world's worst leaders'. However what can clearly be seen is that America and Britain have no inclinations towards anyone or anything except their own material interests. This can be clearly illustrated after the last Gulf war when they abandoned the Kurds and the Shi'a to be butchered whilst they looked on from above. Brigadier Ali an exiled Iraqi officer said, *'We had the message that the Americans would support us. But I saw with my own eyes the American planes flying over the helicopters. We were expecting them to help; now we could see them witnessing our demise between Najaf and Kerbala. They were taking pictures and they knew exactly what was happening'* [Andrew and Patrick Coburn, 'Out of the Ashes' p.23].
8. Britain and America have claimed that despite UNICEF's contention that an additional 500,000 Iraqi children have died due to UN economic sanctions, that if deaths have occurred it has been due to the policy of the Iraqi regime. This argument is systematic of the Capitalist nations and the lack of value they put to people's lives. Dr Leon Eisenberg, who does not work for the Iraqi Ministry of Health but Harvard Medical School, noted that the destruction of the country's power plants in 1991, *'brought its entire system of water purification and distribution to a halt, leading to epidemics of cholera, typhoid fever, and gastroenteritis, particularly among children'*. An international study group supported by UNICEF concluded that, *'There were approximately 47,000 excess deaths amongst children under the age of 5 in the first 8 months of 1991'* [Len Eisenberg, 'The Sleep of Reason Produces Monsters –Human Costs of Economic Sanctions, New England Journal of Medicine 24 April 1997 pp1248-1250]. As Milan Rai states, *'Much was made of the [fabricated] story of incubators being stolen from Kuwait by Iraqi forces. Little was said of the incubators in Iraq that were effectively stolen by the cutting off of electricity supplies'* [Milan Rai, 'War Plan Iraq' p.138].
9. The US and her British ally claim that any future military attack against Iraq will seek to minimise deaths to civilians and that attacks on power stations are carried out due to the fact that they have a utility for Iraq's armed forces. However, if any attack follows the precedent of 1991, then we are moving towards another humanitarian disaster. First of all the myth that targeting power stations had some military utility was comprehensively refuted by US human rights group Middle East Watch who said, *'Key military targets were attacked in the opening days of the war, the direct attacks on these military targets should have obviated the need to simultaneously destroy the fixed power sources thought to have formerly supplied them.'* [Middle East Watch, 'Needless Deaths in the Gulf War 1991' cited in Mark Curtis 'The Ambiguities of Power' p192]. The attacks on power stations had minimal effect on the Iraqi military but they did have a tremendous impact upon civilian deaths, especially children due to the effect on water purification. What reason did the predecessors of Bush and Blair have for doing this? This was answered in the words of Colonel John Warden speaking after the war - he was a colleague of General Buster Glosson who was

involved in the compilation of target lists - Warden said, *'Saddam Hussein cannot restore his electricity. He needs help, if there are political objectives that the UN coalition has it can say Saddam, when you agree to do these things, we will allow people to come in and fix your electricity'* [Normand 'Sanctions against Iraq']. In other words Iraqi children had to die so that political leverage and economic benefit could be obtained for the West.

10. The US has maintained that Iraq had links to the attacks and bombings of September 11 2001 in New York and Washington. The key evidence to date has been an alleged meeting that took place in April 2001 between Muhammad Atta the purported mastermind of September 11 and an Iraqi intelligence agent in Prague in the Czech Republic. Czech interior minister Stanislav Gross in October 2001 confirmed as *'fact'* that Atta had been in Prague in 2001 and had met Samir al-Ani an Iraqi diplomat. Al Ani was subsequently expelled from the country for actions incompatible with his status. According to one German magazine Atta had been given his instructions regarding September 11 on an earlier occasion, then returned to Prague to collect a flask of anthrax in April 2001 [Daily Telegraph 1 December 2001]. When the Czech police finally got around to completing their inquiry they concluded that no documents had been found which showed that Atta had visited Prague in 2001 though he had visited twice in 2000; they also stated that a man who looked like Atta did meet Samir Al Ani but he was an Iraqi called 'Saleh' a second hand car dealer from Nuremberg in Germany [Daily Telegraph 18 December 2001]. The story, like much of the West's campaign, was a hoax and this was confirmed when Time Magazine on 13 May 2002 said the story was *'discredited'*, while the BBC confirmed that Atta was in Florida at the time of the so called meeting [BBC Online 1 May 2002]. Yet the myth of the Prague meeting remains in the minds of everyone and acts as a key plank of America's case against the Iraqi regime.
11. The British Government dossier relies considerably on reports from UN reports and the evidence of Iraqi defectors. One of the most notorious defectors who was on US TV in the aftermath of September 11 is Dr Khidir Hamza, a self-described head of Iraq's nuclear weapons programme who defected in 1994. Even a former British Weapons Inspector Terry Taylor who supports a new war says about defectors in general, *'They tend to exaggerate their personal knowledge and importance to guarantee pensions, protection and employment'* [Peter Beaumont, Kamal Ahmed and Edward Helmore, 'Should We Go To War Against Saddam', Observer 17 March 2002]. With specific reference to Hamza who insists Iraq was close to building a nuclear bomb, David Albright, Hamza's former mentor says this about his former protégé, *'I was concerned he was telling me stuff he had read elsewhere, including stuff he could have read in Time magazine, his book is full of technical inaccuracies, so for instance he has a section about the biological weapons programme which he had no knowledge about or access to'*. Scott Ritter goes further and calls Hamza a *'fraud'* and his stories *'completely baseless'* [Observer 17 March 2002]. Yet the American and British Government would have us believe that defectors testimony serves as key intelligence in the war against Iraq, little wonder the British dossier did not want to publish the *'detailed raw intelligence'* or reveal their respective *'sources'*.
12. The last point that we need to refute is the continued argument that an attack on Iraq has nothing to do with oil. It is clear and irrefutable that the politics of the Middle East since the end of the Second World War has been shaped by the politics of oil. In September 1945 Lord Altrincham the British Minister resident in the Middle East said the region, *'Offers the richest reservoir of lubricant and motive oil and furthermore as an area which without desiring to dominate ourselves, we cannot allow any other power to dominate'* [Altrincham 2 September 1945 cited in William Roger Louis 'Imperialism at Bay']. The Americans were also aware of the importance describing the oil reserves, *'as a stupendous source of strategic power, and one of the greatest material prizes in world history'* [US State Department documents 1945 Volume VIII]. In order to illustrate the size of profits that were being made, AIOC the precursor to BP took out £170 million profit from Iran in 1950 alone. When the Iranian Government had the temerity to want to nationalise its oil interests for the

betterment of its citizens, the Labour Government which had nationalised its own assets was furious, with the Foreign office saying, *'The only hope of getting rid of Mr Mussadiq [the Iranian Prime Minister] lies in a coup d'état provided always that a strong man can be found equal to the task. Such a dictator would carry out the necessary administrative and economic reforms and settle the oil question on reasonable terms'* [Foreign Office Memorandum, Sir F. Shepherd's analysis of the Persian situation 28 January 1952. FO 371/98684]. For those remaining sceptics it should be enough just to quote Condeleeza Rice the US National Security Advisor who said on Fox TV recently when she was asked about her past links as a board director with Chevron, *'I'm very proud of my association with Chevron, and I think we should be very proud of the job that American oil companies are doing in exploration abroad, in exploration at home, and in making certain that we have a safe energy supply'*. Despite this abundance of information to the contrary Messrs Bush and Blair still maintain that this has nothing to do with oil.

CHAPTER 1

THE WEST'S WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The British dossier makes a great deal of play about Iraq's alleged Weapons of Mass Destruction [WMD] and its desire to acquire nuclear weapons, conveniently forgetting that Western nations have enough WMD to destroy the planet several times over. This chapter turns the spotlight on the West and its WMD arsenal, highlighting the immense dangers faced by mankind and clearly illustrating that the West has had an irrefutable track record of systematic and deliberate use of the 'world's worst weapons'.

1. **The US was the world's first nation to develop an atomic bomb in 1945.** The US government identified that there was a possibility to build a fission weapon that would have huge destructive capabilities. They took the financial risk of spending \$2 billion during the 1940s on their atomic bomb project, known as the Manhattan project; this drew together their best scientific and engineering minds. They saw this project as a race to be the first nation with an atomic bomb since they had identified the strategic power it would give them. \$2 billion of expenditure in the 1940s is equivalent to a spend of about \$20 billion today. The US first proved the operation of their atomic bomb in the test site Trinity, near Alamogordo, New Mexico. Inspecting the damage after the explosion, they found it to be much more powerful than originally expected; it was equivalent to some 20,000 tons of TNT.
2. **Assessment of the effects of a nuclear explosion.** The US scientists found that the Trinity test explosion had the following results. The land under the explosion was divided into sections of destructiveness. Up to half a mile radius from the hypocenter was called the vaporization point [98% fatalities, bodies would be either missing or burned beyond recognition]. Everything was destroyed in this area. Temperatures would almost immediately rise to 3-4000°C. Up to a 1-mile radius was called the total destruction zone [90% fatalities would be found]. All the buildings above ground were destroyed. Up to a 1.75 mile radius was called the severe blast damage area [65% fatalities, 30% injuries]. Large structures collapsed and damage was done to bridges and roads. Up to a 2.5 mile radius was known as the severe heat damage area [50% fatalities, 45% injuries]. Everything in this area had some kind of burn damage. Up to a 3 mile radius was known as severe fire and wind damage areas [15% fatalities, 50% injuries]. Homes and other buildings were damaged. People would be blown around and would suffer 2nd and 3rd degree burns, if they survived in this area.
3. **The nuclear attack on Japan.** Based on what the US government had ascertained about the effective destructiveness of the bomb, they still decided to drop two atomic bombs on the civilian Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The deliberate killing and targeting of civilians in war was even at that time considered illegal under the Geneva Convention. Yet the targets chosen for the atom bombs, named 'Little Boy' and 'Fat Man', were done so because their respective sizes would demonstrate the new destructive power available to the US.
4. **The justification for the attack on Japan.** At the time the US government justified the decision to drop atom bombs on Japan on two grounds. Firstly, a Japanese home island invasion would have resulted in appalling casualties like those suffered during the battles for Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Secondly, a swift end was needed for a war that the Japanese military was not ready to abandon. After the surrender of Nazi Germany in May, it was obvious to all that Japan was doomed and severely weakened. By late 1945, Japan did not have one single plane left, and American pilots could fly and bomb at will. Tokyo, Nagoya, Osaka, Kobe, Yokohama were already utterly destroyed. Japan was defeated, on the point of surrender, and known to be so. The Japanese Foreign Office had officially notified the Russians on May 13 1945 that the Emperor was '*desirous of peace*' with the

Allies. Given that Bushido, the Japanese military code, demanded absolute and unquestioning obedience, every bit as much as it did bravery, if the Emperor had accepted surrender this order would have been executed immediately and unequivocally by the Japanese military. Russia ignored these diplomatic moves because of strategic reasons, because under the Yalta agreement it was due to enter the war against Japan three months after the surrender of Germany, and it was keen to pick up some of the spoils. US intelligence knew of these diplomatic approaches to Moscow yet work on the Manhattan Project was speeded up in fear that Japan may surrender before the bomb could be used. The two target cities had been left undamaged throughout the war because they were already selected for the 'experiment' - the actual word used by Truman and Major Groves [at the time, head of the Manhattan Project]. The spin used by President Truman in August 1945 on the Hiroshima bombing was, *'The world will note that the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, a military base. That was because we wished in this first attack to avoid, in so far as possible, the killing of civilians'*. He also stated in 1945, *'We have spent 2 billion dollars on the greatest scientific gamble in history - and won'*. What the US achieved was a clear demonstration of their new power which involved the deaths of 200,000 people; the vast majority of whom were civilians - some who died immediately and others who died as a result of their burns or exposure to radiation. Many senior allied military figures considered that the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were completely unnecessary. Field Marshal Montgomery wrote in his History of Warfare, *'It was unnecessary to drop the two atom bombs on Japan in August 1945, and I cannot think it was right to do so, the dropping of the bombs was a major political blunder and is a prime example of the declining standards of the conduct of modern war'*. General Eisenhower the Supreme Allied Commander and future President of the United States himself said that Japan was at that very moment seeking some way to surrender with minimum loss of face - *'It wasn't necessary to hit them with that awful thing'*. Truman's Chief of Staff, Admiral Leahy wrote, *'It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender because of the effective blockade and the successful bombing with conventional weapons; in being the first to use it, we adopted an ethical standard common to the Dark Ages. I was not taught to make war in this fashion, and wars cannot be won by destroying women and children'*. Brigadier General Carter Clarke [The military intelligence officer in charge of preparing intercepted Japanese communications for Truman and his advisors] wrote, *'when we didn't need to do it, and we knew we didn't need to do it, and they knew that we knew we didn't need to do it, we used them as an experiment for two atomic bombs'*.

5. **The development of the hydrogen bomb.** Not content with the effectiveness of the atomic bomb, the US went on to develop the hydrogen or super bomb. This was a bomb that, in the words of the scientists who recommended it in a report to the US government, would have, *'no limit to the explosive power of the bomb itself except that imposed by requirements of delivery'*. The general advisory committee to the Atomic Energy Commission who were responsible for all atomic weapons development in the US recommended that the US not embark on a crash program to build the H-bomb because, *'it is not a weapon, which can be used exclusively for the destruction of material installations of military or semi-military purposes. Its use therefore carries much further than the atomic bomb itself, the policy of exterminating civilian populations'*. However the position of the US military on the development of the hydrogen bomb as stated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was, *'The United States would be in an intolerable position, if a possible enemy possessed the bomb and the United States did not'*.
6. **The effects of US nuclear testing.** In order to understand the effect of nuclear explosions on warships, buildings, livestock and other objects, and to further refine and improve their weapons technologies, the US has engaged in prolific testing of atomic and H- bombs for several decades after the Second World War. The first post-war test site chosen by the US were the Bikini islands in the Pacific Ocean. These islands, which were part of the Marshall Islands, had been wrested from Japanese control. Two years

after assuming authority over these islands, Commodore Ben H. Wyatt, military governor of the Marshall Islands, travelled to Bikini on a mission. Following church one Sunday in February 1946, Wyatt assembled the natives to ask them to abandon their homes 'temporarily' so that the United States could test atomic bombs '*for the good of mankind and to end all world wars*'.

7. King Juda and the people of Bikini were confused and distressed as they discussed the request. In the end, King Juda told Wyatt, '*We will go believing that everything is in the hands of God*'. Over the decades the Bikini citizens suffered malnutrition, the harsh effects of being moved from island to island, radiation fallout – all issues that related to the US plan to test their bombs. More than fifty years after the testing started in the Bikini islands, the islanders are still petitioning the US to pay them the compensation that they have been promised for the damage done to their land and their lives. The second test ground used by the US was the Nevada Proving Ground test range at Yucca Flat, about 65 miles north of Las Vegas. During the 1950s and 1960s, ninety nuclear bomb tests were undertaken in the Nevada desert. The US government's National Cancer Institute [NCI] examined the effect of these tests in the mid 1990s. They determined that the tests sent clouds of fallout over most of the United States, and among the harmful substances spread by the explosions was an isotope known as iodine-131 [I-131]. These radioactive particles, which accumulate in the thyroid gland, are a suspected cause of cancer. The National Cancer Institute recently estimated that 10,000-75,000 cases of thyroid cancer in the United States were caused by the radioactive isotope iodine-131 from the Nevada A-bomb fallout. In addition to the military personnel exposed to high levels of radiation in the vicinity of the tests, thousands of US citizens downwind are likely to have paid a lethal price as a result of the atom bomb testing. A clear example of the West using WMD on its own unsuspecting citizens.
8. **The nuclear developments during the Cold War.** During the Cold War, the US initiated an arms race with the Soviet Union and stockpiled many thousands of nuclear weapons. They also developed multiple ways to deliver these devices including: the B-52 bomber, many types of land-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles, and submarine launched ballistic missiles. The US also based thousands of tactical nuclear weapons all around the borders of the Soviet Union, in Western Europe, Turkey, South Korea, Japan etc. in order to provide itself a first strike capability and to deter Soviet aggression. However when the Cubans invited the Soviets to locate Soviet nuclear missiles on Cuban soil in order to deter American aggression – the US had already in the early 1960 demonstrated their desire to remove Fidel Castro from power – the US went berserk and forced the Soviets to withdraw their missiles by threatening an all out war.
9. **Nuclear weapons arms control.** There are many nuclear weapons arms control treaties that the US has signed up to, including 'Strategic Arm Limitation Talks' [SALT 1 and 2], 'Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty' [START 1 and 2], 'Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty', 'Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty', 'Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty' [INF] and so on. However given the improvements in technology, missile accuracy, range, missile stealth capability that have taken place over the last few decades as well as the wide range of test data already available to the US, none of these treaties has substantially degraded the US's ability to conduct or threaten a nuclear attack on any nation. Several of these treaties are discriminatory towards most nations in the world. For example, the Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT], which entered into force in 1970 and is strongly supported by the US, seeks to inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons. Its 187 signatories are classified in two categories: nuclear-weapon states [NWS], consisting of the United States, Russia, China, France, and the United Kingdom and non-nuclear-weapon states [NNWS]. Under the treaty, the five NWS commit to pursue general and complete disarmament, while the NNWS agree to forgo developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

With its near-universal membership, the NPT has the widest adherence of any arms control agreement, with only Cuba, India, Israel, and Pakistan remaining outside the treaty. In order to accede to the treaty, these states must do so as non-nuclear-weapon states, since the treaty restricts NWS status to nations that '*manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive devices prior to 1 January 1967*'. For India, Israel, and Pakistan, all known to possess or suspected of having nuclear weapons, joining the treaty as NNWS would require that they dismantle their nuclear weapons and place their nuclear materials under international safeguards. With this treaty in place, any NNWS nation that seeks to acquire nuclear weapons can be easily described as a rogue state and targeted, as has happened to Iraq, Iran and North Korea recently. The US, though it remains as the sole superpower, still insists on the right to threaten other states with the first use of nuclear weapons in order to deter potential adversaries. In practice none of the five NWS have demonstrated any serious intention of disarmament as required by the treaty and yet they - led by the US - aim to maintain monopoly control on nuclear weapons, denying other nations the same umbrella that they operate under; yet another bizarre form of double standards. Thus far, the US sees the NPT merely as a tool to constrain the nuclear capabilities of states such as Iran, Iraq, and North Korea and a way of improving the proliferation behaviour of Russia and China, without making any progress on its own nuclear disarmament. In fact the US plans to develop a new range of nuclear weapons. This can be seen in the hypocrisy of the US who only recently unilaterally quit the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union in its zealous pursuance of a 'missile defensive system', yet now the US condemns Iraq and North Korea for breaking treaties preventing these nations from acquiring nuclear weapons of their own.

