

The World Crisis

**The Creation of Hate, Terrorism and  
New-Fascism in the World**

**A Memoir and Commentary  
By Hassan Massali, Ph.D.**

**Publisher: Hassan Massali, Ph.D.  
Multi – Cultural Center e. V.  
P.O. Box 4145  
65031 Wiesbaden, Germany  
ISBN: 978-3-9816239-5-6  
All rights reserved**

## Certificate of Registration



This Certificate issued under the seal of the Copyright Office in accordance with title 17, *United States Code*, attests that registration has been made for the work identified below. The information on this certificate has been made a part of the Copyright Office records.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "King H. Leake".

Acting United States Register of Copyrights and Director

Registration Number

**TXu 2-084-419**

Effective Date of Registration:

January 29, 2018

### Title

**Title of Work:** The World Crisis The Creation of Hate, Terrorism and New-Fascism in the World

### Completion/Publication

**Year of Completion:** 2018

### Author

- **Author:** Hassan Massali  
**Author Created:** text  
**Citizen of:** United States  
**Domiciled in:** United States  
**Year Born:** 1936

### Copyright Claimant

**Copyright Claimant:** Hassan Massali

### Rights and Permissions

**Name:** Hassan Massali  
**Email:** hmassali@aol.com  
**Telephone:** (301)792-3370  
**Alt. Telephone:** (301)792-3370  
**Address:**

### Certification

**Name:** Hassan Massali

## Contents:

<b>Introduction</b> The New World Order And the New Fascism in the World	<b>Page 6</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b> A Short Autobiography of Hassan Massali, Ph.D.	<b>Page 15</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b> The Foreign and Colonialist Intervention in Iran	<b>Page 42</b>
<b>Chapter 3</b> The Role of Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh The Creation a Democratic State in Iran	<b>Page 62</b>
<b>Chapter 4</b> The USA and UK Coup D'état and the Conspiracy against Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh and the Iranian People Creation of Dictatorship, Hate and Terrorism in Iran	<b>Page 72</b>
<b>Chapter 5</b> The Role of the Shah as a “Puppet” of the U.S. and U.K. in Iran and in the Region	<b>Page 86</b>
<b>Chapter 6</b> The Creation of the Khomeini Regime, an Islamic Fascist Republic in Iran	<b>Page 109</b>
<b>Chapter 7</b> Victims of State Terrorism – The Khomeini Regime in Iran	<b>Page 119</b>
<b>Chapter 8</b> Creation of Hate, Terrorism and Corruption in Afghanistan	<b>Page 160</b>
<b>Chapter 9</b> The War and Military Occupation In Iraq	<b>Page 170</b>

**Chapter 10** **Page 188**

**The Military Occupation in Libya**

**The War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity in Libya**

**Chapter 11** **Page 194**

**The Palestinian Cause and Peace in the Middle East**

**The Role of Superpowers and the Policies of Arab-Israeli Leaders**

**Chapter 12** **Page 209**

**The Anti-Democratic Condition in the U.S. and the U.S.**

**Military's Policy of Invasion and Creation of Hate and Terrorism in the World**

**Chapter 13** **Page 244**

**Summary: The Making and Formation of Terrorism in The World**

**Acknowledgments and Notes** **Page 257**

## **Introduction**

**The New World Order**

**And**

**The New Fascism in the World**

## **The World is divided in two Zones:**

- **The Superpowers, under the leadership of the U.S., U.K. and France**
- **The “Underdeveloped Countries” in Africa, Asia, Latin-America.**

**Also, Europe is divided into “poor and rich” countries.**

**I believe that, after World War II and the elimination of classic fascism in Germany, Italy and Japan, the Coalition Forces from the East, under the leadership of Joseph Stalin, and the Coalition Forces from the West, under the leadership of the U.S., U.K. and France, made several mistakes. And step-by-step, they have created a new fascism in the world.**

**I am trying also to explain the difference between the classic fascism and the new fascism in the world.**

**In order to counter fascism in Germany, Italy and Japan, the U.S., British and French governments from one side and the Soviet Union, led by Stalin from the other side, united together and defeated fascism. Subsequently, those governments portrayed themselves as liberating and democratic forces in the world. However, these governments committed huge mistakes, which resulted in the inception of a new form of fascism. This new fascism has led to the current world crisis.**

**The mistakes made are as follows:**

- **In World War II, America’s use of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused horrific human**

