

Supporting Dictatorship and Tyranny

*Traditional Tools in
Western Foreign Policy*



Hizb ut-Tahrir
Britain

Supporting Dictatorship and Tyranny

***Traditional tools in Western
Foreign Policy***

By

Hizb ut-Tahrir
Britain

“When they are told, ‘Do not cause corruption on the earth’ they say: ‘We are only putting things right.’ No indeed, they are the corrupters, but they are not aware of it.”

(Translated Meaning of Quran Surah Baqarah 2: 11-12)

"Why do we support reactionary, selfish and corrupt governments in the Middle East instead of leaders who have the interest of their people at heart?"

Stafford Cripps, Chancellor in the
Attlee Government 1945-51

Hizb ut-Tahrir

Hizb ut-Tahrir is a global Islamic political party that was established in 1953 under the leadership of its founder - the scholar, political thinker and judge in the Court of Appeals in al-Quds (Jerusalem), Taqiuddin an-Nabhani. Hizb ut-Tahrir global leadership is currently headed by Ata' Abu Rashta.

In the Muslim world, Hizb ut-Tahrir works at all levels of society to bring the Muslims back to living an Islamic way of life under the shade of the Khilafah (Caliphate) State following an exclusively political method.

Hizb ut-Tahrir adopts the methodology employed by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) when he established the first Islamic State in Madinah. The Prophet Muhammad limited his struggle for the establishment of the Islamic State to intellectual and political work. He established this Islamic state without resorting to violence. He worked to mobilise public opinion in favour of Islam and endeavoured to sway the political and intellectual elites of the time. Despite the persecution and boycott of the Prophet Muhammad and the early Muslims, they never resorted to violence. The party is therefore proactive in disseminating the Islamic intellectual and political thoughts widely in Muslim societies so as to challenge the existing status quo that exists there. The party presents Islam as a comprehensive way of life that is capable of managing the affairs of state and society. The party also expresses its views on political events and analyses them from an Islamic perspective.

The party disseminates its thoughts through discussion with the masses, study circles, lectures, seminars, leaflet distribution, publishing books and magazines and via the Internet. We encourage people to attend our demonstrations, marches and vigils.

In the West, Hizb ut-Tahrir works to cultivate a Muslim community that lives by Islam in thought and deed, adhering to the rules of Islam and preserving a strong Islamic identity. The party does not work in the West to change the system of government. The party also works to project a positive image of Islam to Western society and engages in dialogue with Western thinkers, policymakers and academics. Western governments, under the banner of the War on Terror, are currently working to present Islam as an 'evil ideology'. Indeed at the heart of this campaign is to malign the Islamic ideology as an alternative to Western liberal capitalism. Because of this propaganda aspect to the War on Terror, Hizb ut-Tahrir works to develop opinion about Islam in the Western countries, as a belief, ideology and alternative for the Muslim world.

Contact details:

Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain
Suite 301
28 Old Brompton Road
London SW7 3SS
<http://www.hizb.org.uk>
info@hizb.org.uk

Introduction

It is always explicit or implicit in rhetoric of Western foreign policy that Western states aim to promote their grand principles of democracy, peace, human rights and overseas development.

However, in truth these same Western states are systematic violators of these principles and of international law. They are consistent condoners of rights abuses and key allies of repressive and dictatorial regimes.

There has long been an ignominious association between 'democratically elected' Western governments and 'dictatorial regimes' around the world. When benefit is the axiom around which politics in the West is conducted, 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 excused under euphemisms related to strategy, geo-politics and the like.

While Western leaders talk of "stability" and "constructive engagement", what they often mean is doing deals with dictators. Even the harshest and most shameful measures are accompanied by assurances of noble intent and rhetoric about freedom and independence.

But, Thomas Jefferson was correct when he said, "**We believe no more in Bonaparte's fighting merely for the liberties of the**

seas than in Great Britain's fighting for the liberties of mankind. The object is the same, to draw to themselves the power, the wealth and the resources of other nations."

The list of dictators, which the West has aided and abetted, is long. It would require a multi-volume encyclopaedia to examine all of them, but the following are but a few:

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

In this booklet we attempt to throw some light on a more realistic viewpoint about western foreign policy. We hope to illustrate that all people – whether objective observers, fierce critics or apologists for individual western leaders such as George W Bush, Tony Blair or indeed Barack Obama – need to look beyond the man, beyond any particular administration and, indeed in some cases, to look beyond the state.