10. **Current and future nuclear developments.** In early 2002, the US put together a review of their nuclear strategy, 'the US Nuclear Posture Review' [NPR]. Sections of this review were leaked to the US press. The review requested that contingency plans be drawn up to target North Korea, Iran, Libya, Syria, Russia and China. The review calls for the US to have more flexibility in developing and deploying the nuclear forces that it may need. One such area of flexibility comes from resuming nuclear testing. One of the reasons why this testing is needed is to develop a new range of bombs and missiles that can destroy hardened and deeply buried targets [HDBTs]. These are buildings and facilities that an adversary could use for hosting command and control operations, leadership shelters or storage areas for WMD. Other US policy documents such as that by Paul Robinson, the director of Sandia National Laboratories call for the development of low yield nuclear weapons. At present the US is a signatory to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty [CTBT] though the US Senate has not ratified the treaty. Thus the message that such developments indicate to the rest of the world is that the US is interested in developing more useable nuclear weapons and will repudiate the CTBT because of her interests. The US has also stated in the NPR and in other presentations, their intention to introduce strategic missile defences that will deter other countries from seeking long-range missiles. The belief is that a global missile defence system would create a shield that would give the United States freedom of action to operate with relative impunity throughout the world. Thus the US could militarily tackle with impunity other nations armed with WMD and the long-range missiles needed to deliver them against the United States. On December 13 2001, the United States announced that it would withdraw from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty, ostensibly because the treaty was restricting testing of mobile missile defences against ICBMs. Then in its first defence budget, the new US administration requested a 57 percent increase in funding for missile defence, from \$5.3 billion to \$8.3 billion, of which it received \$7.8 billion from Congress. All this indicates that many other nations are likely to have much to fear from the US as it proceeds down the road of making itself invulnerable from nuclear missile attack as well as making more useable nuclear weapons. This is a nation that, as we have seen before, has no qualms about the use of these weapons upon innocent civilians.

11. **Chemical and biological weapons.** The first uses of chemical weapons in the modern era were by many of the participants of the First World War: France, Germany, UK and the US - the same nations who now sit on judgement on Iraq. In response to chlorine attack by the Germans around Ypres, Belgium, in which more than 5,000 Allied forces were killed, the UK established its own chemical warfare effort. Major Charles Foulkes of the Royal Engineers was appointed as their first 'gas adviser.' His job was to quickly organise the British chemical warfare effort without concern for ethics. Soon virtually every leading chemist in Britain was working on gas warfare. The Porton Down facility was built and became the headquarters of the British chemical warfare effort, eventually employing more than 1,000 scientists and soldiers.
12. **The US Chemical weapons service.** The US created the Chemical Warfare Service [CWS] in mid-1918, with General Amos A. Fries as its director. The Edgewood Arsenal, a military base near Baltimore, Maryland, became the centre for US chemical weapons research, employing more than 1,200 technical and 700 service assistants who tested more than 4,000 poisonous substances. With 218 manufacturing buildings and 28 miles of railway, Edgewood was capable of producing 200,000 chemical bombs and shells per day. By 1918, between one-fifth and one-third of all shells fired were filled with chemicals of some type. In the last 18 months of the war, the much-feared mustard gas was responsible for one in six casualties. Mustard gas burned and blistered the skin, then caused slow death or debilitation by stripping the mucous membrane of the bronchial tubes and blocking breathing. There were more than 91,000 deaths and 1.3 million casualties 'officially' attributed to gas warfare, but historians today consider these figures to be on the low side.
13. **Inter-regnum uses.** Use of chemical weapons was not only limited to the First World War. Intervening on the side of the White Army in the Russian Civil War in 1919, the British armed them with mustard gas shells, and used the 'M' device to produce clouds of arsenic smoke over the Red Army. The British took advantage of every opportunity to use their new weapons. Major Foulkes, who was sent to India in 1919, pressured the British military to use chemical weapons in their war against Afghanistan, *'Ignorance, lack of instruction and discipline, and the absence of protection on the part of Afghans and tribesmen will undoubtedly enhance the casualty producing value of mustard gas in frontier fighting.'* The British War Department agreed, sending stocks of phosgene and mustard gas, and British troops were trained in anti-gas suits on the Khyber Pass. Yet Tony Blair today has the audacity to present the British Government as one of the 'civilised' nations with a 'clean record' and noble values as compared to Saddam's regime in Baghdad.
14. **The establishment of the Geneva Protocol.** After the First World War, there was widespread disillusionment with gas warfare. In May 1925, under the auspices of the League of Nations, a conference on the international arms race was convened in Geneva, Switzerland. The Geneva Protocol, as it was called, banned the use of chemical as well as biological weapons in any future conflict. *'The signing of the Geneva protocol of 1925'*, as one observer put it, *'was the high-water mark of the hostility of public opinion towards chemical warfare'*. Signing the pact did not mean that it was binding however because governments also had to ratify it. The US Chemical Warfare Service led the attack on the Geneva Protocol in the United States and enlisted the help of such organisations as the American Chemical Society, which declared that, *'the prohibition of chemical warfare meant the abandonment of humane methods for the old horrors of battle'*. In the face of strong opposition, the State Department withdrew ratification of the treaty. Most European countries ratified the Geneva Protocol, but added qualifying clauses that rendered it worthless. One clause added to the protocol made it non-binding on a country unless the country it was fighting against had also ratified it. Moreover, signatories reserved the right to respond with chemical or biological weapons if they were attacked with them. The Geneva Protocol also crucially did not prevent researching or stockpiling biochemical

weapons; it simply banned first use. The net effect of the Geneva Protocol was not to stop the development of biochemical weapons but to make the research and development of such weapons much more secret. In 1925, the future British Prime Minister Winston Churchill let the proverbial cat out of the bag when he wrote of pestilences methodically prepared and deliberately launched upon man and beast. Blight to destroy crops, Anthrax to slay horses and cattle, Plague to poison not armies only but whole district - such are the lines along which military science was remorselessly advancing. This type of war research had to be kept secret for fear of public opposition.

15. **Establishment of Porton Down in the UK.** The Holland Committee, set up by the British government after the First World War to study chemical warfare and Britain's future policy toward it, recommended that the Porton Down facility be maintained on a permanent basis. Porton Down was to add the study and development of germ warfare to its agenda. The Holland Committee also made a crucial admission. It concluded, *'It is impossible to divorce the study of defence against gas from the use of gas as an offensive weapon, as the efficiency of the defence depends entirely on an accurate knowledge as to what progress is being or is likely to be made in the offensive use of this weapon'*. Governments knew from the onset that there was no such thing as purely defensive chemical weapons research. As a result, governments gave their scientists a free hand to design the deadliest weapons they could imagine, on the grounds that they first had to be invented before a defence could be prepared. Scientists at the Porton Down secret weapons base knew they were risking the lives of young national servicemen used as guinea pigs in nerve gas tests, according to toxicologists. The family of one man who died in the experiments are accusing the scientists of murder. According to Alastair Hay, from Leeds University, the briefing notes made by scientists at the Wiltshire base suggested that they knew the doses they were giving the servicemen could be fatal. *'They were playing with fire, they were exposing people to concentrations which in the event only killed one man but weren't far off perhaps killing a number of others'*. Some servicemen, who were given extra pay and time off in exchange for taking part in the tests, said they were told the experiments were for a cure for the common cold. The Ministry of Defence has repeatedly denied the allegation that servicemen were misled in any way. A TV documentary broadcast in 1999 featured a former 'guinea pig' Mike Cox, 68, from Southampton, who was with Serviceman Ronald Maddison on the day he died in the gas chamber where the tests were carried out. The programme also featured relatives of Mr Maddison speaking of the events that took place 46 years prior. Liliias Craik, his sister, said, *'If he'd died in the war, then I could understand, but to die over some stupid stuff that they put on his arm, which you shouldn't do to anybody, then, I'm sorry, I think they murdered him'*.
16. **The role of chemical and biological weapons in the Second World War.** Gas warfare was absent from the Second World War, primarily because of the difficulty of delivering such weapons without affecting one's own troops and the possibility of similar retaliation as all of the major powers had stockpiled hundreds of tons of chemical weapons, especially mustard gas, for possible use. Britain built the first anthrax bomb in 1942. A crude bomb filled with anthrax spores was exploded on Gruinard Island off the west coast of Scotland. The sheep on the island soon began to die. To this day, Gruinard is uninhabitable, and no aircraft is allowed to land there. The British eventually produced 5 million 'anthrax cakes' to drop on Germany. One British contingency plan to bomb Germany with anthrax would have resulted in an estimated 3 million deaths. Britain also experimented with the deadly toxin B~IX, or botulism. The US also massively expanded its germ warfare program during the Second World War. In 1940, the US Health and Medical Committee of the Council for National Defence began to consider, *'the offensive and defensive potential of biological warfare'*. George Merck, of Merck Pharmaceuticals, was appointed director of the War Research Service, which was in charge of germ warfare research. In 1943, Camp Detrick was opened in Maryland, and it quickly became the centre of the US germ warfare effort. The US invested more than \$40 million in plant and equipment between 1942 and 1945 and employed more than 4,000 people at Camp

Detrick, the Field Testing Station at Horn Island in Pascagoula, Mississippi, the production plant at Vigo, Indiana, and at the Dugway Proving Grounds. At Camp Detrick, anthrax, tularaemia, plague, typhus, yellow fever, and encephalitis were tested for battlefield use, as well as various rice, potato, and cereal blights. The US studied the possibility of destroying Japanese rice crops with germ warfare. In May 1944, the first batch of 5,000 anthrax-filled bombs came off the production line at Camp Detrick. In Vigo, Indiana, the US built a plant that was capable of producing 500,000 anthrax bombs a month and 250,000 bombs filled with botulism. Fortunately, they were never used. The US built the largest poison gas manufacturing operation in the world during the Second World War, producing 135,000 tons of poison gas. This was 20,000 tons more than the combined total used by every country during the First World War. The US also began to surpass the British in germ warfare.

17. **Learning from the Japanese experience.** After the Second World War, George Merck wanted the wartime germ warfare programmes to continue. In 1956 Camp Detrick became Fort Detrick, a permanent military research and development institution. The deadliest viruses and gases known to humanity were now added to the American arsenal, including nerve gases such as GB and VX gas, so deadly that a tiny drop on the skin could cause death in less than a minute. The Cold War also meant that former enemies were rehabilitated and put on the US payroll. This meant that Japanese war criminals that had experimented on human beings were now shielded from prosecution. During Japan's long and brutal occupation of China during the 1930s and 1940s, a special unit of the Japanese Army, known as Unit 731, experimented on Chinese soldiers and civilians with gas and germ warfare. Unit 731, led by General Ishii Shiro, carried out vast war crimes. For instance, they tested the effects of anthrax bombs on human beings and injected Chinese soldiers and civilians with tetanus, smallpox and plague. Of the human remains studied by the US in 1947, anthrax accounted for 31 deaths; cholera, 50; mustard gas, 16; plague, 106; typhoid, 22; and typhus, 9. Many more diseases were also tested. The Russians wanted to put members of Unit 731, including Shiro, on trial, but the US granted them immunity. In return, the US were given the results of their experiments. As historians Robert Harris and Jeremy Paxman have written, *'The US was indeed shielding Japanese bacteriologists from war crimes charges in return for data on human experimentation'*. This information was hidden for 30 years after the war.
18. **Use of chemical weapons in the Vietnam War.** The US launched the first biochemical war since the First World War in Vietnam. The US used CS gas against National Liberation Front guerrillas and used defoliants such as the infamous Agent Orange. By 1970, 'Operation Ranch Hand' dumped 12 million gallons of Agent Orange on Vietnam, destroying 4.5 million acres of vegetation in the Vietnamese countryside and poisoning it for years to come. The slogan of Ranch Hand supporters was *'only we can prevent forests.'* Agent Orange contained dioxin, one of the deadliest cancer-causing chemicals on earth. The use of Agent Orange by the US has caused agony for hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese people and American soldiers and their families.
19. **The rationale behind America's support for the Biological and Chemical weapons conventions.** In 1972 President Richard Nixon announced that the US was halting its chemical and biological weapons programme. This was not done for any altruistic purposes but because the administration had realised that the technologies needed to produce these weapons would, in time, become so widespread that proliferation would be inevitable. The production of these weapons would be much cheaper and easier than nuclear weapons. Thus it would be difficult to maintain a monopolistic position with respect to these weapons. Following the US decision on these weapons, the Biological Weapons Conventions [BWC] opened for signature on 10 April 1972, and entered into force on 26 March 1975, and the Chemicals Weapons Convention opened for signature on 13 January 1993 and entered into force on 29 April 1997. Similar to the nuclear arm control treaties, the chemical and biological treaties were

either highly discriminatory or selectively applied by the US. The Security Council can investigate complaints, but this power has never been invoked. Security Council voting rules give China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States veto power over Security Council decisions, including those to conduct BWC investigations. In July 2002 the US rejected an enforcement protocol of this treaty primarily out of concerns for its own domestic interests.

20. **Current bio/chemical-weapons developments.** On 4 September 2001 the New York Times revealed that the US Central Intelligence Agency's [CIA] bio defence researchers, under the pretext of defensive work, had tested mock biological bombs and built a real bio weapons production facility in Nevada, activities completely indistinguishable from offensive biological warfare research. The US kept these activities secret and did not divulge them in annual confidence building reports to the Bio Weapons Convention. These defensive studies that the US has been undertaking can be easily translated into biological weapons. For example, the anthrax attacks of October 2001 that occurred in the US appear to have been initiated by domestic scientists from within the US biological warfare laboratories.
21. **US relationship with Bio/chemical-weapons conventions.** As regards the Chemical Weapons Convention, it is enforced by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons who inspects laboratories and factories, and oversees the destruction of weapons they may contain. The US forced the organisation to remove its director general - Jose Bustani. His crime was his desire to examine the US with the same rigour applied anywhere else and to invite Saddam Hussein to sign up to the Chemical Weapons Convention. In contrast to the US approach in asking for intrusive Iraqi weapons inspections, the US will not even contemplate applying any inspection rules to itself. In 1997, the US Senate passed the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act. Section 307 stipulates, *'The President may deny a request to inspect any facility in the United States in cases where the President determines that the inspection may pose a threat to the national security interest of the United States'*.
22. **US support for Iraq's bio/chemical weapons programmes.** The US has also played a role in the proliferation of these weapons. In 1998 a Channel 4 news broadcast in the UK, claimed that they had come across US intelligence documents that showed that 14 consignments of biological materials had been exported from the US to Iraq. These included 19 batches of anthrax bacteria and 15 batches of botulinum, the organism that causes botulism. The programme indicated that they had seen proof that Iraq had bought a number of toxins after Iraq had used gas in an attack on the Kurdish town of Halabja in which 5,000 people were killed.

Conclusion

It is clear from the above that the West cannot be trusted in its possession of WMD. There has been systematic use of these weapons by the West on millions of innocent people in World War 1, World War 2, Vietnam and even on their own servicemen. This clearly demonstrates that the children of today and tomorrow should not be left to the lottery of future Western slaughter. It is apt to remind ourselves of the values that are present within Capitalist Western Governments by reiterating ourselves of what Major Foulkes, one of the early British architects of chemical weapons, said when he was sent to India in 1919. Pressurising the British military to use chemical weapons in their war against Afghanistan, he argued, *'Ignorance, lack of instruction and discipline, and the absence of protection on the part of Afghans and tribesmen will undoubtedly enhance the casualty producing value of mustard gas in frontier fighting'*.

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORY OF THE WEST'S NON-CONFORMITY WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW

One of the central planks of the argument waged on Iraq is the claim that Iraq is in breach of international law and has ignored countless UN resolutions. This chapter seeks to highlight the West's own contraventions of international law and the fact that the permanent five members have the right of veto, an option not allowed for nations such as Iraq.

The League of Nations and the United Nations

1. The Twentieth Century may become known as the Century of War. Following the two world wars where tens of millions of people lost their lives, many smaller conflicts resulted in the deaths of further millions. Whether it was the shock of the vast loss of life or the challenge to the balance of power, following the two world wars the remaining world powers came together to create an alliance to prevent further conflict. Thus following the First World War the League of Nations was born and after World War Two, the United Nations was born. Both organisations had the stated objective of maintaining the preservation of peace through international alliances. Both have failed to achieve their objectives of peace and security.
2. The League of Nations was formed in the aftermath of the Great War [1914-18]. President Woodrow Wilson of the US was one of its principle advocates with his 14 points which included items like the abolition of secret diplomacy by open covenants, freedom of the seas in peace and war, removal of international trade barriers wherever possible and so on. As a result of the League, a redesigned map of Europe and the Middle East emerged; Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, a reshaped Europe and, of course, a new Middle East. The modern Iraq was created by the League as was a new Palestine, Syria and Lebanon. However not all powers participated in the league; the US Congress prevented Germany from joining the League, and in 1933 she left.
3. From within the members of the League, the then world powers preferred to handle their own affairs; France occupied the Rhineland to force Germany to pay wartime reparations, and Italy occupied Corfu, both in 1923. Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 and the Spanish civil war, which began in 1936, further proved the League's impotence, especially when sanctions on Spain did not end the civil war.
4. Little nations did attempt to sway the giants. Whilst Eamon de Valera of Ireland was President of the League's council - the forerunner of the present-day Security Council - he proposed the League have a multinational force to stop the 1935 Italian aggression. He was even prepared to commit his own new and tiny Irish army to such a project, an offer that did not interest the major powers. *'We have been unable to bend our wills to sacrifice selfish advantage when it conflicts with justice to others,'* de Valera later complained [The Independent, 6 October 2002]. The USSR, a member since 1934, was expelled following the Soviet attack on Finland in 1939. Eventually the League was powerless to prevent the onset of World War II. In 1946 the League voted to affect its own dissolution, whereupon much of its property and organisation were transferred to the UN.
5. The United Nations is an organisation established by the world powers with the aim, in theory, of resolving international disputes that would otherwise lead to wars and loss of human life. The UN also promotes values such as human rights, which are in line with the values of the Western world powers. Yet despite the existence of this large organisation with the representatives of over 180 member-states present to resolve international disputes diplomatically, the world powers time and again bypass and

undermine this organisation to further their own interests. Presently, the United States, Britain, China, Russia and France make up the un-elected permanent membership of the Security Council of the United Nations. They have the power to veto any UN resolution that they do not agree with, thus preventing it from becoming law. It is for this reason you do not find any UN Security Council resolutions condemning the US's invasions of Panama, its use of chemical weapons in Vietnam or Russia's butchery in Chechnya.

