

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

## The Real Motives Behind the Colonial War on Iraq

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ لَا تُفْسِدُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ قَالُوا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ مُصْلِحُونَ ﴿١١﴾

And when it is said to them: "Make not mischief on the earth," they say: "We are only peacemakers."

أَلَا إِنَّهُمْ هُمُ الْمُفْسِدُونَ وَلَكِن لَّا يَشْعُرُونَ ﴿١٢﴾

Verily! They are the ones who make mischief, but they perceive not.

[TMQ Al-Baqarah: 11-12]

### TALK OF WAR

- For decades the world has been made to believe that the US is the brightest beacon of freedom and democracy, the world has been made to believe that no bullet is fired from a US military weapon except that there is a moral cause, a higher purpose, a humanitarian goal.
- However we the Muslim ummah can testify against this time and time again, for we have seen this moral cause in tears of our orphans, we have felt this higher purpose in the destruction of our homes and we have smelt this humanitarian goal in the air that reeks with the innocent blood of our loved ones.
- As the U.S. and Britain **point their imperialist guns** towards **Iraq** we are expected to swallow the pill of apathy with Downing Street and the White House aiming to convince us with unparalleled **deceit** and **duplicity** of the threat of Saddam Hussien.
- And that this war is truly about preventing state sponsored terrorism and bringing security to the region whilst the political indicators confirm something radically different, that this war, first and foremost is about securing Western economic and political interest namely those of the US and Britian.
- We have been told that the evidence is conclusive that Saddam is in possession of weapons of mass destruction and that he intends to use them against the west and their allies and friends.
- Both Bush and Blair have gone to tremendous length to argue the case for war and the necessity of a pre-emptive strike to rid us of "the world's worst leader" and as the debate ensued we have been waiting with anticipation for this conclusive proof, yet all we have received are statements such as "**the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence**" from defence secretary Rumsfeld.

- As for here in Britain Blair's dossier on Saddam's weapons fell short of a joke had it not been for the serious nature of its purpose. A perfect bound document of 'ifs' 'buts' and 'maybes' speculation and guesswork when the lives of millions are at stake.
- Not a single hard fact has been presented
- The main four claims that it presents as justification for attacking Iraq which are also the main arguments presented by the Bush administration are as follows:

The **first** claim made is that **Iraq is in material breach of UN resolutions.**

- A list of which President Bush made a point to address to the UN general assembly on the 12<sup>TH</sup> September.
- And here one cannot but help notice the double standards and hypocrisy of International Law for two key allies of the West are also in serious material breach of UN resolutions however they can expect a completely different treatment
- India today is in material breach of UN resolution concerning its occupation of Kashmir.
- Israel today has around 65 UN resolutions condemning its actions from the right of return of refugees to the occupation of Golan Heights to resolutions issued for Israel's flagrant violation of other UN resolutions.
- Yet today there is no talk of a US led war against Israel or India, instead the United States has vetoed 30 of the 65 UN resolutions issued condemning Israel and has pumped over 85 billion in the form of grants, loans and aid with the total cost to the US taxpayer including the interest borne amounting to nearly 135 billion US dollars
- But this should be no surprise for the so-called champions of international law neither respect nor abide by it when it comes to their interests. Ronald Reagan, former US President, basking in the triumph that was the US invasion of Grenada, in 1983 stated

*"One hundred nations in the UN have not agreed with us on just about everything that's come before them, where we're involved, and it didn't upset my breakfast at all."*

The **Second** claim is that **Iraq has weapons of mass destruction**

- Today there are 26 countries with a chemical weapon's programme
- 20 with biological weapons
- 7 states with nuclear potential
- 8 fully nuclear states

- & 16 states with missile technology to deliver this
- Are they all to be disarmed? Are they all to be attacked?
- But we are all told that Iraq is special. President Bush stated in his recent speech *“Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people”*
- Yet Mr Bush seems to forget how his predecessors in the White House dropped Nuclear bombs in Hiroshima & Nagasaki in 1945, even though the Japanese have tried in numerous attempts to surrender, killing 140,000 and 70,000 innocent civilians respectively.