For the evidence is that the most aggressively capitalist regimes in the western world, have always built their foreign policy upon corporate interests. That means colonial policies to maintain their own dominance in the world – and to exploit and pillage weaker countries; by economic, political and military means.

Support of tyrannical regimes is but one tool in this wider centuries old policy, in which the governments of Britain, France and the United States have been true world leaders.

The twentieth century is arguably history's bloodiest century – with two World Wars, a war in Vietnam and other proxy-wars played out between the super powers of the day. It is the century which was dominated by two ideologies – that of God-less Communism, and that of profit driven Capitalism. A century when wars were raged, brutal regimes supported, famine flourished, and people starved despite the massive wealth in the world.

It was also the century when sadly, Islam, as carried on a state and international level, was absent. This, we believe is no coincidence.

Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler

History will probably judge Josef Stalin and Adolf 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.

George W Bush's statement that Saddam Hussein was 'a student of Stalin' is somewhat ironic. For it was the West, and the US in particular, who courted and made allies with Stalin, arguably one of history's most brutal dictator during World War Two. In 1932 – only a few years before his alliance with Britain, France and the United States - Stalin ordered Ukraine starved to enforce collectivisation and crush Ukrainian nationalism. At least 8 million Ukrainians were murdered and

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 courting his friendship and help during World War Two in the name of a 'greater good'.

It would be hard to argue the relationship was a reluctant one, born out of necessity. 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 too, 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 is reported to have 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'].

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 challenges 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.

Their evidence is that 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. Their 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 ruling class at that time, 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 they realised that Nazism threatened Britain's markets and colonies.

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.

Britain 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.

Central and South America – the United States’ “back yard”

In more recent years the US association with dictatorships and terrorist groups have involved training, funding and extending political support to 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”**, 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].

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 Sandinistas. 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.]

"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 which 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 the twentieth century in 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 as follows:

- 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: I 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.
- 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 U.S. 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.'
- 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 U.S. objectives.

- National Security Council, National Security Decision Memorandum 93, Policy towards Chile, November 9, 1970: This memorandum summarizes the presidential decisions regarding changes in U.S. 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 U.S. agencies to adopt a 'cool' posture toward Allende's government, in order to prevent his consolidation of power and 'limit [his] ability to implement policies contrary to U.S. and hemisphere interests.' The memo states that existing U.S. 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.
- 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, Indonesia's dictator

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'.

The British Ambassador in Jakarta, Sir Andrew Gilchrist, informed the Foreign Office that "**I have never concealed from you my belief that a little shooting in Indonesia would be an essential preliminary to effective change**".

In 1965, when Suharto toppled General Sukarno as leader of Indonesia, it is estimated that some half a million Indonesians were killed - constituting one of the worst slaughters in post-war 20th century 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.

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 Federspeil, who an Indonesian expert was working at the State Department when Suharto orchestrated the anti-communist pogrom. “No one was getting very worked up about it.”

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 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

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.

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 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 U.S. interests' and has made several moves to prevent that result."

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 U.N. experts has concluded...Meanwhile, in the Iraqi capital of Baghdad, U.S. 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 U.N. report said. "***The types of chemical agents used were bis-[2-chlorethyl]-sulfide, also known as mustard gas, and ethyl N, dimethyl phosphoroamido cyanidate, a nerve agent known as Tabun."***

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 that emanated from the American and British government prior to the 2003 Iraq

war, 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."***

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 U.S. 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."***

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. U.S. intelligence sources told the LA Times in 1991, they “believe that the American-built helicopters were among those dropping the deadly bombs.”

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.

Prior to the 2003 invasion of Iraq, Washington spoke of Saddam's threat and the consequences of a failure to act. Despite the fact that the administration failed to provide even a shred of concrete proof that Iraq had links to Al Qaeda or had resumed production of chemical or biological agents, Rumsfeld insisted 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.

The UK's role in the pre-Gulf War rise of Saddam has been suppressed by the UK Government. In defiance of UN guidelines, Margaret Thatcher's government in the 1980s, and then the Major government 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 a 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 1980's under the arms-export drive by Thatcher, her son Mark became an unofficial roving salesman for British arms companies. Mark Thatcher is estimated to have earned himself about \$160 million in commissions in the process, including up to \$40 million from a single deal with Saudi Arabia.