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1991 was said to have breached international law and UN resolutions. Yet if Kuwait had been invaded by any of the permanent five Security Council members, the UN Security Council would have been powerless to act. Consequently the veto power given to the five main Security Council members enables them to block resolutions that may even have large international support. The US is well known for exercising her veto powers frequently to block resolutions that conflict with her own national interests. Still the UN is held up by many as a bastion of democracy and a bedrock of international objectivity.

6. With regards to the Middle Eastern issues, many resolutions have been blocked by American vetoes. The British publication *The Economist* recently attempted to illustrate the fact that there were no double standards between the use of force against Iraq and the lack of a military option against countries such as Israel. It was said the resolutions passed were legally different [*Economist* pp23-25 Oct 12-18 2002]. However this fails to take notice of the fact that countries such as America and Britain would not permit any resolutions to be passed authorising military force against Israel, despite the latter's occupation of land, its war crimes and systematic butchery of the civilian population. Recent US vetoes include; the call for a UN Observers Force in West Bank, Gaza, 2001; demands that Israel cease construction of settlements in east Jerusalem as well as all the other Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories, 1997; calls upon Israeli authorities to refrain from all actions or measures, including settlement activities 1997; confirmation that the expropriation of land by Israel in East Jerusalem is invalid and in violation of relevant Security Council resolutions and provisions of the Fourth Geneva convention; expressing support of the peace process, including the Declaration of Principles of 13 September 1993, 1995; NAM draft resolution to create a commission to send three Security Council members to Rishon Lezion, where an Israeli gunmen shot down seven Palestinian workers, 1990; the list goes on [See inserted table at the end of this section, where the US has vetoed several resolutions that condemn Israel].
7. In the summer of 2002 the US vetoed the renewal of the Bosnian mission, fearing that US troops serving overseas could be vulnerable to unjustified accusations by America's enemies before the new International Criminal Court [3 July 2002, BBC online]. This illustrates the drive by the US to support the UN only when it suits herself. Such selective adherence to international law, however, is part and parcel of the US's foreign policy, yet still it demands that Iraq stick rigidly to the same international law that it itself ignores and views with disdain. As Robin Theurkauf, Visiting Fellow at Yale University and wife of one of the September 11 victims said, *'We in the US like international law, specifically we like other nations to obey. However it is the height of hypocrisy to demand that others live up to their obligations while we aggressively reject the notion that we should submit to a legitimate international system of laws as part of a community of nations'* [Milan Rai, 'War Plan Iraq' p.205].
8. Human rights, a highly subjectively used term, are in theory recognised as fundamental by the United Nations and, as such, feature prominently in the Preamble of the Charter: *'... to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small...'* Whilst preaching the values adopted by the UN to the rest of the world, the world powers such as the US, Britain, Russia and others have all openly supported regimes that abuse their people and violate their basic rights. Whilst a separate section has been dedicated in this report specifically to this topic, it is important to note the manner in which the UN breaks its own

principles by remaining inactive whilst the world powers violate every basic right of people. When calling on the world to adhere to such 'universal' values, the US, Britain and others all openly support, morally and financially, regimes including Egypt and Uzbekistan who openly abuse people's rights.

9. Recently at a joint press conference with the UN Secretary General in Tashkent, Uzbek President Karimov lashed out in response to a question on human rights abuses in Uzbekistan. He said, *'I would like to answer the correspondent's question with a question,'* he said. *'Tell me, do you know a country in the world where human rights are not abused? Perhaps you could name one country in the world which has not abused human rights or where there are no facts connected with disregarding human rights?'* [Reuters, 18 October 2002]. Whilst preaching the values of human rights to everyone in the world and until 2001 even being a member of the UN Human Rights body, a Western nation like America does not have a blameless record when it comes to looking after people's basic rights. Reports by human rights groups highlight abuses in overcrowded US Prisons, including racism [CNN 6 October 1998], racism in the application of the death penalty [Amnesty International 16 October 2002], and police brutality highlighted in the infamous cases of Amado Dialo and Rodney King. The US's systematic annihilation of the indigenous Red Indian population for the sake of acquiring more land cannot be put aside either. Despite this, America and Britain, whose colonialist past needs no further comment, have the gall to lecture countries like Iraq on their appalling human rights record. Even Australia has been reported of abusing rights of refugees seeking nothing more than shelter in her territory. America and Britain are not alone amongst the major powers with grim records with regard to maintaining people's rights; Russia is also infamous for its atrocities in Chechnya as is China in Xinjiang.
10. Such abuses by world powers, members of the UN, the Security Council and members of the UN Human Rights body confirms that self interest is more important than people's rights, welfare, housing, employment or general human compassion.
11. 1994 saw the massacre of almost a million people in Central Africa. UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali accused the Hutu-dominated Rwandan Army of genocide against the Tutsi. At the height of the violence, the UN forces, lacking a mandate to protect civilians shamelessly abandoned Kigali and over the next few months the Rwandans, mostly Tutsi, were massacred. The RPF army pushed toward Kigali and a civil war ensued. The UN was present in the region. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the then UN Secretary General complained of a lack of will and support by the world powers particularly the United States to fulfil UN peace keeping operations. The Rwandan massacre could have been avoided though, as three UN members [Belgium, France and the US], two of whom were on the Security Council, were aware of the preparation of the massacre of the Tutsi's.

The following extract from Boutros Boutros-Ghali's biography exposes the fact that the world powers had knowledge of the ensuing massacre: *'A cable had been sent by General Dalaire to the UN Department of Peace-Keeping Operations [DPKO] reporting an informant's claim that weapons were being stockpiled by Hutu forces in preparation for mass killings of Tutsis. Dalaire requested authorisation to try to seize the weapons, but his request was denied by DPKO on the ground that the United Nations mandate for Rwanda did not cover such operations. The next day, January 12 1994, Dalaire acting under UN instructions, told the ambassadors of Belgium, France and the United States about the informant's report. In other words, the powers that could have acted to prevent the ensuing massacre – the United States, France and Belgium- had indisputably and immediately informed by the United Nations of the severity of the threat.'* [Boutros Boutros-Ghali, 'Unvanquished' 1998]. Once again a lack of will by world powers in leading positions in the UN led to the culmination of another human disaster. Unlike Iraq, Rwanda had no oil and was not situated within a strategic location.

Boutros-Ghali in his biography reminisces on this ongoing problem at the UN, '*Not so long ago the world thought it could recognize and then stop genocide. 'Never again' was the watchword. But here was genocide once more; in Cambodia, where more than a million victims fell to the Khmer Rouge; in the former Yugoslavia, where genocide was called 'ethnic cleansing'; in Somalia, where genocide by starvation resulted when warlords deliberately withheld food aid from the starving and sick and where 350,000 died before the security council decided to step in. In Rwanda close to a million people were killed in what was genocide without doubt, yet the Security Council did nothing.*' [Boutros Boutros-Ghali, 'Unvanquished' 1998].

12. The recent Earth summit in Johannesburg highlighted the difference between the first and third world and exposed the desire of world powers to avert environmental and third world aid targets. This lack of will from the developed world was old news as very little from the Earth Summit in Rio, Brazil in 1992 has been accomplished. Then the UN member states pledged to rehabilitate the world's environment by cutting down on current unsustainable consumption habits, which studies had concluded were exhausting the world's natural resources. Member nations who attended the Summit have reneged on their promises and failed to implement or ratify appropriate legislation or policies.
13. A WWF spokesman said that the US Government, led by the Bush administration, but also Canada and Australia, were essentially working hard to make sure nothing positive came out of the process. '*They're blocking absolutely any progress on concrete action plans and that's had a terrible domino effect here.*' [CNN, 7 June 2002]. Ten years later, critics say none of Rio's lofty goals have been accomplished. Some member nations have reneged on their promises, failing to implement or ratify appropriate legislation or policies. Subsidies provided by rich countries to local farmers were another issue of contention. According to the World Bank, subsidies to farmers in Europe and the United States total nearly US \$1 billion a day, seriously undermining the lot of producers in developing countries [AFP, 28 August 2002].
14. Consequently environmentalists criticised the world powers, in particular America, and protesters even heckled the speech given by the US Secretary of State Colin Powell at the Johannesburg Summit. Vandana Shiva, founder of India's Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology, said, '*the U.S. has no strategy.*' Referring in particular to privatisation, she said: '*They want us to close our eyes and say, 'Leave it all to the market,' and that hasn't worked.*' [Washington Post, 30 August 2002]. Republican politician, George Miller [D-Calif.], who attended the Johannesburg summit, joined critics of the Bush administration's proposals. '*The U.S. government is becoming somewhat obstructionist in meeting the goals of sustainable development,*' he said [Washington Post, 30 August 2002].
15. The US Government denied blame and instead focused responsibility on the third world. The US Secretary of State, Colin Powell criticised the African country of Zambia for refusing American food aid, which included genetically modified grain and which would have benefited US companies. This is the same US regime that has opposed increases in aid to the third world, while it colonises them through institutions like the IMF and the World Bank. The US also opposed a resolution at the UN Global Summit in Monterrey earlier this year to increase the aid target to 0.7% of the national income to the third world. Washington is already one of the least generous donors - despite being the world's largest economy - devoting just 0.1% of national output to its international aid effort [The Guardian, 23 January 2002]. Prior to the meeting the US sought to remove any mention of the internationally agreed development goals and of the suggestion that rich countries should meet the UN target of spending 0.7% of national income on aid.
16. It was well known that during the 1990s the US was holding back its dues to the UN; by the time America started to pay off these debts to the UN, they had reached \$1.5 billion.

America's reasoning for not paying sooner was not linked to any financial constraint, as during the 1990s it was going through a substantial economic boom on the back of the dot com mania. Faced with losing her vote in the general assembly and the increasing loss of influence within the organisation, Washington provided some of the money in 1999. But Washington likes to do things her own way and has balked at paying an expanded assessment for peacekeeping, has withheld money for some projects that it considers wasteful or biased and disputes the amount of tax that the United Nations pays for American employees in its tax equalisation program [New York Times, 28 June 1998].

Conclusion

International institutions such as the UN and the IMF are imperialistic organs designed to colonise the developing world including the Muslim world. Islamic jurisprudence prohibits Muslims from referring to these institutions in any instance of politics and ruling. However, as has been illustrated in chapter, nations such as America and Britain do not believe the concept of international law should be held above each country's national interest. It is therefore intellectually and politically bankrupt to attempt to justify a war on Iraq by using the argument of Iraq's breach of international law. It is clear that the use of the UN by the allies is a tactical move not a strategic one, which is why they have always held onto the unilateral route as a viable option. The propensity and determination to act unilaterally therefore is the final nail in the coffin of those who hold onto the argument that this dispute is about the eminence of the UN and international law.

U.S. Vetoes of UN Resolutions Critical of Israel - [1972-2002]

Vetoes: 1972-1982

Subject	Date & Meeting	US Rep Casting Veto	Vote
Palestine: Syrian-Lebanese Complaint. 3 power draft resolution 2/10784	9/10/1972	Bush	13-1, 1
Palestine: Examination of Middle East Situation. 8-power draft resolution [S/10974]	7/2/1973	Scali	13-1, 0 [China not partic.]
Palestine: Egyptian-Lebanese Complaint. 5-power draft power resolution [S/11898]	12/8/1975	Moynihan	13-1, 1
Palestine: Middle East Problem, including Palestinian question. 6-power draft resolution [S/11940]	1/26/1976	Moynihan	9-1,3 [China & Libya not partic.]
Palestine: Situation in Occupied Arab Territories. 5-power draft resolution [S/12022]	3/25/1976	Scranton	14-1,0
Palestine: Report on Committee on Rights of Palestinian People. 4-power draft resolution [S/121119]	6/29/1976	Sherer	10-1,4
Palestine: Palestinian Rights. Tunisian draft resolution. [S/13911]	4/30/1980	McHenry	10-1,4
Palestine: Golan Heights. Jordan draft resolution. [S/14832/Rev. 2]	1/20/1982	Kirkpatrick	9-1,5
Palestine: Situation in Occupied Territories, Jordan draft resolution [S/14943]	4/2/1982	Lichenstein	13-1,1
Palestine: Incident at the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. 4-power draft resolution	4/20/1982	Kirpatrick	14-1, 0
Palestine: Conflict in Lebanon. Spain draft resolution. [S/15185]	6/8/1982	Kirpatrick	14-1,0
Palestine: Conflict in Lebanon. France draft resolution. [S/15255/Rev. 2]	6/26/1982	Lichenstein	14-1
Palestine: Conflict in Lebanon. USSR draft resolution. [S/15347/Rev. 1, as orally amended]	8/6/1982	Lichenstein	11-1,3
Palestine: Situation in Occupied Territories, 20-power draft resolution [S/15895]	8/2/1983	Lichenstein	13-1,1

Security Council Vetoes/Negative voting 1983-present

Subject	Date	Vote
S. Lebanon: Condemns Israeli action in southern Lebanon. S/16732	9/6/1984	Vetoed: 13-1 [U.S.], with 1 abstention [UK]
Occupied Territories: Deplores 'repressive measures' by Israel against Arab population. S/19459.	9/13/1985	Vetoed: 10-1 [U.S.], with 4 abstentions [Australia, Denmark, UK, France]

Lebanon: Condemns Israeli practices against civilians in southern Lebanon. S/17000.	3/12/1985	Vetoed: 11-1 [U.S.], with 3 abstentions [Australia, Denmark, UK]
Occupied Territories: Calls upon Israel to respect Muslim holy places. S/17769/Rev. 1	1/30/1986	Vetoed: 13-1 [US], with one abstention [Thailand]
Lebanon: Condemns Israeli practices against civilians in southern Lebanon. S/17730/Rev. 2.	1/17/1986	Vetoed: 11-1 [U.S.], with 3 abstentions [Australia, Denmark, UK]
Libya/Israel: Condemns Israeli interception of Libyan plane. S/17796/Rev. 1.	2/6/1986	Vetoed: 10 -1 [US], with 4 abstentions [Australia, Denmark, France, UK]
Lebanon: Draft strongly deplored repeated Israeli attacks against Lebanese territory and other measures and practices against the civilian population; [S/19434]	1/18/1988	Vetoed 13-1 [US], with 1 abstention [UK]
Lebanon: Draft condemned recent invasion by Israeli forces of Southern Lebanon and repeated a call for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanese territory; [S/19868]	5/10/1988	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Lebanon: Draft strongly deplored the recent Israeli attack against Lebanese territory on 9 December 1988; [S/20322]	12/14/1988	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: Draft called on Israel to accept de jure applicability of the 4th Geneva Convention; [S/19466]	1988	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: Draft urged Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention, rescind the order to deport Palestinian civilians, and condemned policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories; [S/19780]	1988	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: Strongly deplored Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, and strongly deplored also Israel's continued disregard of relevant Security Council decisions.	2/17/1989	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: Condemned Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories.	6/9/1989	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: Deplored Israel's policies and practices in the occupied territories.	11/7/1989	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Occupied territories: NAM draft resolution to create a commission and send three security council members to Rishon Lezion, where an Israeli gunmen shot down seven Palestinian workers.	5/31/1990	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Middle East: Confirms that the expropriation of land by Israel in East Jerusalem is invalid and in violation of relevant Security Council resolutions and provisions of the Fourth Geneva convention; expresses support of peace process, including the Declaration of Principles of 9/13/1993	5/17/1995	Vetoed 14-1 [US]
Middle East: Calls upon Israeli authorities to refrain from all actions or measures, including settlement activities.	3/7/1997	Vetoed 14-1 [US]

Middle East: Demands that Israel cease construction of the settlement in east Jerusalem [called Jabal Abu Ghneim by the Palestinians and Har Homa by Israel], as well as all the other Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories	3/21/1997	Vetoed 13-1,1 [US]
Call for UN Observers Force in West Bank, Gaza	3/27/2001	Vetoed 9-1 [US], with four abstentions [Britain, France, Ireland and Norway]
Condemned acts of terror, demanded an end to violence and the establishment of a monitoring mechanism to bring in observers.	12/15/2001	Vetoed 12-1 [US] with two abstentions [Britain and Norway]

[Source: US State Department]

CHAPTER 3

THE WEST'S LOVE OF DICTATORIAL REGIMES

The British Government's dossier makes great attempts to justify a war based on Saddam Hussein's repressive regime. However there has long been an ignominious association of 'democratically elected' Western nations and 'dictatorial regimes' in the world. When benefit is the axiom around which politics in the West is conducted then international law, principles and 'ethical' foreign policies are conveniently discarded. Given this, it is of no surprise that the UK and US have been at the forefront of courting alliances with the most brutal of dictatorships over the best part of the last century and continue to do so today. In many instances they have installed, supported and removed leaders according to their respective national interests. Their alliance with the world's most reprehensible regimes has been explained away under euphemisms related to strategy, geo-politics and the like. This section of the dossier seeks to examine the West's track record of association with despotic regimes and brings forth documentary evidence of their collusion and support of the activities of brutal dictatorships. Readers should be left in no doubt as to the vacuous premise upon which the UK and US in particular have sought to impose laws and standards on the rest of the world's nations.