**tragedy. Additionally, the Allies bombed millions of civilians in Germany as an excuse to fight Hitler.**

- **Following World War II, military control of Eastern Europe by the Soviets, led by Stalin, resulted in transforming these countries into communist nations.**
- **The rest of the allied forces including the British, the Americans and the French, decided to stay silent in the face of this aggression by the Soviets. Instead, they began dividing up some of the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America amongst themselves, thus creating a new era of exploitation in those countries.**
- **The competition between the East and West evolved during the Cold War, which became an era of further exploitation of other countries in three continents.**
- **The superpowers, ignoring the wishes for democracy by the native populations, supported dictators either by coup or military aggression in order to fight communism. These autocrats stayed in power with U.S. and Western support, and destroyed democratic forces in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.**
- **This strategy was even taken further when the U.S., British and French governments helped to create Islamic terrorist groups from fanatic Islamists in several countries in order to combat communism.**
- **After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the U.S., British and French governments continued their hegemony throughout the world. And this new policy was claimed to be "the new world order."**
- **It is my opinion that within this "new world order," a new fascism has emerged, which is supported by some government elements, politicians and lobbyists.**

**The contrast between the new fascism and the classical fascism led by Hitler are as follows:**

- **In the classical fascism, the ideology was transparent. Political programs were well defined and racism was encouraged and implemented. There was only one party to implement this fascist ideology. The government was very openly implementing those policies.**
- **In the current new world order, there is superficial talk about democracy. However, the super powers have created two-party**

**systems in order to deceive people into thinking that they are part of a democratic society. A large majority of people who hold positions in government or the political parties are not themselves fascist. But the real power is controlled by fascists who function behind closed doors and/or through lobbyist organizations.**

- In this new world order, the globe is divided into two segments:**
- Capitalist superpower countries led by the U.S., Britain and France continue to aggressively pursue their exploitation in Africa, Asia and Latin America. These powers believe that it is their right to intervene militarily and destroy life and property in order to maximize their power and influence. Furthermore, they view many of the people of some of these three continents as inferior and second-class citizens.**
- Underdeveloped countries, which have sustained long periods of colonization and oppression under both the old and new world order. These countries have enormous natural resources and far too little economic or industrial progress,**
- In this new world order of fascism, people of different ethnic and religious backgrounds are often encouraged to fight one another. World superpowers thereby create “terrorist” groups in this regional, ethnic and religious strife, and they see this as an opportunity to intervene politically and militarily in those regions' affairs.**
- In this new world order fascism, the autocratic governments of Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Israel and others are used as bases for this intervention.**

**Superpowers like the United States, Great Britain and France have brought old colonial politics into new forms. They exploit the economic resources of underdeveloped countries. They override the sovereignty of many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and they trample on the human rights of the people there.**

**These New Colonial and New Fascist powers try to expand their power and influence as follows:**

- **They organize coup d'états against the democratic governments and bring their marionettes to power (such as the CIA-backed coup d'état in Iran in 1953).**
- **Under the pretense of the “fight against terrorism,” they occupy countries, i.e., Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, etc.**
- **The superpowers financially and militarily support Islamic extremists, or agitate religious and ethnic groups against each other to achieve a reason for military interventions. For example, the U.S. launched the “Taliban” in Pakistan and Afghanistan with the support of Saudi Arabia and the families of Osama bin Laden and George H.W. Bush.**
- **Both the U.S. and Great Britain used the shah of Iran like a puppet in the Near East. But as soon as they learned that the shah was going to die of cancer, the U.S. and its European partners decided to bring an Islamic extremist government led by Khomeini to power. The heads of four Western powers – the U.S., U.K., France and West Germany – attended a conference, which was held the first week of January 1979. The illness of the shah was kept secret for a long time, and he died July 27, 1980, in Egypt.**
- **The authorities and governments of the U.S., Great Britain and France do not respect the democratic rights of the people in underdeveloped countries. There is extensive historical documentation indicating that they have infiltrated and undermined democratic movements in many countries.**
- **There is evidence that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Israel and the U.S. founded and financially and militarily supported ISIS in order to pursue their interests in Syria and Iraq. The ISIS extremists (like their counterparts in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran) have now decided to no longer depend on their backers (including the U.S.), and have proceeded to attack Iraq and Syria and are operational in many other countries. They plan to establish an Islamic extremist superpower in the Near East. The U.S., Great Britain and France have seized on this situation to justify further military intervention in the Near East.**
- **The U.S. spies on its allies, including the Germans and other Europeans, but most politicians in these countries remain silent and do not have enough courage to seriously challenge this activity or shut down their relationships with the U.S.**