While sales to most dictatorial regimes caused no particular diplomatic problems [the only protests being from the

political far 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 1980s 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 a 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 dictators, like Saddam. This twisted logic may have impressed the Labour party delegates but 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 the so-called 'war on terrorism' still has as its allies the most odious of dictators.

The West and other Muslim world dictators

Western regimes have not hidden their admiration for the dictators of the Muslim world. The history of the relationship goes back to World War One, the division of the Arab world under the Sykes-Picot treaty between Britain and France, and the installation of western-friendly absolute monarchs.

In November 2001, Tony Blair welcomed the head of Pakistan's military junta, General Musharraf, by saying "**So, Sir, thank you very much for your support and your help and once again let me repeat our very warm welcome to you here.**" These were his words of support for the military dictator who fixed the 2002 referendum which allegedly showed 97 per cent support for his rule. He was later responsible for the deaths of thousands of Pakistanis and Afghans in the 'war on terror'.

Speaking of the late King Fahd bin Abdul Aziz, Tony Blair said that he was a "**man of great vision and leadership**". At a speech in front of the then Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia in London in 2000, Peter Hain, a Government minister, said that he was delighted by his presence in London "**which we like to think is your second home**". It is therefore unsurprising that while Britain can officially protest for free elections in Iran, it never criticises the tyrannical surrogate regimes in the Persian Gulf.

Peter de la Billiere, the UK commander in the first Gulf War, explicitly explained the importance of keeping these dictators in power in the Muslim world. He talked of the need to maintain the Saudi regime: "**As we, the British, had backed the system of sheikhly rule ever since our own withdrawal from the Gulf in the early 1970s, and seen it prosper, we were keen that it should continue. Saudi Arabia was an old and**

proven friend of ours...It was thus very much in our interests that the country and regime should remain stable after the war."

This was no surprise given that in 1958 the UK Joint Intelligence Committee said that ***"The maintenance of our interests in the Persian Gulf states is dependent on continued stability in the area. At present only the Rulers can provide this. No alternative regimes are in sight, certainly not regimes which could provide the stability on which the maintenance of British interests depends. A failure to support any one of the Rulers would weaken the confidence of the others in our ability and willingness to protect them. It is on this confidence that our special position in the Gulf chiefly rests."*** [Nationalist and radical movements in the Arabian Peninsula, 10 February 1958, Public Record Office, CAB 158/31]

Similarly, the US National Security Council wrote that the USA's ***"economic and cultural interests in the area have led not unnaturally to close US relations with elements in the Arab world whose primary interest lies in the maintenance of relations with the West and the status quo in their countries"***.

Through their support for the dictators of the Muslim world, Western governments are complicit in the deaths of thousands killed and tortured for working for Islamic governance, complicit in denying Muslims a political voice in any Muslim country and complicit with the rulers of the Muslim world in impoverishing the masses by shackling entire nations under IMF loans and giving corporations a freehand to exploit the masses.

As far back as 1957, the British Foreign Office identified the danger of Muslim rulers ***"losing their authority to reformist or revolutionary movements which might reject the connexion***

with the United Kingdom". It is for this reason that some fifty years later, the British Home Secretary, Charles Clarke, argued that opposition to the re-establishment of the Caliphate was fundamental to the West's civilisation. This is principally because Western governments are acutely aware that the Caliphate will draw a line under the era of surrogate client states that safeguard Western interests while oppressing the masses.

Afghanistan

Western propaganda at the time, and since the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 was largely built upon characterisations of the Taliban regime as being brutal, authoritarian and 'violators of human rights' – particularly it was emphasised – against women.

However, 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. U.S 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 U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and director of strategic studies for the Washington-based Centre for Strategic and Budgeting Assessments. **"But the Northern Alliance does have some good elements."**

"The U.S. 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 U.S. allies are rapists. As early as 1996, the U.S. 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 Hazzara 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..."**

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.

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 recognized 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 U.S. 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.

Two years later, according to the U.S. 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 mujahedeen 'freedom fighters.' When the various mujahedeen 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.

The Northern Alliance funded much of its war effort from the heroin trade. According to the U.S. 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 tameily however, that the U.S. 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?'