'Terrorists become any foreign people you don't like.' [Frank Furedi]

'If the Nuremberg laws were applied today, then every Post-War American president would have to be hanged.'
[Noam Chomsky]

1. The list of dictators, which the West has aided and abetted, is long and illustrious. It would require a substantial dossier in its own right to examine all. For information purposes we list the dictators:

Sani Abacha
Daniel Arap Moi
Jerry Rawlings
Yoweri Museveni
Muammar Gaddafi
Gamal Abdul Nasser
Anwar Sadat
Hosni Mubarak
Islam Karimov
Adeeb Shishkaly
Hosni As Zaim
Abdul Qareem Kassem
Hafez Al Assad
General Ayub Khan
General Yahya Khan
General Zia ul Haq
General Pervaiz Musharraf
General Suharto
Ferdinand Marcos
Pol Pot
Josef Stalin
Adolf Hitler
General Augustine Pinochet
Reza Pehlavi - Shah of Iran
Mobuto Sese Seko
Laurent Kabila
Robert Mugabe
Saddam Hussein

2. History will probably rank Josef Stalin and Adolph Hitler amongst the greatest mass murderers and tyrants of our time. The total killed by them numbers in the millions and this is only an estimate. It was however the West who have had a key treacherous role to play in their rise and in aiding them in their crimes.
3. George W. Bush's statement that *'The dictator of Iraq is a student of Stalin,'* is somewhat ironic. For it was the West, and the US in particular, who courted and made allies with arguably history's most brutal dictator during World War Two. Josef Stalin will go down in history as the most brutal dictator of our recent times. In 1932, Stalin ordered Ukraine starved to enforce collectivisation and crush Ukrainian nationalism. At least 8 million Ukrainians were murdered; others resorted to cannibalism. From 1917 to Stalin's death in 1953, the Soviet Union shot, tortured, beat, froze or starved to death at least 40 million of its people. Some Russian historians claim the true figure is even higher. However this did not stop the West in courting his friendship and help during World War Two in the name of the 'greater good'.
4. The rapport that wartime US President Roosevelt had with Stalin is well known. In his book, *'From Chronicles of Wasted Time: Number 2 The Infernal Grove,'* the English author Malcolm Muggeridge states on page 199: *'Roosevelt...did everything in their power to insure that, when Germany finally collapsed, Stalin easily occupied and dominated the countries adjoining his frontiers...and our young spy-masters [such as Kim Philby etc.] showed a like determination so to arrange matters that, in countries far away, he [Stalin] was presented with a well-armed, well-financed, and well-organized underground army.'* The US felt Russian participation was crucial to shape the post-war world order and so cutting deals with Stalin was seen as an essential strategic imperative. Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's closest aide, reflected this aspect of the President's thinking when he wrote: *'We simply cannot organize the world between the British and ourselves without bringing the Russians in as equal partners. For that matter, if things go well with Chiang Kai-shek, I would surely include the Chinese too.'* Amongst the British there was mild admiration for the killer of almost 20 million *'If I had to pick a negotiating team, Stalin would be my first choice,'* said Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary. In a meeting in Tehran in 1943 Churchill said *'Marshal Stalin can take his place beside the major figures in Russian history, and deserves to be known as 'Stalin the Great.'*" [Edward Radzinsky, 'Stalin'].
5. Alvin Finkel and Clement Leibovitz document British involvement with the Nazis most recently in the published work, *'The Chamberlain-Hitler collusion'*. The authors bring forth documentary evidence to suggest that contrary to the conventional belief that Britain can be proud of its role in World War Two wherein the entire nation stood up as one to defend democracy and the rights of smaller nations, and to defeat the tyranny of fascism, the British ruling class in fact found nothing abhorrent in the Nazis. They welcomed Hitler's regime [as they did Franco's and Mussolini's], encouraged Germany to re-arm, and fully expected to work in alliance with it, right up until 1939. The book dispels the idea that Chamberlain desired a deal with Hitler because he was naive or wanted to avoid bloodshed. Sir Neville Henderson, Britain's ambassador to Germany between 1937-39, wrote in October 1939 that, *'There are in fact many things in the Nazi organisation and social institutions...which we might study and adapt to our own nation and old democracy'*. As for Hitler, *'if he had known when and where to stop: even, for instance, after Munich and the Nuremberg decrees for the Jews, he would be acclaimed as a great world leader'*. For the British, the Nazis could have a free hand in Eastern and Central Europe. The British ruling class could accept Hitler's actions in Austria, Czechoslovakia, etc. That is, they could accept it up until the point Nazism threatened Britain's markets and colonies.
6. Finkel and Leibovitz highlight how the British ruling class was keen for Germany to re-arm because they saw in the Nazis a natural ally and potential saviour against communism. Chamberlain wrote to the King expressing the idea that Germany and

England would be, *'the two pillars of European peace and buttress against Communism'*. When in 1936 the Rhineland was re-militarised the cabinet actively opposed French plans to stop it. Cabinet minutes show that they felt that if the French plans succeeded, Hitler would be overthrown and the German Communists would benefit. This became the constant line of argument of the Chamberlain government. They would justify Germany's invasion of Austria in February 1938 on the grounds that the two countries had decided to peacefully unite. Hitler was told that, because of the large Sudeten German population in Czechoslovakia, Britain would not oppose *'her next goal'* - invasion. The British even signed the Anglo-German Naval Accord in 1935, which allowed Hitler to expand his war machine in direct contravention of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. The arrangement would involve Hitler having a *'free hand'* in Central and Eastern Europe, while the British Empire would be left alone. This was the real meaning of Chamberlain's proclamation of *'peace in our time'* - stability for the ruling class and to hell with Jews, Slavs, Romanians and any other undesirables, especially Communists. America's involvement with the so-called Nazi menace was rather more insidious than they would care to admit. Between 1929 and 1939, American industrial investment grew faster in Nazi Germany than in any other country.

7. More recently the US association with dictatorships and terrorist groups have involved training, funding and politically supporting the most brutal of regimes. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the states of Central and South America. Between 1981 and 1985 an American terrorist army, the Contra in Nicaragua, were trained, armed and funded by the CIA murdering 3,346 Nicaraguan children and teenagers and killing one or both parents of 6,236 children [Dianna Melrose, *'Nicaragua: The Threat of a Good Example'*, Oxfam, Oxford, 1985, p26]. Former CIA analyst David MacMichael gave reasons for this in evidence given to the International Court of Justice. The American terror he said was designed, *'to provoke cross border attacks by Nicaraguan forces and thus serve to demonstrate Nicaragua's aggressive nature'* and to pressure the Nicaraguan government *'to clamp down on civil liberties within Nicaragua itself, arresting its opposition, demonstrating its allegedly inherently totalitarian nature and thus increasing domestic dissent within the country.'* The aim was to destroy the Nicaraguan economy. In 1986 the World Court condemned the US for its *'unlawful use of force'* and illegal economic warfare against Nicaragua. The US responded by vetoing a UN resolution calling on all governments to observe international law in 1986 [Noam Chomsky, *'Western State Terrorism'*, p19].
8. According to the United States Commission on Human Rights, in a fifteen month period, more than 20,000 civilians in El Salvador were murdered by death squads related to or part of security forces trained by the United States and funded with \$523 million in US 'aid' [Centre for International Policy Aid memo, Washington, April 1981. See New York Times, 1 April 1981]. In Central America in the 1980s, after Congress had denied its funding, the US knowingly consented to drugs funding the CIA *'secret war'* against the Sandanistas. The Congressional hearings conducted by Senator John Kerry's sub-committee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International relations found that, *'on the basis of evidence, it is clear that the Contras knowingly received financial and material assistance from drug traffickers...In each case, one or another agency of the US government had information about the involvement...Indeed US policy makers were not immune to the idea that drug money was a perfect solution to the Contras' funding problems.'* [Report by the Sub Committee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy, December 1988 p36].
9. *'I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist because of the irresponsibility of its own people'*, Henry Kissinger US Secretary of State and National Security Adviser said. In September 1970 the left-wing candidate Salvador Allende gained power with 36.2% of the vote in the Chilean presidential elections. Ample documentary proof collated since then shows that it was the US involvement and financial assistance that allowed the rise of General Augustine Pinochet. General Pinochet who came to represent the military

regime ordered many of the purges. The coup in which General Augusto Pinochet seized power in 1973 was the bloodiest in Twentieth Century South America. More than 3,000 were killed in the September military onslaught, which began when fighter jets bombed the Presidential Palace while the democratically elected President, Salvador Allende, was still inside. It was the start of a 17-year rule by General Pinochet. Abundant documentary proof points to US involvement in the rise of Pinochet. Some of these documents and their details are briefed below.

10. **CIA, Notes on Meeting with the President on Chile, 15 September 1970:** These handwritten notes, taken by CIA director Richard Helms, record the orders of the President of the United States, Richard Nixon, to foster a coup in Chile. Helms' notes reflect Nixon's orders: 1 in 10 chance perhaps, but save Chile; worth spending; not concerned; no involvement of embassy; \$10,000,000 available, more if necessary; full-time job - best men we have; game plan; make the economy scream; 48 hours for plan of action. This presidential directive initiates major covert operations to block Allende's ascension to office, and promote a coup in Chile.
11. **CIA, Report of CIA Chilean Task Force Activities, 15 September to 3 November 1970, 18 November 1970:** The CIA prepared a summary of its efforts to prevent Allende's ratification as President and to foment a coup in Chile - track I and track II covert operations. The summary details the composition of the Task Force, headed by David Atlee Phillips, the team of covert operatives '*inserted individually into Chile*,' and their contacts with Col. Paul Winert, the US Army Attaché detailed to the CIA for this operation. It reviews the propaganda operations designed to push Chilean president Eduardo Frei to support '*a military coup which would prevent Allende from taking office on 3 November*'.
12. **CIA, Memorandum of Conversation of Meeting with Henry Kissinger, Thomas Karamessines, and Alexander Haig, 15 October 1970:** This memo records a discussion of promoting a coup in Chile, known as '*Track II*' of covert operations to block Allende. The three officials discuss the possibility that the plot of one Chilean military official, Roberto Viaux, might fail with '*unfortunate repercussions*' for US objectives.
13. **National Security Council, National Security Decision Memorandum 93, Policy Towards Chile, November 9, 1970:** This memorandum summarises the Presidential decisions regarding changes in US policy toward Chile following Allende's election. Written by Henry Kissinger and sent to the Secretaries of State, Defence, the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and the Director of Central Intelligence, this memo directs US agencies to adopt a '*cool*' posture towards Allende's government, in order to prevent his consolidation of power and '*limit [his] ability to implement policies contrary to US and hemisphere interests*.' The memo states that existing US assistance and investments in Chile should be reduced, and no new commitments undertaken. Furthermore, according to Kissinger's memo, '*close relations*' should be established and maintained with military leaders throughout Latin America to facilitate coordination of pressure and other opposition efforts.
14. **Department of State, Memorandum for Henry Kissinger on Chile, December 4, 1970:** In response to a 27 November directive from Kissinger, an inter-agency Ad Hoc Working Group on Chile prepared this set of strategy papers covering a range of possible sanctions and pressures against the new Allende government. These included a possible diplomatic effort to force Chile to withdraw or be expelled from the Organization of American States, as well as consultations with other Latin American countries '*to promote their sharing of our concern over Chile*.' The documents show that the Nixon administration did engage in an invisible economic blockade against Allende, intervening at the World Bank, IDB, and Export-Import bank to curtail or terminate credits and loans to Chile before Allende had been in office for a month. One of his

erstwhile allies was former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who became a personal friend of the zealous despot. In a letter sent in response to Pinochet's arrest in 1998 in the UK, she wrote, '*A lot has happened since then - and not much for the better. Today I break my self-denying ordinance and for a very good reason - to express my outrage at the callous and unjust treatment of Senator Pinochet.*'

Links with Suharto

15. When Suharto visited Washington in 1995 a Clinton administration official was quoted in the New York Times as saying that Suharto was '*our kind of guy.*' In 1965, when he toppled General Sukarno as leader of Indonesia, it is estimated that some half a million Indonesians were killed. Half a million constitutes one of the great slaughters in modern history. In East Timor, it is believed General Suharto's decisions have led to the deaths of 200,000 people or one-third of East Timor's population. In 1990 retired US diplomats and CIA officers, including former Ambassador to Indonesia Marshall Green, admitted helping the Indonesian military organise its mass killing. According to a report by States News Service, published in the Washington Post May 21, 1990, State Department and CIA officials at the US Embassy in Jakarta personally provided the names of thousands of local, regional and national leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party [PKI] to the armed forces, which then killed or detained most of those named.
16. A former political officer in the US Embassy in Jakarta, Robert Martens, was quoted as saying, '*They probably killed a lot of people and I probably have a lot of blood on my hands, but that's not all bad. There's a time when you have to strike hard at a decisive moment.*' Martens said he supplied the names to an aide to Adam Malik, the Indonesian foreign minister who played a prominent role in the planning of the military coup. The aide, Tirta Kentjana Adhyatman, who was interviewed in Jakarta, confirmed that he received lists of thousands of names from Martens and passed them on to Malik, who gave them in turn to Suharto's headquarters. The former State Department and CIA officials interviewed by States News Service in 1990 freely admitted that the purpose of the lists of PKI leaders was to organise mass killings. '*No one cared, so long as they were communists, that they were being butchered,*' said Howard Federspiel, who was an Indonesian expert working at the State Department when Suharto orchestrated the anti-communist pogrom. '*No one was getting very worked up about it.*'
17. Millions were killed outright or imprisoned in concentration camps where they died of torture, neglect and slave labour. Even an internal CIA report, leaked to the press in 1968, said that the Indonesian security forces killed 250,000 people in '*one of the greatest massacres of the twentieth century.*' In addition the US has supported the regime of Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines and indirectly aided the rise of the butcher Pol Pot in Cambodia

The West's role with Iraq during the Saddam era

18. Five years before Saddam Hussein's now infamous 1988 gassing of the Kurds, a key meeting took place in Baghdad that would play a significant role in forging close ties between Saddam Hussein and Washington. It happened at a time when Saddam was first alleged to have used chemical weapons. The meeting in late December 1983 paved the way for an official restoration of relations between Iraq and the US, which had been severed since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.
19. With the Iran-Iraq war escalating, President Ronald Reagan dispatched his Middle East envoy, a former secretary of defence under President Ford, to Baghdad with a hand-written letter to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and a message that Washington was willing at any moment to resume diplomatic relations. The envoy was no other than Mr Donald Rumsfeld. Rumsfeld's 19-20 December 1983 visit to Baghdad made him the

highest-ranking US official to visit Iraq in 6 years. He met Saddam and the two discussed *'topics of mutual interest,'* according to the Iraqi Foreign Ministry. *'[Saddam] made it clear that Iraq was not interested in making mischief in the world,'* Rumsfeld later told The New York Times. *'It struck us as useful to have a relationship, given that we were interested in solving the Mideast problems.'* Just 12 days after the meeting, on 1 January 1984, the Washington Post reported that the United States, *'in a shift in policy, has informed friendly Persian Gulf nations that the defeat of Iraq in the 3-year-old war with Iran would be 'contrary to US interests' and has made several moves to prevent that result.'*

20. In March of 1984, whilst the Iran-Iraq war grew more brutal by the day, Rumsfeld was back in Baghdad for meetings with then Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz. On the day of his visit, 24 March, UPI reported from the United Nations: *'Mustard gas laced with a nerve agent has been used on Iranian soldiers in the 43-month Persian Gulf War between Iran and Iraq, a team of UN experts has concluded... Meanwhile, in the Iraqi capital of Baghdad, US presidential envoy Donald Rumsfeld held talks with Foreign Minister Tarek Aziz [sic] on the Gulf war before leaving for an unspecified destination.'* The day before, the Iranian news agency alleged that Iraq launched another chemical weapons assault on the southern battlefield, injuring 600 Iranian soldiers. *'Chemical weapons in the form of aerial bombs have been used in the areas inspected in Iran by the specialists,'* the UN report said. *'The types of chemical agents used were bis- [2-chlorethyl]-sulfide, also known as mustard gas, and ethyl N, dimethyl phosphoramido cyanidate, a nerve agent known as Tabun.'*
21. Prior to the release of the UN report, the US State Department on 5 March 1984 had issued a statement saying, *'available evidence indicates that Iraq has used lethal chemical weapons.'* Commenting on the UN report, US Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick was quoted by The New York Times as saying, *'We think that the use of chemical weapons is a very serious matter. We've made that clear in general and particular '.* Compared with the rhetoric emanating from the current administration, based on speculations about what Saddam might have, Kirkpatrick's reaction was hardly a call to action. Most glaring is that Donald Rumsfeld was in Iraq as the 1984 UN report was issued and said nothing about the allegations of chemical weapons use, despite the State Department *'evidence'* on the contrary. The New York Times reported from Baghdad on 29 March 1984, *'American diplomats pronounce themselves satisfied with relations between Iraq and the United States and suggest that normal diplomatic ties have been restored in all but name.'*
22. A month and a half later, in May 1984, Donald Rumsfeld resigned. In November of that year, full diplomatic relations between Iraq and the US were fully restored. Two years later, in an article about Rumsfeld's aspirations to run for the 1988 Republican Presidential nomination, the Chicago Tribune Magazine listed among Rumsfeld's achievements helping to *'reopen US relations with Iraq'*. The Tribune failed to mention that this help came at a time when, according to the US State Department, Iraq was actively using chemical weapons. Throughout the period that Rumsfeld was Reagan's Middle East envoy, Iraq was frantically purchasing hardware from American firms, sales legitimised by the White House. The buying frenzy began immediately after Iraq was removed from the list of alleged sponsors of terrorism in 1982. According to a 13 February 1991 Los Angeles Times article, *'First on Hussein's shopping list was helicopters -- he bought 60 Hughes helicopters and trainers with little notice. However, a second order of 10 twin-engine Bell 'Huey' helicopters, like those used to carry combat troops in Vietnam, prompted congressional opposition in August, 1983... Nonetheless, the sale was approved.'*
23. In 1984, according to The LA Times, the State Department, in the name of *'increased American penetration of the extremely competitive civilian aircraft market'* pushed through the sale of 45 Bell 214ST helicopters to Iraq. The helicopters, worth some \$200 million, were originally designed for military purposes. The New York Times later reported that Saddam *'transferred many, if not all [of these helicopters] to his military'*. In 1988, Saddam's forces attacked Kurdish civilians with poisonous gas from Iraqi helicopters and planes. US

intelligence sources told The LA Times in 1991, they *'believe that the American-built helicopters were among those dropping the deadly bombs.'*

24. In response to the gassing, sweeping sanctions were unanimously passed by the US Senate that would have denied Iraq access to most US technology. The White House threw out the measure. Senior officials later told reporters they did not press for punishment on Iraq at the time because they wanted to shore up Iraq's ability to pursue the war with Iran. Extensive research uncovered no public statements by Donald Rumsfeld publicly expressing even remote concern about Iraq's use or possession of chemical weapons until the week Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990, when he appeared on an ABC news special. Eight years later, Donald Rumsfeld signed on to an *'open letter'* to President Clinton, calling on him to eliminate *'the threat posed by Saddam'*. It urged Clinton to, *'provide the leadership necessary to save ourselves and the world from the scourge of Saddam and the Weapons of Mass Destruction that he refuses to relinquish.'* In 1984, Donald Rumsfeld was in a position to draw the world's attention to Saddam's chemical threat. He was in Baghdad as the UN concluded that chemical weapons had been used against Iran. He was armed with a fresh communication from the State Department that it had *'available evidence'* Iraq was using chemical weapons, but Rumsfeld said nothing.
25. Washington now speaks of Saddam's threat and the consequences of a failure to act. Despite the fact that the administration has failed to provide even a shred of concrete proof that Iraq has links to Al Qaeda or has resumed production of chemical or biological agents, Rumsfeld insists that, *'the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.'* However there is evidence of the absence of Donald Rumsfeld's voice at the very moment when Iraq's alleged threat to international security first emerged - and in this case, the evidence of absence is indeed evidence.
26. The UK's role in the pre-Gulf War rise of Saddam is suppressed by the Government. In defiance of UN guidelines, Margaret Thatcher's government in the 1980s, and then John Major's in the 1990s, covertly approved arms sales to Saddam Hussein. These were used in the Iran-Iraq war, against rebel Kurdish villagers and to aid Saddam's nuclear programme. The report, by High Court judge Sir Richard Scott, revealed a web of conspiracy, intrigue and profiteering going to the heart of government. Major's Conservative government survived the 26 February House of Commons debate on Scott by a single vote; with several Tories voting with the Labour opposition. The origins of the scandal show that in the 1980s under the arms-export drive by Thatcher, her son Mark became an unofficial roaming salesman for British arms companies. Mark Thatcher earned himself an estimated \$160 million in commissions in the process, including up to \$40 million from a single deal with Saudi Arabia.
27. While sales to most dictatorial regimes caused no particular diplomatic problems [the only protests being from the political left], sales to Iran and Iraq were a different matter. This potentially huge market was stymied by the UN restrictions on sales to both countries, then in the middle of a war in which 1 million people died. The potential loss of the Iraqi market was keenly felt, between 1970 and 1990 Britain supplied the Saddam regime with a vast array of equipment, from VIP armoured cars to tank spares and sophisticated communications equipment. It is now known that British firms supplied weapons to both sides in the 1980's by the simple device of sending them to intermediary countries, which then re-exported them. The British company BMARC, of which former Tory minister Jonathan Aitken was a director, supplied hundreds of light naval guns to Singapore, a country not renowned for the huge size of its navy. Those guns found their way to Iran. Favourite staging posts for Iraq-bound weapons were Oman and Jordan. In 1986 Swedish Customs discovered a European cartel, including British firms, supplying explosives via Jordan.