The **third** claim is that **Saddam is a monster, a real brutal dictator who terrorizes his own people** and therefore needs to be removed

- Now the problem with this claim whilst it is true is that Saddam is a product of western foreign policy.
- In the 1980’s he was armed and befriended by the West as well as encouraged through defence contracts to build his weapons programme.
- So let us not forget how Saddam acquired his WMDs. Recent studies have shown that companies from at least 26 different countries (of which 12 of them are Western states) have helped Saddam build his WMD. 19 companies from the UK alone and 18 companies from the United States had involvement with Saddam’s weapons programme.
- As for the west’s sympathy for the Iraqi people it is an insult to try convince us that when the US and Britain their hands are soaked with the innocent blood of women and children in Iraq that they are concerned with the fate of the Iraqi people.
- In fact the real acid test of this farce known as ethical foreign policy is to look at the current Western allies in the war upon terror such President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan.
- A man who regularly imprisons his political opponents and tortures them to the point of death. There is not a single Human Rights Organisation that has not documented the brutality of Karimov’s regime with evidences and facts and the crimes that he has committed against his people.
- And yet whilst Iraq anticipates aerial bombardment and a military invasion, Uzbekistan on the other hand awaits 160 million in US aid for its services to stamp out Islam from society and its crackdown on Islamic groups.

## The **fourth** claim it is that **Saddam is a special case because he has a track record for using his WMD on his own citizens as well as previous experience for invading his neighbours**

- Whilst Saddam did gas his own people killing 130,000 at the time he did this he was considered an ally of the west, in fact the biological weapons that he used to kill his own people were manufactured from stock supplied by the American Type Culture Collection Company of Rockville in the US under an export license issued by the United States Department of Commerce.
- Further to this the use of WMD and invading other countries is not confined to Saddam and the same accusation can be legitimately applied to the US, Britain or Israel.
- So if we were apply the same pretext used against Saddam, under similar circumstances a Syrian and Egyptian attack on Israel would equally be justified.
- Israel has WMD,
- Has invaded its neighbours and remains a menace,
- Violates international law and conventions,
- Oppresses those it has occupied
- And is led by a brutal leader who has been implicated in war crimes.

## **The Real Motives**

- My dear Muslim Brothers and Sisters we have seen from the claims presented by Downing Street and the White House that their arguments for war against Iraq are as flimsy as a spider's web.
- Therefore what are the real motives behind this colonial war that the west is avoiding to discuss?
- Before I discuss the true motives of this war I would like to begin with two quotes that lay the framework for US foreign policy in the Middle East:

American ex president, Nixon, states in his memoirs: *"Today, the question of who controls what is in the Arabian Gulf and the Middle East forms a key in the hand of the one who controls what is in the world."*

Myles Copeland former CIA operative and political advisor to Jamal Abd Al Nasser states in his book Game of Nations:

*“... when our government decides what to do about other countries it is limited only by considerations of effectiveness. If it works we can do it. When moral considerations loom up, the question is not “can we do it?” but “can we get away with it?” ...if we do not lie about our intentions or enter into treaties we do not intend to honour it is because such behaviour is ineffective-and the fact remains, of course, that we do lie about our intentions and fail to abide by our treaties when it is to our advantage to do so and when we can get away with it.”*

- Now that we have this framework let us look at the motives behind this war.
- If we assess U.S foreign policy we will find that it is built upon four fundamental pillars:
  1. Making the world open and hospitable for **globalisation**, particularly American-based Multinational corporations;
  2. **Enhancing the financial statements of defence contractors** at home who have contributed generously to members of Congress and residents of the White House;
  3. **Preventing the rise** of any society that might serve as a successful example of **an alternative to the capitalist model**;
  4. **Extending political, economic and military hegemony** over as much of the globe as possible, **to prevent the rise of any regional power that might challenge American supremacy**, and **to create a world order** in America's image, as befits the world's only superpower.

## OIL

- If we look at the first pillar, making the world open and hospitable for globalisation, the motive of oil regarding the attack on Iraq is visible for all to see.
- Iraq today sits on 10% of the world's oil supplies, the second largest reserves after Saudi Arabia. It has a potential of producing 5 million barrels per day.
- This enormous wealth quoted by Dick Cheney when he stated at the beginning of August in reference to Saddam: **'He sits on top of 10 per cent of the world's oil reserves. He has enormous wealth being generated by that.**
- Tempts a US administration heavily linked to big oil. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney and National security Advisor Condoleezza Rice all have extensive, personal, professional and political interests in the oil industry.
- The oil and gas industry more or less own Washington these days and have pumped about \$50m to political candidates since the 2000 election. More than that, America

views oil not simply as an economic commodity but a strategic necessity due to the effect oil and its price has on trade and commerce globally.