Democracy vs. Dictatorship

After the image of Western governments was irreparably tarnished through the Iraq war and the 'regime change' that followed, there have been attempts to once again portray the motives of Western foreign policy as noble. In a visit to Cairo in June 2005, US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, said that **"America will not impose our style of government on the**

unwilling. Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, to attain their own freedom, make their own way." She argued that the US pursuit of stability in the Middle East at the expense of democracy had "achieved neither", and claimed "***Now, we are taking a different course. We are supporting the democratic aspirations of all people.***"

Newly elected US President, Barack Obama, made similar comments to Secretary Rice, hoping to use 'soft power' and personal charm to rescue the image of the USA. While in 2002, as an Illinois state senator, Obama called on Saudi Arabia and Egypt to stop oppressing their people and suppressing dissent, he made no such comments when he gave a much publicised speech in Cairo in June 2009.

But in his visit to Saudi Arabia, Obama refused to criticise the dictatorship, choosing instead to praise the king for his '***wisdom and graciousness***'. In an interview with the BBC just prior to his departure to the Middle East, the BBC's Justin Webb asked Obama directly, "***Do you regard President Mubarak as an authoritarian ruler?***" ***Obama replied "No...I tend not to use labels for folds"***. He later refused to acknowledge Mubarak's authoritarianism on the grounds that "I haven't met him". He also described Mubarak as a "***force for stability in the region***".

It is often the case, that the people of Muslim world are presented with a choice between democracy or dictatorship. A good example of this is the recent political turmoil in Pakistan. After realising the wavering support for the dictator General Musharraf due to his blind servitude to the 'war on terror', the West started to create a movement for a return to democratic rule in Pakistan. This is despite the fact that the democratic rulers of Pakistan have an equally poor track record compare to the dictators who have ruled it over the last sixty years. Western governments, knowing that their interests would be protected by either dictators or democratically elected politicians, were happy to place pressure on Musharraf to pave the way for a

return of power to the PPP. This ensured that the masses were pacified, while Pakistan's regime remained a loyal servant to Western interests. The West knows that changing from military leaders to political leaders without changing the underlying political system does not bring about a real change that threatens its interests.

Despite talk of freedom, democracy and an 'ethical foreign policy', the support for dictators and the ruthless foreign policy towards the Muslim world continued unabated.

Conclusion

After the destruction of the Ottoman Caliphate in March 1924 at the hands of the self-proclaimed secularist Mustafa Kemal, western regimes, in particular that of Britain and France, exploited this collapse which they had helped engineer.

The Muslim world was carved up under the Sykes-Picot agreement into a host of weak and ineffective states with corrupt dictators ruling over them. The main feature of the Muslim world since that time is a leadership that has not looked after the interests of the people but has rather looked after the interests of foreign governments.

In this short booklet, we have merely presented 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. All people of conscience must call into question the role of the West in leading and shaping world affairs.

Today, the Muslims are looking for a new, alternative leadership to these dictators and tyrants – a leadership that will be sincere, independent, transparent and accountable and politicians who will be servants of the masses and not slaves to Washington and

London. This can only happen when the Caliphate (Khilafah) is restored as the ruling system in the Muslim world.

The Caliphate will put an end the corruption, develop the potential of their countries and establish relations with the world on a level playing field. It will not take the Muslim world to a mythical medieval theocratic model, but rather will advance the world under an enlightened social, economic and political order, dealing with the inequalities, injustice and corporate terror felt by most under Capitalism.

Selected Bibliography

Aris, B & Campbell D. How Bush's grandfather helped Hitler's rise to power. The Guardian, 25th September 2004.

Black, E. IBM and the Holocaust: The Strategic Alliance between Nazi Germany and America's Most Powerful Corporation, London: Crown Publishers.

Chomsky, N. Dictators R Us. Toronto Star, 21st December 2003.

Curtis, M. The Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World, London: Vintage.

Finkel, A & Leibovitz, C. Hitler-Chamberlain Collusion, The Merlin Press Ltd.

Louis, WR. The British Empire in the Middle East 1945-1951: Arab Nationalism, the United States, and Postwar Imperialism: Arab Nationalism, the United States and Postwar Imperialism, Oxford: OUP.

Muggeridge, M. The Infernal Grove Chronicles of Wasted Time: No. 2, William Morrow and Co.

Radzinsky, E. Stalin, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.

Nationalist and radical movements in the Arabian Peninsula, 10 February 1958, Public Record Office, CAB 158/31.