However some have argued, as President Clinton did at his recent speech to the Labour

Party Conference, that the West has made mistakes - that it has coddled dictators but this should act as a catalyst to clean up the situation by removing the Iraqi regime. This twisted logic may have impressed the Labour party delegates but they should not impress any aware observer who studies the current international political situation. Rather than learning from their past *'mistakes'* in the aftermath of the 9-11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, the West in its so-called War on Terrorism still has as its allies the most odious of dictators.

The Northern Alliance

28. The West's Afghan friends in the war against terrorism and the Taliban included vitriolic anti-Americans, basic rights violators, one-time allies of Osama bin Laden and soldiers of the former communist regime. Officially, they were known as the United Islamic Front for the Salvation of Afghanistan. Unofficially, they called themselves the Northern Alliance. US officials provided weapons to the alliance's estimated 15,000 troops, on top of the non-military aid Washington has been giving since 1998. The News Media responded by calling these allies Afghanistan's new freedom fighters. *'They may not be perfect,'* acknowledged Mike Vickers, a former officer with the US Central Intelligence Agency and now director of strategic studies for the Washington-based Centre for Strategic and Budgeting Assessments, *'but the Northern Alliance does have some good elements.'*
29. *'The US and its allies should not co-operate with commanders whose record of brutality raises questions about their legitimacy inside Afghanistan,'* said Sidney Jones, executive director of the Asia division of Human Rights Watch. Human Rights Watch urged in particular that no cooperation be extended to Abdul Rashid Dostum, the head of the Junbish militia; Haji Muhammad Muhaqqiq, a senior commander of Hizb-i Wahdat; Abdul Rasul Sayyaf, leader of the erstwhile Ittihad-i Islami; and Abdul Malik Pahlawan, a former senior Junbish commander. Gary Leupp, in CounterPunch.org on 16 July 2002 reported that, *'These US allies are rapists. As early as 1996, the US State Department's own report on human rights in Afghanistan concluded that the forces led by [the now lionized] Ahmed Shah Massood systematically raped and killed Hazara women in Kabul in March 1995: 'Massood's troops went on a rampage, systematically looting whole streets and raping women.' Since their return to power, Northern Alliance forces have returned to their old habits...'*
30. Violations of international humanitarian law committed by United Front factions include: Late 1999 - early 2000: Internally displaced persons who fled from villages in and around Sangcharak district recounted summary executions, burning of houses, and widespread looting during the four months that the area was held by the United Front. Several of the executions were reportedly carried out in front of members of the victims' families. Those targeted in the attacks were largely ethnic Pashtuns and, in some cases, Tajiks. 20-1 September 1998: Several volleys of rockets were fired at the northern part of Kabul, with one hitting a crowded night market. Estimates of the number of people killed ranged from 76 to 180. The attacks were generally believed to have been carried out by Massood's forces, which were then stationed about twenty-five miles north of Kabul. A spokesperson for United Front commander Ahmad Shah Massood denied targeting civilians. In a 23 September 1998 press statement, the International Committee of the Red Cross described the attacks as indiscriminate and the deadliest that the city had seen in three years. Late May 1997: Some 3,000 captured Taliban soldiers were summarily executed in and around Mazar-i Sharif by Junbish forces under the command of Gen. Abdul Malik Pahlawan. The killings followed Malik's withdrawal from a brief alliance with the Taliban and the capture of the Taliban forces, which were trapped in the city. Some of the Taliban troops were taken to the desert and shot, while others were thrown down wells and then blown up with grenades. 5 January 1997: Junbish planes dropped cluster munitions on residential areas of Kabul. Several civilians were killed and others wounded in the indiscriminate air raid, which also involved the use of conventional bombs. March 1995: Forces of the faction operating under Commander

Massood, the Jamiat-i Islami, were responsible for rape and looting after they captured Kabul's predominantly Hazara neighbourhood of Karte Seh from other factions. According to the U.S. State Department's 1996 report on human rights practices in 1995, *'Massood's troops went on a rampage, systematically looting whole streets and raping women.'* On the night of 11 February 1993 Jamiat-i Islami forces and those of another faction, Abdul Rasul Sayyaf's Ittihad-i Islami, conducted a raid in West Kabul, killing and *'disappearing'* ethnic Hazara civilians, and committing widespread rape. Estimates of those killed range from around seventy to more than one hundred.

31. In addition, the parties that constitute the United Front have committed other serious violations of 'internationally recognised rights'. In the years before the Taliban took control of most of Afghanistan, these parties had divided much of the country among themselves while battling for control of Kabul. In 1994 alone, an estimated 25,000 were killed in Kabul; most of them civilians killed in rocket and artillery attacks. One-third of the city was reduced to rubble, and much of the remainder sustained serious damage. There was virtually no rule of law in any of the areas under the factions' control. In Kabul, Jamiat-i Islami, Ittihad, and Hizb-i Wahdat forces all engaged in rape, summary executions, arbitrary arrest, torture, and *'disappearances'*. In Bamiyan, Hizb-i Wahdat commanders routinely tortured detainees for extortion purposes. Senior members of the alliance, including former Afghan president Burhanuddin Rabbani and northern warlord Abdul Rashid Dostum, a key ally of the Soviet Union during that country's attempt to occupy Afghanistan, have been cited by the US itself for human rights abuses. At other times the various factions have cheerfully massacred one another. In 1993, according to the non-governmental organisation, Human Rights Watch, Rabbani's Society of Islam killed 70 to 100 members of the Hazara minority linked to the rival Party of Islamic Unity, another member of the Northern Alliance.
32. Two years later, according to the US State Department, Rabbani forces - under the command of Ahmed Shah Massood [celebrated by Western journalists as the *'Lion of the Panjshir'* until his assassination] - went on another anti-Hazara rampage *'systematically looting whole streets and raping women'*. General Dostum's career is abhorrent. From 1979 to 1992, he was allied with the communist government in Kabul. As that government was about to fall, Dostum switched loyalties to join the anti-communist mujahideen *'freedom fighters'*. When the various mujahideen factions had a falling out, he first allied himself with Rabbani to fight Hekmatyar. Later, he joined Hekmatyar to fight Rabbani. By 1995, he was supporting the Taliban against both Hekmatyar and Rabbani. By 1996, he was allied with his two former enemies against the Taliban.
33. The Northern Alliance funded much of its war effort from the heroin trade. According to the US State Department, virtually the entire Afghan opium crop in 2002 - about 77 tonnes - was grown in territories controlled by the alliance. Russian media report that the heroin manufactured from that opium is smuggled to Europe and America through neighbouring states such as Tajikistan. Vickers, the former CIA agent, acknowledged the difficulty of backing a Northern Alliance that is not really an alliance. He said, rather tamely however, that the US had little choice. *'The Taliban is the central objective here. Air power won't deal with them. We will need ground forces. The question is: Whose ground forces? That's why the opposition looks attractive... They may not be perfect. But the question is: Is it better to use them or to use Western ground troops?'*

Conclusion

The above documented accounts are merely a sample of the evidence of duplicity, corruption and criminality displayed by the West in its association with despots, tyrants and dictators past and present. It calls into question the role of the West in leading and shaping world affairs. When examined in conjunction with the West's accumulation of WMD, her duplicitous standards and application of International Law and the general

degradation of Western society, the neutral observer should be in no doubt that it is Capitalism that is the evil of our times. Its values and beliefs of freedom, democracy and materialism are the driving force for much of the world's evil and fanaticism.

CHAPTER 4

HOW THE WEST REPRESSES THE RIGHTS OF ITS OWN CITIZENS

Western propaganda seeks to justify a war against Iraq based on the latter's repression of its own citizens. Yet when we look towards the Western world we also find citizens being repressed in a whole litany of issues related to life. This chapter categorically shows that the world is not enamoured with the US and its Capitalist way of life. It is also proposed that if the citizens of the US were not so beguiled by the Goebbels-esq diet of propaganda fed to them they too would have a similar attitude to their own government. There are many violations of basic rights that occur in the West, particularly in America, but yet the common people are unaware of them. The mantra of Washington DC and Trendy London has made the people blind to the inhumane activities occurring on their own doorstep. It is further suggested that if the American people were to snap out of their American dream, George W. Bush would not only be asking why do they hate us, but he would be asking why do our own subjects hate us?

1. Robbie Burns wrote, *'I would that God gift would give us, to see ourselves as other see us'*. Here, the Scottish bard articulated his view that it is a blessing to be able to see one's own foibles and flaws. Most of us appreciate the importance of self-examination in the process of self-improvement. When fair and just self-examination is not present it leads to arrogance. For a nation not to see itself as the rest of the world sees it, this leads to the reinforcement of myths and inaccurate self-perceptions. When this occurs in a nation that is powerful, the net result is a state full of criticisms for others whilst being oblivious of its own manifest problems. When this occurs in a *'hyper power'*, possessing WMD, it results in a troubled world soaked in human blood and teetering on the edge of annihilation.
2. This inability of the US to see itself as the rest of the world sees it, was illustrated when a woman ran to the microphone of a film crew, from the dust cloud in down town Manhattan in September 2001 and said simply, *'why?'* Since then the phrase *'why do they hate us?'* has been oft repeated. It is repeated in newsprint, television broadcasts and radio comment ad nauseam. As for those of us out with the milieu Americana the only thing we find surprising about the asking of the question *'why?'* is that the US is so sincerely surprised that people hate them. We are only able to say this because we see the US as outsiders. Many of us, perhaps naively, thought there were ample indicators of the world's sentiments regarding the US.

Thought control

3. We do intend to justify our assertion that the predicament of the average American is indeed dire. However before addressing this it is important to outline how the mindset of the average American has been moulded in a particular manner enabling them to accept this state of affairs. Both the Ba'athists and the US insist that their system is the envy of the world. Both the Ba'athists and the US insist that their citizens should be grateful that they are Iraqi and American, respectively. The techniques of propaganda have many parallels with those used by the Ba'athist regime.
4. This is exemplified in the comment that was printed in the US media over the last year. For example, The New York Observer's columnist Richard Brookhiser [17 September 2001] described the US as: *'...an empire of capitalism and democracy. New York City is also perceived as the hub of one of those subsystems, the roaring dynamo of wealth. Anyone in the world, who*

looks at his lot and is unhappy, looks at us — country and city — and sees an alternative. If he has an aspiring frame of mind, he may try to come here or imitate us. If he has an aggrieved frame of mind, he will hold us responsible. If he has the resources of a hostile nation, or its functional equivalent, he will try to kill us. . . The world's losers hate us because we are powerful, rich and good [or at least better than they are]. When those who acted on that hatred have been repaid, seven times seven, we will rebuild the World Trade Towers, with one more story, just to rub it in.'

5. This false notion that the world is envious of the US is a line that the US media and politicians spin continually. Military historian, Victor Davis Hanson wrote in *City Journal* [25 February 2002], *'they hate us because their culture is backward and corrupt'* and because *'they are envious of our power and prestige'*. This maxim that the *'world is jealous of us'* is obviously for the home market. This type of propaganda helps create a quiescence climate of contentment. Furthermore nobody outside the US is ignorant enough to believe this.

6. In the period following 11 September 2001 there were few printed words of dissent from this official US line. Anyone who did not express complete deference to this standpoint were marked men and women. The Guardian [17 January 2002] aptly summed up the point, *'Within days of the deaths in New York and Washington, anyone, it seemed, who had ever been publicly critical of America or globalisation suddenly found themselves accused of complicity with Osama bin Laden - and worse. In the British press alone, they have been described as 'defeatist' and 'unpatriotic', 'nihilist' and 'masochistic', and both 'Stalinist' and 'fascist'; as 'Baader Meinhof gang', 'the hand - maidens of Osama' and 'an auxiliary to dictators'; as 'limp', 'wobbly', 'heartless and stupid'; and 'worm eaten by Soviet propaganda'; as full of 'loose talk', 'wilful self-delusion' and 'intellectual decadence'; as a collection of 'useful idiots', 'dead-eyed zombies'; and 'people who hate people'*

7. Returning back to the deferential style of the US media, there are thousands of examples that could be quoted to illustrate how the US has masqueraded herself as the force for good in the world, whilst actually being a pernicious force for death and destruction. However there is one particular example of jingoistic claptrap that really speaks volumes about the nature of the US government, people and media. Rich Lowry wrote a web article for National Review online – *'America's premier conservative website'* – *'Lots of sentiment for nuking Mecca'*. In which he commented: *'This is a tough one, and I don't know quite what to think. Mecca seems extreme, of course, but then again few people would die and it would send a signal. Religions have suffered such catastrophic setbacks before...And, as a general matter, the time for seriousness - including figuring out what we would do in retaliation, so maybe it can have a slight deterrent effect - is now rather than after thousands and thousands more American casualties'* [R. Lowry, *'Lots of Sentiment for Nuking Mecca'*, National Review online, www.nationalreview.com/thecorner].

8. Is this a threat? Is this a promise? Is this merely macho bravado? What ever it is, one should pause for a moment and contemplate how this statement fits in with the current discussion of WMD. It should be remembered that the US has such weapons, and the voice of right wing America has sounded. Bravado or not, emotive language like this should be a wake up call to the inhabitants of this world, Muslim and Non-Muslim. Perhaps this is not quite the view of the man on the street. The average American is interested in sports and movies and not reading obscure web pages of right wing drivel. When the Hollywood film *Rules of Engagement* was released it was widely condemned by many Arab-American groups. One group said of it *'probably the most vicious anti-Arab racist film ever made by a major Hollywood studio'*. In a film review that appeared on film.com, Peter Brunette said, *'the audience I saw the film with cheered when the Marines slaughtered the civilians'* [*'Down Right Offensive'*, film.com]. Robert Bowman, a Vietnam veteran and

presently Bishop of the United Catholic Church in Melbourne Beach, Florida said, *'We are not hated because we practice democracy, value freedom, or uphold human rights. We are hated because our government denies these things to people in Third World countries whose resources are coveted by our multinational corporations. That hatred we have sown has come back to haunt us in the form of terrorism and in the future, nuclear terrorism.'* [The National Catholic Reporter, 2 October 1998].

'We need a common enemy to unite us' - Condeleeza Rice, March 2000

9. American needs some way of coming to terms with its many internal problems. The method of choice for managing them is not to confront them, but to divert attention away from them. This has been the case for issues such as US infant mortality, life expectancy for urban black males and living conditions for certain sectors of the US community. Thirty-six million Americans do not have enough to eat, and the number is growing. Nearly half of those lining up outside soup kitchens have one or more family members in employment. They are simply too poor to buy food. The have's repudiate the have-not's, saying, *'Why don't you get a job'*. Few realise that, less than 1.1 percent of the people removed from the welfare rolls by the welfare reform in 1996 will ever get a job that pays a living wage. On minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour, working 50 hours a week there will still not be enough to pay rent and feed a family living in any major US city. That is to say nothing of clothes and any other necessities. This is just the issue of poverty. Crime, drugs and alcohol addiction, the breakdown in family structure as well as a whole raft of other social problems all further distance the American peoples from Thomas Jefferson's system based on the pursuit of happiness.
10. The main instrument used to sweep America's problems under the rug is the media. This may seem like a cliché, but propaganda utility is something that cannot be overstated. At times of war, such as this War Against Terror, the reality of this slogan becomes particularly apparent. As General Douglas MacArthur said: *'One cannot wage war under present conditions without the support of public opinion, which is tremendously moulded by the press and other forms of propaganda.'* In addition to this sentiment that sweeps the nation there are many other effects that the media industry have on the nation. By-products such as greed and mass consumerism are issues that result in the oppression of Joe Public by corporate America with the wholehearted approval of the government.
11. A brief review of the media industry is necessary to illustrate how this industry serves no one but itself and a corrupt central government. In 1983 media ownership was concentrated in the hands of 50 trans-national conglomerates [Ben Bagdikian: *The Media Monopoly*]. Today this is reduced to just nine firms that dominate the US and global media. These being AOL-Time-Warner, Disney, Bertelsmann, Viacom, News Corporation, TCI, General Electric [owner of NBC], Sony [owner of Columbia and TriStar Pictures and major recording interests], and Seagram [owner of Universal film and music interests]. So one global super-industry now provides virtually everything that Americans see and hear on the screen, over the airwaves, in print and on the Internet. These companies function as a powerful political lobby at the national, regional and global levels. In Washington, they spend an estimated \$125 million per year lobbying against ownership restrictions. They not only have a heavy hand in drafting national laws and regulations, but also play an important part in shaping and directing international rules and regulations. In 2000, for example, Big-Media lobbied to initiate trade with China, and drowned out those who raised concerns about free speech and a free press. They also used US levers to prise open up Indian markets to satellite television.