- Rice was on the board of US oil giant Chevron. In an interview with Fox TV appearing in her current role as national security adviser she stated ***“ I’m very proud of my association with Chevron, and I think that we should be very proud of the job that American oil companies are doing abroad, in exploration at home, and in making certain that we have a safe energy supply”***
- As for Cheney, until recently he was CEO of the worlds largest Oil services company Halliburton and remains the majority Shareholder. An organisation that provides services and equipments for the exploration of oil that has undertaken major projects in the Persian Gulf, Mexico and more significantly the Caspian region specifically after September the 11<sup>th</sup>.
- In 1998 in a meeting to Oil industry executives he stated: **“I can't think of a time when we've had a region emerge as suddenly to become as strategically significant as the Caspian.”**
- And Lo and behold 3 years later America has built a puppet regime in Afghanistan, established military basis in strategic locations near the Caspian sea that oddly enough seem to follow the exact map of a proposed American pipeline route being built from the Caspian through Afghanistan in to the Arabian Sea through Pakistan for the transport of oil to America’s customers.
- Indeed it would be naïve to assume that big oil does not play a part in US foreign Policy when the Vice President of the United States famous for his statement **“You've got to go where the oil is”**
- Is it any surprise that the Chicago Tribune published in an article: **War is big business and Dick Cheney is right in the middle of it.**
- Further to the economic interests that tempt the West Wing there is also the political advantage that the US would have over Europe, Russia, Japan and China.
- 30% of Europe’s oil consumption if from the Middle East and Persian Gulf
- 80% of Japan’s oil consumption is from the Middle East and Persian Gulf
- Therefore control of the energy sources of the needs of these countries is an indispensable political tool.

The report, **Strategic Energy Policy Challenges For The 21st Century**, concludes: ***'The United States remains a prisoner of its energy dilemma. Iraq remains a de- stabilising influence to ... the flow of oil to international markets from the Middle East. Saddam Hussein has also demonstrated a willingness to threaten to use the oil weapon and to use his own export programme to manipulate oil markets. Therefore the US should conduct an immediate policy review toward Iraq including military, energy, economic and political/ diplomatic assessments.***

- And once an Iraqi Hamid Karzai has replaced Saddam there is no question that the oil wells of Iraq will open for US companies led by Exxon and Chevron to exploit the wealth of the Ummah as is the standard feature of the greed driven capitalist states.

## Defence Contractors

- As for the second pillar of enhancing the statements of defence contractors this is evident in the closeness of relationships that exist between the defence industry and the successive US administrations.
- Defence Secretary Rumsfeld's oldest friend is a man called Frank Carlucci, a former defence secretary himself who now heads the Carlyle Group, an investment consortium which has a big interest in the contracting firm United Defence.
- Carlyle's board includes George Bush Senior and James Baker. Carlyle's European chairman is John Major who was the Prime Minister who ordered British troops into the first Iraqi war.
- One programme alone, **the Crusader artillery system**, has earned Carlyle more than \$2bn in advance contracts.

## To curb the Rise of the Khilafah

- As for the third and fourth pillar which are **Preventing the rise** of any society that might serve as a successful example of **an alternative to capitalism and extending political, economic and military hegemony to prevent the rise of any regional power that might challenge American supremacy** the middle east plays an absolutely vital role.
- There is no question that the middle east is today unstable
- The plight of the Palestinian people remains a concern for every Arab and every Muslim.
- More importantly the call for Khilafah in the Muslim world has built in the minds of many Islam as complete and comprehensive way of life that can be implemented as a deen and state.
- The ummah today has lost all confidence in her rulers and is calling for their removal, her political unification and an end of western interference in her affairs.
- No longer can America and the West rely on their puppets to secure their interests, no longer can they trust that the situation is under control and therefore there is a strong case in Capitol Hill that the presence of American forces in the region is absolutely vital and the only way that the US can fully guarantee the security of her Interests.

## **Conclusion**

- Mention Albright angle
- Give stats on effect of sanctions
- Discuss what is needed in Iraq, not Hamid karzai's (Chalabi, Salihi, Khazarji) but the correct and sincere Islamic political leadership –the khilafah.