12. Much of what this media Mafia purveys to America is mere propaganda. This includes news, which is another version of the entertainment that the media cartel also offers. These services are not for the good of the people. They come at a price, and not just financial. *'Whereas we need to know the truth about such corporations, they often have an interest in suppressing it [as do their advertisers]. And while it takes much time and money to find out the truth, the parent companies prefer to cut the necessary costs of journalism, much preferring the sort of lurid fare that can drive endless hours of agitated jabbering. [Prior to 9/11, it was Monica, then Survivor and Chandra Levy, whereas, since the fatal day, we have had mostly anthrax, plus much heroic footage from the Pentagon.] The cartel's favoured audience, moreover, is that stratum of the population most desirable to advertisers - which has meant the media's complete abandonment of working people and the poor. And while the press must help protect us against those who would abuse the powers of government, the oligopoly is far too cosy with the White House and the Pentagon, whose faults, and crimes, it is unwilling to expose. The media's big bosses want big favours from the state, while the reporters are afraid to risk annoying their best sources. Media devoted to the public interest would investigate the poor performance by the CIA, the FBI, the FAA and the CDC, so that those agencies might be improved for our protection - but the news teams [just like Congress] haven't bothered to look into it. So, too, in the public interest, should the media report on all the current threats to our security - including those far-rightists targeting abortion clinics and, apparently, conducting bio terrorism; but the tele-journalists are unconcerned... So should the media high-light, not play down, this government's attack on civil liberties - the mass detentions, secret evidence, increased surveillance, suspension of attorney-client privilege, the encouragements to spy, the warnings not to disagree, the censored images, sequestered public papers, unexpected visits from the Secret Service and so on. And so should the media not parrot what the Pentagon says about the current war, because such prettified accounts make us complacent and preserve us in our fatal ignorance of what people really think of us - and why - beyond our borders. And there's much more - about the stunning exploitation of the tragedy, especially by the Republicans; about the links between the Bush and the bin Laden families; about the ongoing shenanigans in Florida - that the media would let the people know, if they were not... indifferent to the public interest.'* [Mark C Miller, 'The Nation', 7 January 2001].

Paradigm of Democracy

13. The recent Iraqi elections were much ridiculed in the Western and global press. The Ba'athist regime is indeed ridiculous and deserves whatever lampooning is directed its way with regard to cheap gimmicks. However cheap tricks are not the sole monopoly of Saddam. One of the key issues that the American people have been kept in the dark about is the process of democracy itself. Very few people in the whole Union understand the system of Electoral College. This is just as well as when it runs smoothly nobody questions it, and when it does not run so smoothly nobody cares. The 2000 presidential elections illustrate exactly how undemocratic the US system actually is. More importantly the 2000 elections show how the American people were duped and how Big Media and the government treated the common man with utter contempt.
14. Throughout the world there are various forms of democracies, each implemented with its own individual complexities. The US Presidential electoral system is where he who gains the greatest number of votes from individual voters across the whole country does not necessarily become President. Individual votes do not elect the President directly; rather they determine the makeup of the Electoral College, which is apportioned on a state-by-state basis. The number of Electors [the people who form the Electoral College] allocated to each state is proportionate to its population. Different states have different arrangements for the selection of their Electors. In some states candidates get Electors proportionate to their vote, whilst in others, it is winner-take-all. In order to become President it is necessary to build up the right chequerboard of support in particular states. An enormous majority in the popular vote in one particular state, or even a

number of states, may not affect to the overall outcome of the election. Where there is a close call, voters representatives, the professional politicians in Congress, choose the president. In 2000 the decision of the Supreme courts terminated the laborious procedure and handed the election to George W. Bush. In the summer of 1999 Katherine Harris, George W. Bush's presidential campaign co-chairman and the Florida secretary of state in charge of elections, paid \$4 million to Database Technologies to go through Florida's voter register and remove anyone 'suspected' of being a former felon. This was done with the approval of the governor of Florida, George W. Bush's brother Jeb. Florida's law stated that ex-felons cannot vote - thus 31 percent of all black men in Florida were prohibited from voting because they had a felony on their record. Black Floridians, overwhelmingly, are Democrats. This was demonstrated when Al Gore did receive the votes of more than 90 percent of them on November 7, 2000. That is, 90 percent of those who were allowed to vote. It appeared that mass electoral fraud was committed in Florida. They not only removed thousands of black felons from the rolls, they also removed thousands of black citizens who had never committed a crime in their lives - along with thousands of eligible voters who had committed only misdemeanours.

15. The result was that 173,000 registered voters in Florida were permanently wiped off the voter rolls. In Miami-Dade, Florida's largest county, 66 percent of the voters who were removed were black. In Tamassee County, 54 percent of those who would be denied the right to vote on 7 November 2000 were black. Needless to say that there were all manner of dirty tricks played out in Florida, probably too numerous to mention. However the net results was that a President was elected who won a minority of the vote. The New York Times summed up some of the shenanigans in Florida; 344 ballots had no evidence that they were cast on or before Election Day, 183 ballots were postmarked in the US, 96 ballots lacked appropriate witness information, 169 ballots came from unregistered voters, had envelopes that weren't signed properly, or came from people who had not requested a ballot, 5 ballots came after the November 17 deadline, 19 overseas voters voted on two ballots - and had both counted. All of these ballots violated Florida law, yet they all were counted. To cut a long story short the US is no paradigm of democracy.

American Dream

16. Apart from democracy, there are many other aspects of the American way of life that they claim the rest of the world is envious of. Woodrow Wilson [1919] said, *'sometimes people call me an idealist, well that is the way I know I'm an American. Because America is the only idealistic nation.'* Post September 11 America is not a nation that has suddenly become aware that it has been sleep walking through history. However, it is a nation that has woken up from its slumber and its American dream. Enron, WorldCom and the stark realities of bloodshed on home soil have made America an anxious nation of fragile aspirations. Perhaps for the first time since the Great Depression, parents speak openly of their children growing up in a country worse off than the one into which they themselves were born.
17. The American Dream has been put well beyond the reach of the seven million Muslims who had settled between New York and Los Angeles. Almost two-thirds say they have been the victims of prejudice and discrimination since last year's attacks, some forced off planes by suspicious passengers, others not even allowed to board. The world famous civil rights that the founding fathers enshrined in the Bill of Rights are nothing more than empty slogans. The *'lovers of freedom'* that rule the land of the free have sacrificed *'liberties'* in the name of national security. Suspects have been held without trial and

lawyers barred from meeting their clients. Edward Said, professor at Columbia University – New York, wrote in Al Ahram [weekly edition]: *'I do not know a single Arab or Muslim American who does not now feel that he or she belongs to the enemy camp, and that being in the United States at this moment provides us with an especially unpleasant experience of alienation and widespread, quite specifically targeted hostility'* ['Thought about America', 28 February to 6 March 2002].

18. We may also turn again to that voice of true American sentiment, the National Review. Contributing Editor Ann Coulter wrote: *'This is no time to be precious about locating the exact individuals directly involved in this particular terrorist attack. Those responsible include anyone anywhere who smiled in response to the annihilation of patriots like Barbara Olsen. People who want our country destroyed live here, work for our airlines, and are submitted to the exact same airport shakedown as a lumberman from Idaho. This would be like having the Wehrmacht immigrate to America and work for our airlines during World War II. Except the Wehrmacht was not so bloodthirsty. We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity. We weren't punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officials. We carpet bombed German cities, we killed civilians. That's war. And this is war.'* [National Review, 'This is War', 13 September 2001].
19. So this is what has been written. What of the facts? In March 2002 it was reported that Adeel Akhtar, a British man, flew to the US for an acting audition. When his plane arrived at JFK airport in New York, he and his female friend were handcuffed. Based on this description he hardly seems fundamentalist material. He was taken to a room and questioned for several hours. The officials asked him whether he had friends in the Middle East, or knew anyone who approved of the attacks on September 11.

His story will be familiar to hundreds of people of Asian or Middle Eastern origin. Like for example the British woman [50-year-old] who flew to JFK to visit her sister who was suffering from cancer. At the airport, immigration officials found that on a previous visit she had overstayed her visa. She explained that she had been helping her sister, who was very ill, and had applied for an extension. When the officers told her she would have to return to Britain, she accepted their decision but asked to speak to the British consul. They refused her request, but told her she could ring the Pakistani consulate if she wished. She explained that she was British, not Pakistani, as her passport showed. The guards then started to interrogate her. How many languages did she speak? How long had she lived in Britain? They smashed the locks on her suitcases and took her fingerprints. Then she was handcuffed and chained and marched through the departure lounge. *'I felt like the guards were parading me in front of the passengers like their prize catch. Why was I put in handcuffs? I am a 50-year-old housewife from the suburbs of London. What threat did I pose to the safety of the other passengers?'*

20. Also in March 2001, a correspondent for the Times found 30 men and a woman camped in a squalid hotel in Mogadishu, in Somalia. They were all African-Americans of Somali origin that had arrived in the US as babies or children. Most were professionals with secure jobs and stable lives. In January, just after the release of Black Hawk Down [the film about the failed US military mission in Somalia], they were rounded up. They were beaten, threatened with injections and refused phone calls and access to lawyers. Then, a fortnight ago, with no charges made or reasons given, they were summarily deported to Somalia, without passports, papers or money, in an alien [to them] country.
21. All these people are victims of racial profiling. In the six months following September 11, the US attorney general called for some 5,000 men of Arab origin to be questioned

by federal investigators. In this period more than 1,000 people who were born in the Middle East had been detained indefinitely for *'immigration infractions'*. There are countless instances of official discrimination in the US. Muslim women have been strip-searched at airports and men have been dragged out of bed at gunpoint in the middle of the night. Evidence, which remains shielded from the suspect, of the kind permitted by the recent US Patriot Act, *'has been used almost exclusively against Muslims and Arabs in America'*. In the US, Muslims and people of Middle Eastern origin are now all terrorist suspects, treated as guilty until proven innocent.

Crime and Punishment

22. America, the land of the free, is held captive by crime, and the fear of crime acts like a straitjacket for the people. An Associated Press poll found that 52 percent of men and 68 percent of women are personally afraid of becoming crime victims. In America a murder is committed every 22 minutes, a rape every 5 minutes, a robbery every 49 seconds and a burglary every 10 seconds. The cost of crime is estimated at \$675 billion each year. According to a recent study from Texas A&M University, Prof Morgan Reynolds found that of the 500,000 burglaries that take place each month, only 6,000 burglars go to jail. This situation is compounded by alcohol and drug abuse. Shootings related to drug gang turf wars, in the inner cities, are given a high profile in the press. However, shootings are merely the tip of a crime-ridden iceberg that affects all urban citizens. In the UK 'Class A' drugs such as heroin and cocaine [particularly its 'street' form crack, which is favoured by the poor rather than the snorted form that is favoured by yuppies] are driving other crimes such as burglary and theft. UK Home Office research has shown that those arrested for property offences are most often under the influence of drugs. Almost 70 percent of those charged test positive for heroin and or cocaine. About 30 percent of those caught shoplifting were positive for cocaine and 47 percent for opiates. Violent crime seems to be most commonly associated with cocaine only. Half of all arrestees for assault tested positive for crack. Those using both drugs accounted for a quarter of arrests. These figures do not address alcohol, which is even more wide spread because it is legal and considered socially more acceptable. Its effects on crime statistics, as well as its consumption of the health budget – through alcohol related diseases and alcohol induced assaults and the subsequent occupation of hospital beds – is almost un-quantifiable.
23. Americans are twice as likely to be assaulted, robbed at gunpoint, raped or abducted as they are to be seriously injured in a car. US Assistant Attorney General's 1998 National Symposium on Alcohol Abuse and Crime showed that nearly 4 in 10 violent crimes involve the use of alcohol. Approximately 4 in 10 fatal motor vehicle accidents are alcohol-involved; and about 4 in 10 offenders, regardless of whether they are on probation, in local jail, or in state prison, self-report that they were using alcohol at the time of the offence. Violence between current and former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends is especially likely to involve alcohol abuse.
24. Teenagers commit the largest portion of all violent crimes. More murders and robberies are committed by 18-year-old males than by any other age group. More than one-third of all murders are committed by offenders under the age of 21. Homicide is now by far the leading cause of death among African-American teenagers. The crime statistics speak for themselves. What of the methods employed to reduce them? The Clinton/Gore solution was to lock them up and the Bush/Cheney solution is to kill them as well. At the beginning of the 1990s there were about one million people in prison in the US. By the end of the Clinton period it was two million. Since 1976, there have been over seven hundred executions in the US. Since 1973, ninety-five death row inmates have been fully exonerated by the courts. A recent study of 4,578 cases in a twenty-three-year period

[1973-1995] concluded that the courts found serious, reversible error in nearly 7 of every 10 capital sentence cases that were fully reviewed during the period. In 85 percent of the death penalty states, the error rates were 60 percent or higher. Three-fifths of these states have error rates of at least 70 percent. The most common errors were: 1. Incompetent defence lawyers who did not look for, or missed, important evidence that would have proved innocence. 2. Police or prosecutors who did discover such evidence suppressed it, actively derailing the judicial process.

25. The United States is one of the few countries in the world that puts to death the mentally retarded and juvenile offenders. The United States is also the only country besides Somalia that has not signed the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Supreme Court allows the execution of those who were 16-year-old when they committed a capital offence. This is despite the fact that the same court has ruled that 16-year-olds do not have *'the maturity or judgement'* to sign contracts. So a child's diminished capacity for signing contracts is viewed as a legal barrier to enforcing a contract, but when it comes to the right to be executed, a 16-year-old's capacity is the same as an adult. America is a society that does nothing about corporate corruption; indeed it actively rewards creative accounting. At the same time it puts to death retards and those they consider to be minors.

George W. Bush and Company

26. We have already discussed how George W. Bush became President under dubious circumstances. Bush also has a dubious past with drinking and driving, and covering it up. As far as his business ventures were concerned, up until the early 1990s they were not successful but not necessarily shady. He may have acquired a degree in Business, but his academic achievements were followed by failure in the field. This serial non-achiever struck gold whilst his daddy was President. His crime against the US people was the sale of stocks in an oil company of which he was a director in June 1990. It was this transaction that catapulted him into massive wealth and gave him a political profile in Texas. It is assumed that Bush was aware that the values of shares in his company, Harken Oil, were about to plummet due to pending losses. He sold them off just in time, reaping a profit of \$835,807 [£553,514]. With his profits he bought a baseball team, which when later sold turned him into a multi-millionaire. Bush's Harken share sale was investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission, operating under his father, George Bush senior, who found that notification of the transaction had been delayed by 9 months. Needless to say no action was taken. It also recently emerged that Bush received a low-interest loan from Harken - something that WorldCom chief executive Bernie Ebbers [currently under investigation] did, and which Bush said should be banned. It is not only Bush's antics that have been brought into question recently. During the same week Vice President Dick Cheney was named in a civil action against energy construction group Halliburton and its accountants Andersen for colluding to inflate the company's earnings. There are striking similarities between the Halliburton case and the debacle of Enron.
27. On 29 January an article in the Washington Post drew comparisons between Halliburton and Enron, pointing out that both their stocks plunged last autumn, and that they share the same accountant, Arthur Andersen [Halliburton has been plagued with lawsuits over its use of asbestos, discouraging investor confidence]. Another similarity is that their CEOs both cashed in at the right time. In Halliburton's case, Vice President Dick Cheney cashed out \$20.6 million in stocks before retiring as CEO. With Halliburton now ailing financially, it's only natural that the Defence Department, over which Cheney presided in the administration of Bush Senior, would provide the bailout. The Pentagon posts all contract announcements exceeding \$5 million on its website, but in

Halliburton's case declined to disclose the estimated value of the award. A spokesperson for Halliburton gave \$2.5 billion as the amount the company earned from base support services in the 1990s, acknowledging that the contract value could exceed that number assuming that the scope of US military actions widens in the next decade.

28. Harvey Wasserman, author of *The Last Energy War*, says of Cheney and Bush's antics, 'The Bush-Cheney team have turned the United States into a family business. That's why we haven't seen Cheney - he's cutting deals with his old buddies who gave him a multi-million dollar golden handshake.' Wasserman went on to say, 'have they no grace, no shame, no common sense? Why don't just have Enron run America? Or have Zapata Petroleum [George W. Bush's failed oil exploration venture] build a pipeline across Afghanistan?' It seems that the President surrounds himself with men that could all be caught in the rhetorical net that Bush has cast over corporate dealers. In addition to Dick Cheney, his shadow adviser was Kenneth L. Lay, the old head of Enron. His Secretary of State, Colin Powell, was on the Board of AOL. During his period at AOL the company merged with Time-Warner, and Powell's stock rose in value by \$4 million. Colin's son, Michael Powell, had been the only Federal Communications Commission [FCC] member who advocated that the AOL/Time Warner merger go through without question. Michael Powell has since been named chair of the FCC; part of his job is to oversee the activities of AOL/Time Warner.
29. Then there are many more such as Thomas White, the Army Secretary. He is a former Enron executive, who sold \$12m of Enron shares between June and November 2001. He was vice-chairman of Enron Energy Services, implicated in manipulating electricity costs in the California power crises.
30. Paul O'Neill: Treasury Secretary a former chief executive of Alcoa, the world's biggest aluminium company. O'Neill receives an annual pension from the company of \$926,000. Once in office, he delayed selling his Alcoa shares, until they rose steadily by 30 percent. Lastly there is Larry Lindsey, the White House economic adviser who was a paid Enron consultant. He was still on the payroll when devising Bush's economic policies for the election campaign. Lindsey conducted an investigation into the effect of the collapse of a major energy company on the economy just before Enron's difficulties became known.
31. It is not just individuals that should have their connections scrutinised. The whole Republican Party itself has many dubious connections. In the 2000 presidential election, WorldCom gave 70 per cent of its \$1.9m political donations to the Republicans. For Andersen it was 71 per cent of \$1.4m. Enron gave their \$113,800 between 1989 and 2001 to the Republicans, while Al Gore got \$13,750. Enron gave \$300,000 to the Bush inaugural fund in 2001, and helped out with the costs of the 2000 poll recount.
32. Several scandals have put a dent in the global image of Capitalism. Its perceived position as being the only ideology viable to address the problems of man, since the death of communism over a decade ago, has taken yet another blow. This blow to its foundations has come from within. However the glittering gild of confidence in this ideology has begun to flake off. The Europeans have been quick to label the scandal in the US as an American problem, i.e. '*an American brand of capitalism*', conveniently forgetting that they too have been hit by similar scandals. These labels and accusations are protection mechanisms for the whole system, from skin to core. People are prevented from questioning the cause of these scandals, because they are too busy defending marginal secondary issues or assigning blame to scapegoat companies and individuals. The solution to the problem is even more worrying, especially when you have politicians

calling on the corporate world to have character and a conscience; Bush said, *'All investment is an act of faith, and faith is earned by integrity. In the long run, there is no capitalism without conscience. There is no wealth without character'*. This is total hypocrisy coming from G.W. Bush and his father's friends whom he decides to surround himself with. The pursuit of material goals is the only oil that drives the Capitalist machine.

Human nuclear guinea pigs

33. The rights of servicemen in both the US and British armed forces have constantly been violated through the years. They had been given hallucinogenic drugs, sent into combat without adequate training or cover, as well as a whole host of inhumanities inflicted upon them. In relation to this current issue of WMD there are two recent stories that are highly revealing as to how successive US and British governments feel about their own servicemen and civilians. Recently the Pentagon acknowledged that some soldiers who engaged in chemical and biological weapons testing in the 1960s might not have been fully informed about the secret experiments conducted at sea. Some tests used the military's deadliest nerve agent, VX. It was also revealed that thousands of civilians in Hawaii and Alaska also probably were unaware that they were sprayed with relatively mild bacteria meant to simulate germ weapons such as anthrax. Tests in Alaska exposed soldiers in protective suits to deadly nerve agents, including VX, and experiments in Hawaii used a hallucinogen developed as a chemical weapon, according to Pentagon records. VX is a sophisticated nerve agent that lasts longer in the environment than other such agents. The tests were meant to determine how long VX would remain deadly and how well decontamination procedures worked.

34. A compensation claim in the UK also hit the headlines recently. Ex-servicemen are seeking compensation for being made to witness nuclear explosions in the South Pacific. But what did the thousands of young soldiers experience on Christmas Island 40 years ago? It was the height of the Cold War and thousands of British servicemen were despatched to the South Pacific to witness test explosions of nuclear weapons. Many were in their late teens or early 20s, working their compulsory national service. To them, the warm and exotic climes of Christmas Island were a welcome escape from the hardships of post-war Britain. Servicemen were told to crouch moments before a detonation. Little effort was made to safeguard their health from the radioactive fallout. Often they were just 30 miles from the scene of the explosion. Men were told to turn their backs to the blast or wear long trousers instead of shorts.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the above, the system of Capitalism is crumbling from its foundations, propped up only by a desperate band of elites who see their spoils being threatened. It falls to us to quote a previous President to end this chapter, William Jefferson Clinton, the Forty Second President of the United States of America. Unlike his successor President George W. Bush, Bill Clinton was well known for his oratory skills and his academic achievements, a man who knows the truth of the system he implemented. Is the following statement a reflection of what the history books lay testament to, or is it simply irony? *'We were born with a declaration of independence which asserted that we all were created equal and a constitution that enshrined slavery. We fought a bloody civil war to abolish slavery but we remained unequal by law for another century. We advanced across the continent in the name of freedom, yet in doing so we pushed Native Americans off their land. We welcome immigrants, but each new wave has felt the sting of discrimination.'* [President Clinton, Speech at the University of California 1997].

CHAPTER 5

THE HISTORY OF WESTERN COLONIALISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

America and Britain claim their war against Iraq is just and their cause noble. They continue to argue that they are simply seeking to rid the world of a menace and to restore good governance back to the people of Iraq. This chapter exposes this lie, proving that colonialism is closely attached to the war on Iraq, in fact it being the driving force behind it.

1. The Renaissance in Europe heralded an intellectual revolution culminating with industrialisation and the presage of a new world order. It was in the face of aristocratic tyranny and theocratic dogma that Western thinkers established the philosophical foundations of Western Civilisation, and despite their intellectual differences, they all shared an occidental worldview of social organisation, which was the separation of Church and State. However its philosophical pioneers only replaced tyranny and intellectual backwardness with another form of ideational oppression. Indeed it is ironic that the very doctrine from which the principles of freedom and liberal democracy evolved is also the same source from which colonialism arose. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's treatise on democracy spoke of equality and freedom stating that, '*Man was born free, and he is everywhere in chains*' [The Social Contract, 1743], yet at the same time the paragon of liberty was enslaving whole nations. Jules Harmand one of the main architects of French imperialism said, '*It is necessary, then, to accept as a principle and point of departure the fact that there is a hierarchy of races and civilizations, and that we belong to the superior race and civilization...the basic legitimation of conquest over native peoples is the conviction of our superiority...*'. [Edward Said, 'Culture & Imperialism' 1993, p17]. Such philosophical contradictions are characteristic of Western culture and further demonstrate the inability of the mind to determine a system of life that would truly elevate human behaviour.
2. In reality colonialism flows through the arteries of Western civilisation; if Capitalism is its soul then colonialism is its heartbeat - freedom of ownership became the dominant feature of secular philosophy thereby determining society's objective in life. The pursuit of material interests by the state translated into a body of principles that defined a method for propagating the Capitalist ideology, which Robert Cooper reaffirmed in his essay on '*the Postmodern State*'. Calling for a new liberal imperialism and the need for empires, his words echo British ambition of a century earlier when British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain said, '*the days are for great empires, not little states.*' [Jan Morris, 'Farewell to the Trumpets; An Imperial Retreat']. Therefore it is in true imperial tradition, that Tony Blair's foreign policy adviser Robert Cooper said, '*The challenge to the postmodern world is to get used to the idea of double standards. Among ourselves, we operate on the basis of laws and open cooperative security. But when dealing with more old-fashioned kinds of states outside the postmodern continent of Europe, we need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era - force, pre-emptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary to deal with those who still live in the nineteenth century world of every state for itself. Among ourselves, we keep the law but when we are operating in the jungle, we must also use the laws of the jungle...What is needed then is a new kind of imperialism, one acceptable to a world of human rights and cosmopolitan values. We can already discern its outline: an imperialism which, like all imperialism, aims to bring order and organisation but which rests today on the voluntary principle...*' [Robert Cooper, 'The New Liberal Imperialism', 2002].
3. Thus colonialism is very much alive - indeed colonialism and Western civilisation were conjoined at birth because colonialism is derived from the secular doctrine. Double standards in Western policy, throughout its shameful history, are not only a truism but also an ideological necessity. It is important to comprehend the philosophy behind Western colonialism such that we not only decipher the warmongering over Iraq but also realise that colonialism is integral to the very existence of Western civilisation, and as such appreciate that secularism is unfit as an intellectual leadership for mankind. It

would therefore be political suicide to liberate the Islamic lands upon a secular basis. In origin Western thinkers sought to remove tyranny but failed miserably as they replaced the tyranny of feudalism with an even more pernicious system of human organisation, unleashing a disaster unparalleled in human history. Like a dreadful tsunami this ideological disaster has corroded people's lives for centuries and its waves have consumed Iraq, drowning the people with economic hardships.

Cruelty and Conquest

4. *'Free societies do not intimidate through cruelty and conquest'* President Bush unsuccessfully proselytised to the UN as he sought legitimacy for his war against Iraq. These words resonate with the same arrogance of a century earlier when Lord Roseberry described the British Empire as, *'the greatest secular agency for good the world has ever seen'* [J. A. Hobson, 'Imperialism a Study']. In the vicissitudes of comic history President Bush will join Lord Roseberry in a distinguished list of luminaries that boast amongst others Adolph Hitler and Josef Stalin for their invaluable contribution to moral ineptitude. Iraq's history has not only been shaped by cruelty and conquest but problems in the Middle East stem from centuries of European imperialism and are perpetuated by American hegemony. Indeed it is one of history's greatest ironies that America should become an imperial power when she fought to free herself from British and European colonialism. Such are the dire consequences for a nation structuring itself upon the secular ideology as America imitates British Empire of a bygone era.
5. The East Indian Company, that exemplar of Western corporate governance, first set foot in Mesopotamia in 1763 as Britain sought to facilitate her trading route with colonial India. It proved to be a portent of things to come, as Lord Palmerston began an assertive quest to find new markets in the Middle East for Britain's industry and commerce in the 1830s – a doctrine that is integral to Western civilisation - as President Clinton's National Security Adviser Anthony Lake noted, *'private firms are natural allies in our efforts to strengthen market economies'* [Mark Curtis, 'The Great Deception Anglo-American Power & World Order', 1998, p38]. Similarly former US Secretary of State Cordell Hull explained, *'Leadership towards a new system of international relationships in trade and other economic affairs will devolve very largely upon the United States...we should assume this leadership, and the responsibility that goes with it, primarily for reasons of pure national self interest'* [Gabriel Kolko, 'Politics of War', p251].
6. National self-interest, a euphemism for voracious greed, stimulated European conquests, with Britain occupying Aden in 1839. In 1882 she invaded Egypt having built the Suez Canal with France in 1869, which Prime Minister Gladstone defined as *'the great question of British interest'* since 13 percent of Britain's entire foreign trade went through it at the time. Earl Kimberley, Secretary of State for India declared in 1885, *'Does anyone really suppose that if we did not possess our Indian Empire we should have interfered in Egypt?'* [Ronald Hyam, 'Britain's Imperial Century 1815 to 1914', 1976, p180]. These were sentiments that were to resurface during the Gulf War of 1991 when Lawrence Korb, Assistant Defence Secretary under the Reagan administration, said, *'If Kuwait grew carrots we wouldn't give a damn'* [Paul D'Amato, 'US Intervention in the Middle East; Blood for Oil', International Socialist Review, Issue 15, December 2000-January 2001]. In 1856 Britain fought her way into Persia as she sought land access to her colony in India and entered into treaty obligations to protect the suzerain sheikhdoms of Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar and Oman so as to ensure these lands would only be ceded to Britain.
7. The conquest of the Ottoman Khilafah in the First World War further established Britain as the paramount power in the Middle East, giving her control over Mesopotamia, Persia, the Gulf and Egypt as stipulated in the infamous Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916. In March 1917 she occupied Baghdad and in a telegraph to her forces indicated a new stratagem for Western colonialism in the twentieth century. The

War Office communicated, *'Baghdad to be an Arab State with local ruler or government under British protectorate in everything but name. It will accordingly have no relations with foreign powers... Baghdad to be administered behind the Arab façade as far as possible'* [P.W. Ireland, 'Iraq; A Study in Political Development', 1937]. A colonial doctrine of sustaining puppet regimes, Britain was indeed innovating the art of colonisation. The Foreign Office further elaborated on her new colonialist styles in 1947 stating, *'our strategic and security interests throughout the world will be best safeguarded by the establishment in suitable spots of 'police stations' fully equipped to deal with emergencies within a large radius. Kuwait is one such spot from which Iraq, South Persia, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf could be controlled'*. The post Gulf War era however saw America not only enhance these styles but replace Britain as the dominant power in the Middle East.

8. It would see America pioneer this new doctrine of Western colonialism, innovating new styles in conquest with an emphasis upon covert actions, economic enslavement and political intrigues. A conquest that entailed suppressing Middle Eastern societies through their puppet regimes and encouraging torture, imprisonment and murder. Jesse Leaf, the CIA's chief Iran analyst elucidated upon American intimidation of the Middle East when he said, *'we set them [SAVAK] up, we organised them, we taught them everything we knew... extreme interrogation techniques... including torture... torture rooms were toured and it was all paid for by the USA'* [Salaam Al-Sahrqi, 'Iran: Unholy Alliances, Holy Terror', Covert Action Information Bulletin, No.37, Summer 1991]. The control of the Middle East population was further elucidated upon by a US government memorandum that stipulated, *'it is current American policy to confine arms sales to countries of the Middle East to reasonable quantities required for the maintenance of internal security'* [Statement by the United States & United Kingdom Groups, FRUS, 1947, Vol. V, p613] and the US National Security Council said military aid was important *'as a means of maintaining internal security'* [National Security Council, Statement of US Policy Toward Iran, 15 November 1958, FRUS, 1958-1960, Vol. XII, pp.611-3]. US Senator Hubert Humphrey illuminated this policy relating a conversation that an American official had had with Iran's military leadership, *'Do you know what the head of the Iranian army told one of our people? He said the army was in good shape, thanks to US aid, it was now capable of coping with the civilian population'* [Fred Halliday, 'Arabia without Sultans'].

9. Coups and countercoups entrenched Middle East politics in a miasma of Western rivalries immediately after the Second World War. America installed Husni Zaim in Syria on March 30, 1949. Miles Copeland who led many CIA operations in the region reflected, *'If you can't change the board, change the players'* [Miles Copeland, 'The Game of Nations', 1969, p28]. In 1958 America intervened in Lebanon sending her naval fleet and marines to preserve what she called *'stability'*, a euphemism for preserving American influence in the region. Indeed she would again intervene in Lebanese affairs in 1983, sending her marines to a conflict that was precipitated by imperial rivalries. The Gulf war of 1991 would however see the largest military conquest undertaken by America in the Middle East. Indeed it facilitated a military occupation in everything but name as she further strengthened existing military bases as well as securing new establishments in Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait. Anthony Cordesman, Chair for Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, revelled in America's colonial fundamentalism, *'A decade ago, under a different President Bush, we emerged out of a major foreign policy crisis in the Middle East with the most advantageous position we had had since World War II'* [Anthony H Cordesman, 'Iraq and America's Foreign Policy Crisis in the Middle East', 1 March 2001]. An advantage that its military leaders have revelled in, as Brigadier General William Looney made no hesitation in pointing out, *'They know we own their country... we dictate the way they live and talk. And that's the great thing about America right now. It's a good thing, especially when there's a lot of oil out there we need.'* [Dr. Eric Herring, 'Iraq: the Realities of Sanctions and the Prospects for War', October 2002].

10. British and American rule over the Middle East has therefore not only been shaped by conquest, but is also characterised by a cruelty that is all too familiar to the people of Iraq. In 1919 she faced the aerial spectre of mustard gas and today US and British warplanes continue where their ancestors left off, applying the 'Bomber' Harris maxim of dropping 'a bomb in every village that speaks out of turn' [Martin Woollacott, 'Getting the Dosage Right', *Guardian* 19 January 1993]. Such barbarity is intrinsic to Western colonialism and is it any wonder when President Bush has adopted the lingua franca of Winston Churchill, whom he recently paid tribute to as the model statesman? He is a man who actively encouraged the use of mustard gas and sanctioned British pilots mowing down Iraqi women and children as they fled from their homes for not having paid their taxes [David Omissi, 'Baghdad and British Bombers', *Guardian*, 19 January 1991]. The *Sunday Times* wrote at the time, 'we killed about ten thousand Arabs in this rising this summer. We cannot hope to maintain such an average' [Elie Kedourie, 'England & the Middle East; the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921'].

11. Churchill acknowledged the savage rapacity of Western colonialism in Iraq when he said, 'there is no doubt that we are a very cruel people' [Mark Curtis, 'The Great Deception Anglo-American Power & World Order', 1998, p136]. Indeed when former US Secretary of State Madeline Albright was asked whether the death of half a million children in Iraq as a result of sanctions was worth it, she stoically replied, 'I think this is a very hard choice, but the price, we think the price is worth it' [Lesley Stahl interview with Madeline Albright on CBS Television 1996]. It was such cruelty that prompted the UN Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq, Denis Halliday, to resign. He said, 'I am resigning because the policy of economic sanctions is totally bankrupt. We are in the process of destroying an entire society...I had been instructed to implement a policy that satisfies the definition of genocide; a deliberate policy that has effectively killed well over a million children and adults' [Dr. Eric Herring, 'Iraq; the Realities of Sanctions and the Prospects for War', October 2002]. Perhaps the moral justification for the West's crimes can be found in the views of British planners who described the Iraqis as 'crude, coarse and overbearing' [Louis, 'The British Empire in the Middle East', p159], or perhaps the views of the former British Ambassador in Iran can shed some light, when he said, 'a primitive mind finds it easier to embrace Islam with its five simple duties' [ibid. p60].

12. It is somewhat of a paradox that Western ideologues perceive themselves as liberators when their governorship of not only the Middle East but also the world has been nothing but a litany of malicious policies designed to subjugate people. It should be noted however, that Western politicians are being sincere to their ideology because this is the reality of Capitalism. Indeed they are proud of their legacy as Blair shamelessly pointed out, 'Britain has been a major force in world affairs for several centuries' and 'no British patriot should be willing to give up that status' [Mark Curtis, 'The Great Deception Anglo-American Power & World Order', 1998, p49]. Indeed the principles of 'nation building' have not changed since the nineteenth century. When Egypt was developing her textile industry in the 1830s at the same time Europe was experiencing the industrial revolution. Europe sought to prevent industrialisation in the Islamic world. In 1817 the French consul warned, 'The silk factories that are being established in Egypt will deal a deadly blow to those of Italy, and even ours.' [Noam Chomsky, 'World Orders, Old and New', 1988, p117]. Similarly Britain also 'did not want a new independent state in the Mediterranean, one that was militarily and economically powerful and therefore able to check her advances in that area and the Persian Gulf.' [ibid.]. Britain therefore conspired to prevent industrialisation and economic advancement in Egypt by sending her navy 'to terminate Egypt's quest for independence and economic development' [ibid.], something the Western world continues to do as evidenced in Iraq. The *Economist* said, 'the Iraqi welfare state was until recently amongst the most comprehensive and generous in the Arab world.' [Dr. Eric Herring, 'Iraq; the Realities of Sanctions and the Prospects for War', October 2002.] Yet from a nation boasting a welfare state, the West has imposed a \$200 billion debt that will increase by compound interest, to the extent that Iraq will rank alongside Rwanda in debt to exports ratio, ensuring that the Iraqi people will be indebted for generations to come. 'Free societies' have reduced Iraq to

what the United Nations described in a report in 1991 as, *'near apocalyptic results upon the economic infrastructure of what had been, until January 1991, a rather highly urbanized and mechanized society...Iraq has for some time to come been relegated to a pre-industrial age'*.

Imperial Rivalries

13. Cruelty and conquest are therefore a permanent trait of Western civilisation and problems in the Middle East have been exacerbated by centuries of Western rivalries that culminated in two catastrophic World Wars. They are just as evident today as they were when Napoleon sought to attenuate British power by invading Egypt in 1798. Secular doctrine has indeed propelled the *'free world'* to impose their imperial fundamentalism upon the Middle East peoples as the Western nations seek world influence and domination. The political invasion of the Islamic world that began in the eighteenth century endures into the twenty first century. Joseph Chamberlain epitomising the nation's ambition in the nineteenth century spoke of the dream of *'creating an empire'* [Ronald Hyam, *'Britain's Imperial Century 1815 to 1914'*, 1976, p2]. Words that illuminate Prime Minister Blair's ambitions *'to make ourselves once again a force that can stand comparison with other great powers'* and *'to promote Britain's interest firmly, persistently and toughly'* [Mark Curtis, *'The Great Deception Anglo-American Power & World Order'*].
14. In the nineteenth century British statesmen were obsessed with the decline of the Ottoman Khilafah and how it would impact upon their influence and the international balance of power. Lord Palmerston said, *'British interests encircled the globe'* [Ronald Hyam, *'Britain's Imperial Century 1825-1914; A Study of Empire and Expansion'*, 1976, p3], and it was these interests that she endeavoured to safeguard from Russian and French ambitions, which became increasingly under siege with the decline of the Ottoman Khilafah. Imperial statesmen therefore debated whether they should reform the Khilafah in a European mould in order for it to become a European protectorate or to divide her peacefully amongst the Western states. Before becoming Foreign Secretary in 1878, Lord Salisbury said, *'...defending English interests by sustaining the Ottoman dynasty has become impracticable and I think the time has come for defending English interests in a more direct way by some territorial rearrangement. I fear that when we come to the same thing some years later, one of two things will have happened. Either France will have recovered her position and be jealous of any extension of our power in the Mediterranean, or Germany will have become a naval power. Either of these contingencies will make it difficult for us to provide ourselves with pied-a-terre, in place of that which we shall infallibly lose Constantinople'* [Elie Koudrie, *'England and the Middle East; the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire 1914-1921'*, p21].
15. In a twist of history America experiences similar challenges to her global leadership as she too is faced with the political void left by a ruined superpower. In the nineteenth century it was the decline of the Ottoman Khilafah that impacted upon the international balance of power, and British interests. While in the late twentieth century it would be the collapse of the Soviet Empire, which would reconfigure the geopolitical context, whose seismic waves are still being felt in the twenty first century. Inevitably it has occupied successive US administrations. Former Secretary of State Warren Christopher said, *'as the sole remaining superpower, we have an unprecedented opportunity to shape the world we seek'*, [Mark Curtis, *'The Great Deception Anglo-American Power & World Order'*, 1998, p35] and in the aftermath of 9/11, America seeks to exploit the opportunity presented to her in reshaping the Middle East. A report by the Presidential Study Group further symbolised the nature of the debate amongst American statesmen and women in the twenty first century. Aptly titled, *'Navigating through Turbulence; America and the Middle East in a New Century'*, the report described the strategic challenges in a post cold war era. *'On January 20, 2001, a new President will take office at a perilous moment in the Middle East. While most regional states still seek close political and military ties with the United States, Arab-Israeli relations are in crisis, regional radicals are buoyant, and the popular mood in much of the Arab world is critical of U.S. policy. Overall, the strategic situation of the United States in the*

area is characterized more by challenges than opportunities.' [Presidential Study Group, 'Navigating Through Turbulence; America & the Middle East in a New Century', Washington Institute for Near East Affairs, 12 December 2000, p7].

16. The culmination of rethinking US foreign policy was reflected in the National Security Strategy released in September 2002. Max Boot, journalist and author of *'the Savage Wars of Peace; Small Wars & the Rise of American Power'*, described it as the most *'significant US Foreign Policy statement since NSC 68, the 1958 paper that codified the containment doctrine'* [Max Boot, 'Doctrine of the Big Enchilada', the Washington Post, 14 October 2002] since it established principles for a new worldview in a post cold war era. President Bush is therefore treading the path of his predecessors who also made epochal changes to US foreign policy, beginning with the Truman doctrine, followed by the Eisenhower doctrine and now President Bush has been attributed with his own doctrine for American foreign policy. In his State of the Union address in January 2002 he outlined three key principles of the Bush doctrine. The first principle centres upon preserving America's leadership in the world; the Bush strategy proclaimed, *'Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build up in hopes of surpassing, or equalling, the power of the United States'* [Max Boot, 'Doctrine of the Big Enchilada', the Washington Post, 14 October 2002]. Secondly that America would strike pre-emptively against potential threats; President Bush said America's *'enemies view the entire world as a battlefield'* and vowed to *'pursue them wherever they are'* [Schmitt and Donnelly, 'The Bush Doctrine', 30 January 2002]. William Kristol former White House Chief of Staff to the Vice President explained, *'In 1947 Harry Truman reversed a post-World War II policy of withdrawal from Europe, and committed the United States to containing and resisting the Soviet Union. In 1981 Ronald Reagan reversed a failed policy of détente and committed us to seek victory over communism. On Tuesday night George W. Bush put an end to a decade of temporising and timidity and committed the nation to removing the threat of hostile tyrannies seeking Weapons of Mass Destruction. This task is comparable to Truman's and Reagan's. It will not be easy or painless. But it's worthy of a great nation'* [William Kristol, 'Taking the War Beyond Terrorism', Washington Post, 31 January 2002]. Finally as with all previous missionary ideologues the proverbial quest to promote liberal democratic principles was promulgated. Thinkers at the Project for the New American Century said, *'The Bush doctrine is also notable for what it is not. It is not Clintonian multilateralism; the President did not appeal to the United Nations, profess faith in arms control, or raise hopes for any 'peace process'. Nor is it the balance of power realism favoured by his father. It is rather a reassertion that lasting peace and security is to be won and preserved by asserting both US military strength and American political principles'*.
17. American imperialists therefore echo the strategic concerns of their British cousins in the nineteenth century as they, like Britain, seek to preserve their leadership in the world and control of the Middle East is pivotal in this end. Since the British government realised the control of oil was *'a vital prize for any power interested in world influence or domination'* [Introductory Paper on the Middle East', FRUS, 1947, Vol. V, p 569], British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd wrote in 1956, *'We must at all costs maintain control of this oil'* [Message from British Foreign Secretary Lloyd to Secretary of State Dulles, 23 January 1956, FRUS, 1955-1957, Vo. XIII, p323.]. The US was not far behind in realising its significance - the National Security Council stated in 1953, *'United States policy is to keep the sources of oil in the Middle East in American hands'* [Mohammed Heikal, 'Cutting the Lions Tail; Suez Through Egyptian Eyes', 1986, p38] and in 1945 the US State Department declared, *'These resources constituted a stupendous source of strategic power, and one of the greatest material prizes in world history . . . probably the richest economic prize in the world in the field of foreign investment'* [US State Department History, 1945, Vol. 8 p45]. America therefore seeks to guarantee her leadership in the world by securing control of the region's oil wealth, thereby *'preventing the emergence of a hostile regional coalition or hegemony'* [Conetta and Knight, 'Military Strategy Under Review, Foreign Policy in Focus' Vol. IV No. 3, January 1999], as described in the Quadrennial Defence Review submitted by former Defence Secretary William Cohen to the US Congress in May 1997. Paul Wolfowitz also reflected

America's ambition for world domination in a planning document that said the US should '*maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role*' [Max Boot, 'Doctrine of the Big Enchilada', the Washington Post 14 October 2002].

18. This inevitably has brought her into conflict with the leading colonialist nations and has reached crisis point in the UN. Her unilateralism prompting French President Chirac to forewarn of the dangers ahead, when he said, '*It's also the future of international relations which is at stake here*' ['UN only legitimate framework for action on Iraq', Egyptian Gazette, 18 October 2002]. However America has since the Second World War worked surreptitiously to liquidate British and European influence in the region, and this is what Chirac fears most. In 1947 America announced to the British Embassy in Washington the end of British rule in the Middle East. Miles Copeland wrote, '*The two messages were official notification that the Pax Britannica, which has kept order in much of the world for over a century, was at an end*' [Miles Copeland, 'the Game of Nations', 1989, p145]. This was the precursor for a fierce Anglo-American struggle in the Middle East culminating with a dangerous game of coups and counter coups. In Egypt, America removed the British puppet regime of King Farouk, and in cold candour Miles Copeland narrates the affair, '*The American CIA saw an opportunity. We broke off official contact with the British SIS*', he went on to elaborate, '*So on 23 July 1952, the coup came off without a hitch, with General Mohammed Naguib nominally at its head. For the next six months, the only contacts with Nasser, his Revolutionary Command Council [RCC] and top civilians in the government were maintained by 'straights' in our embassy, including Ambassador Caffery himself*' [Miles Copeland, 'the Game of Nations', 1989, p145].
19. The present Iraqi crisis therefore is a continuation of the struggle between the Western powers. In the early twentieth century the European nations quarrelled over how the lands of the Khilafah would be divided amongst them and a century later they quarrel over how the region's resources should be divided amongst them, with America seeking to secure the majority share. Russian specialist Michael McFaul of the Carnegie Endowment Institute said, '*Russian President Putin and his administration believe the United States will go ahead with or without them so they're trying...to extract what they can from America*', and Paul Sanders, Director of the Nixon Institute noted, '*The oil is the main thing...there is widespread nervousness in Russia that if the US changes regimes in Iraq, then all the oil contracts will come to the United States and Russia will be left out*' [Eric Boehlert, 'At the UN its all about the Money', 14 October 2002]. It is in this context that we see the Western nations vie for power, scrambling to secure their oil interests in Iraq, a scramble that rekindles memories of Europe's colonisation of Africa in the nineteenth century. US policy therefore seeks to attenuate any European influence and control in Iraq, Michael O'Hanlon from the Brookings Institute told the House Armed Services Committee, '*The region that Iraq inhabits is so critical to U.S. interests that we cannot just go in, remove Saddam, and leave the clean-up to others... Iraq, unlike Afghanistan, is located in the heartland of Arabia, a region whose stability is a critical U.S. interest*' [Michael O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow, Brookings, Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, 2 October 2002]. Regime change in Iraq is therefore predicated upon realising her aims in '*environment shaping*' the Middle East according to her viewpoint [Carl Conetta and Charles Knight, 'Military Strategy Under Review', Foreign Policy in Focus Vol. IV No. 3, January 1999]. Indeed regime change will entail the division of Iraq, which the US has unsuccessfully pursued since the end of the Gulf war in 1991. Deputy Secretary of Defence, Paul Wolfowitz elucidated upon the American stratagem for Iraqi control in September 1998 before the House National Security Committee. He said, '*Establish a safe protected zone in the South, where opposition to Saddam could rally and organize, would make it possible...For that provisional government to control the largest oil field in Iraq and make available to it, under some kind of international supervision, enormous financial resources for political, humanitarian and eventually military purposes*' [Paul Wolfowitz's statement on US Policy toward Iraq, 18 September 1998]. Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz further evidenced US

policy in their support for a letter sponsored by the Project for a New American Century, 'calling for the establishment of a provisional and free government in those areas of Northern and Southern Iraq not under Saddam's control...US and allied military forces should be prepared to support the Iraq opposition and 'be prepared...to help remove Saddam from power' ['Memorandum to Opinion Leaders' from Tom Donnelly, Deputy Executive Director of the Project for the New American Century, July 6, 2001].

20. There can be no doubt that the Iraqi crisis is a continuation of centuries of colonialist rivalries. In the early twentieth century Britain and France divided the Ottoman Khilafah into artificial states that gave rise to Iraq, and in the early twenty first century America seeks to emulate European imperialism by dividing Iraq even further. Subjugating the people by spreading their ideological poison, they were and are the driving force behind the nationalist movements that mortally wound the Muslim psyche. The ideological disaster that was born out of the Renaissance has seen the Western world not only colonise the Middle East but also Africa, Asia, and South America. Its history is strewn with hypocritical oaths, dishonest argumentation and carnivorous deceit. Never in the history of the world has there been so much injustice, corruption and economic disparity. The colonialist states that destroyed the Ottoman Khilafah on 3 March 1924 took away the only state that was capable of bringing true intellectual leadership and being an ideological alternative to Western Capitalism. Instead the colonialists destroyed this state and divided the peoples when they were bonded by brotherhood, love and compassion. They further sowed the seeds for war in Palestine when Muslims, Jews and Christians had been living with dignity, honour and justice under the shade of Islam for centuries. Not only did they do this but they also imposed their rule through dictatorial regimes upon the ashes of the Khilafah. Regimes who would protect Western interests by preventing the re-establishment of the Khilafah State, even if it meant silencing peaceful opposition with murder, imprisonment and torture, because the Khilafah is the only state that will truly present an ideological challenge to Western liberal capitalism.
21. Colonialism is therefore very much alive because it is integral to the very existence of Western civilisation and the Bush doctrine like the new liberal imperialism advocated by Robert Cooper is a product of the age. An era that Western thinkers have hailed as an epochal shift into the 'information age' or the 'post-industrial era' to the extent that futurist Alvin Toffler described it as the birth of a new civilisation. But while the West is building a new infrastructure for wealth creation that will advance Western civilisation, the basis for this progress remains rooted in secular doctrine and the social problems that have accrued as a result of this epochal change are not solely the result of this shift as some Western thinkers have argued, but originate from the very contradictions of Western philosophy. The social strife in the first world like the third world is but the result of secular ideology and globalisation has merely magnified the evils of Western colonialism. The growing independencies of nations and the immediacy of information has opened the eyes of many Western thinkers to the problems of global Capitalism and its imperial muscle. Creating wider international structures for security and prosperity will not end injustice, because these structures are formulated in a secular context just as colonialism is derived from secular philosophy.

CONCLUSION

This dossier we produce today highlights two things in an intellectual and political manner; the real motives behind the war on Iraq, and the West's colonial foreign policy. It clearly demonstrates to any aware observer that the world we live in today is devoid of real leadership. Capitalism has failed to unify the people, advance their material means, enlighten their minds and has abandoned their deep yearning for spiritual and intellectual ascension. It has in fact led the world to the brink of destruction. The majority of the world's inhabitants are oppressed, whilst a minority feeds off their wealth and resources. This imbalance is legitimised by the ballot box, where the masses are sold a series of hopes and dreams only to see government after government further their relationships with corporate powers. Such an ideology cannot lead humanity out of darkness towards a true revival.

So we call upon the world for change. Not the change Bush prophesises for Iraq, a change of faces, a regime change - for we have seen regimes changed by the CIA, littering the world with Hamid Karzais. What the world requires is a fundamental reassessment of how it views life and the systems of life. Our proposed change is the Islamic ideology - the clear and only solution to the ills we are afflicted with.

Ideological Islam has been long suppressed by the Capitalist states. We, the Muslims, maintain that Islam provides an enlightened basis for life from which emanates a sophisticated system of life; an ideology which treats all problems in a precise, responsible and balanced way. Islam neither shuns the pursuit for material progress, nor makes it the driving force for society, such that all moral, spiritual and humanitarian values are eradicated, as we now witness in the West. Its politics are not based upon the unscrupulous Western principles, the pursuit for interests above all other considerations, until even the human life loses all its value.

The only process to bring about the practical implementation of Islam is by the establishment of the Islamic State (Khilafah). This Khilafah has been absent from the world since 1924, leaving the world at the merciless hands of a decadent ideology that knows no limits or humanity. Today, the Muslims the world over call for the re-establishment of the Khilafah, for we see no other way to liberate ourselves and indeed the world from Capitalism.

We urge you to the imperative call for an ideological change – it is time for you to study Islam as the ideological alternative.

وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَاٰنُ قَوْمٍ عَلٰٓى اَلَّا تَعْدِلُوْا
اَعْدِلُوْا هُوَ اَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوٰى وَاتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ اِنَّ
اللّٰهَ خَبِيْرٌۢ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ
المائدة 8

'And let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just, that is next to piety; and fear Allah, for Allah is acquainted with all you do.'

[TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 8]

Appendix 1

Some of the achievements that Bush has been responsible for in the first 20 months of his presidency are listed below:

- ?? Cutting \$39 million from federal spending on libraries
- ?? Cutting \$35 million in funding for advanced paediatric training for doctors
- ?? Cutting funding for research into renewable energy sources by 50 percent
- ?? Delayed rules that would reduce 'acceptable' levels of arsenic in drinking water
- ?? Cutting funding for research into cleaner, more efficient cars and trucks by 28%
- ?? Revoked rules strengthening the power of the government to deny contracts to companies that violate federal laws, environmental laws, and workplace safety standards
- ?? Broke a campaign promise to invest \$100 million per year in rain forest conservation
- ?? Reduced, by 86 percent, the Community Access Program, which co-ordinated care for people without health insurance among public hospitals, clinics, and other health care providers
- ?? Nullified a proposal to increase public access to information about the potential ramifications of chemical plant accidents
- ?? Pulled out of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol agreement on global warming, ultimately signed by 178 other countries
- ?? Rejected an international accord to enforce the 1972 treaty banning germ warfare
- ?? Cut \$200 million from workforce training programs for dislocated workers
- ?? Cut \$200 million from the Childcare and Development grant, a program that provides childcare to low-income families as they are forced from welfare to work
- ?? Cut \$700 million in funds for public housing repairs
- ?? Overturned workplace ergonomic rules designed to protect Workers' health and safety
- ?? Allocated only 3 percent of the amount requested by Justice Department lawyers in the government's continued litigation against tobacco companies
- ?? Pushed through a tax cut, 43 percent of which goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans
- ?? Cut \$15.7 million from programs dealing with child abuse and neglect
- ?? Proposed elimination of the 'Reading Is Fundamental' program, which gives free books to poor children
- ?? Pushed for development of 'mini-nukes,' designed to attack deeply buried targets - a violation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- ?? Tried to reverse regulation protecting sixty million acres of national forest from logging and road building
- ?? Made Monsanto executive Linda Fisher deputy administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency
- ?? Appointed oil and coal lobbyist J. Steven Giles as Deputy Secretary of the Interior
- ?? Proposed the selling of oil and tracts in the Alaska wildlife preserve

Appendix 2

Things which the US can claim it is the world leader in:

- ?? In firearm deaths
- ?? In per-capita energy use
- ?? In carbon dioxide emissions [more than Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Indonesia, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and the United Kingdom combined]

- ?? In total and per capita municipal waste [720 kilograms per person per year]
- ?? In hazardous waste produced [by a factor of more than twenty times their nearest competitor, Germany]
- ?? In oil consumption
- ?? In natural gas consumption
- ?? In the least amount of federal and state government expenditure [as a percentage of GDP]
- ?? In daily per-capita consumption of calories
- ?? In lowest voter turnout
- ?? In fewest numbers of political parties represented in the lower or single house
- ?? In recorded rapes [by a factor of almost three times the nearest competitor - Canada]
- ?? In injuries and deaths from road accidents [almost twice as many as runner-up Canada]
- ?? Number one among countries in the United Nations with a legally constituted government to not ratify the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
- ?? In number of known executions of child offenders
- ?? In likelihood of children under the age of fifteen to die from gunfire
- ?? In likelihood of children under the age of fifteen to commit suicide with a gun
- ?? In lowest eighth-grade mathematics scores