- **Russia is no friend of suppressed people. But because of its rivalry with the U.S., Russia at times act against U.S. policy and appears to support suppressed people. The best friends of the governments of the U.S. and Great Britain in the Near East are Saudi Arabia, Israel and Turkey.**
- **In Saudi Arabia there are still barbaric and medieval laws and cultural norms. In particular, women are nearly treated as second-class citizens. But the U.S. government and most European politicians remain silent about the inhumanity in Saudi Arabia and even try - with the help of Saudi Arabia - to support the Islamic forces who oppose the progressive and democratic elements in the region. For the U.S., Great Britain and France, the oil and gas reserves in the region are more important than democracy and human rights.**
- **The invasion of Libya by the U.S., France and Great Britain was a war crime. These governments wanted to get the gas and oil resources in order to exploit them. But the consequences of the invasion were the destruction of the whole country, the killing of countless people and the launching of a civil war with Islamic extremists.**
- **Turkey has become a political and military base for the U.S. and Great Britain. Through open or secret cooperation with the Turkish government, the superpowers continue to try to achieve their political and military interests in this region. The Baghdad Pact or CENTO and then NATO are tools of this effort.**
- **The U.S. has decided to back the supposed democracy in Turkey. This is the same Turkey that has been involved with systematic genocide for 100 years, starting with the massacre and genocide of the Armenians from 1915 to 1917. Moreover, the Turkish government has always oppressed the Kurdish people and has sought to eliminate them. Finally, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish president, officially announced that women do not enjoy equal rights because they were not built equally by nature.**
- **From Turkey as a base, a racist, ultranationalist, neofascist organization, named the “Grey Wolves,” operates with support of the Turkish intelligence. Members of the Grey Wolves agitate ethnic and religious groups against each other in Turkey and in neighboring countries and try to destabilize these areas with military actions. Yet, the superpowers such as the U.S. and Great Britain claim that they are seeking to**

achieve democracy in the region with the support of Turkey and Saudi Arabia.

- Because of the military interventions of the U.S., Great Britain and France in Africa and the Near East, there are millions of civilians who seek refuge, and die while waiting in refugee camps or attempting to migrate to Europe, only to face marginalization and racism once they may get there.

### **The Role of Israel in the Mideast:**

After World War II, the nation of Israel was founded in the Palestinian territories with the military support of Great Britain. Some democratic forces hoped that a Jewish nation, which represents the oppressed Jews and victims of the Holocaust, would be the best example of democracy in the region. But on the contrary, Israel was dominated by Zionists and both British and American lobbyists, and many authorities in Israel executed a Zionist policy in the region -- for example, the Six-Day War in 1967 under the leadership of Moshe Dayan; and the 1982 military occupation of Lebanon including the massacre of the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon under the leadership of Ariel Sharon.

Israeli politicians like Yitzhak Rabin tried to live in peace with the Palestinians with a peace treaty, but he was assassinated by a Jewish extremist, and afterwards reactionary politicians like Benjamin Netanyahu gained power. Netanyahu launched military actions against the Palestinians, including bombing raids of civilians, schools and hospitals and the killing of hundreds of children. The superpowers like the U.S., Great Britain and France just watched these actions without doing anything serious to challenge or confront them.

I have had the opportunity to meet some of the personalities of the Palestinian movement like Khalil Al-Vazir (Abu Jihad) and Mahmud Hamshahri. They were not “terrorists,” but members of the resistance who wished to live in peace with the Jews.

**But Israelis killed Abu Jihad and other PLO leaders and members in 1988 in Tunis.**

**Mahmud Hamshahri was a PLO representative in France. He was married to a French woman (Marie Claude). In 1972, agents of Mossad, the Israeli National Intelligence Agency, placed a bomb under his telephone and killed him in Paris. It was obvious that the French police cooperated with Mossad in carrying out this assassination.**

**I have been informed by various legitimate sources that the U.S., as well as many European governments allow Mossad agents to use documents and passports, which were issued by the U.S. and European countries for use in carrying out their terroristic activities.**

**During the Iran-Iraq war from 1980-1988, the U.S. government and the government of Israel tried to provoke and incite Khomeini and Saddam Hussein against each other in order to destroy and disrupt those countries.**

**In the mid-1980s, the Reagan Administration, in what is called the Iran-Contra Affair, sought to fund rebels in Nicaragua and liberate American hostages being held by an Iranian ally in Lebanon by secretly selling weapons to the Khomeini Regime. The CIA and Mossad collaborated on this operation and among other things, organized a secret meeting with delegates of the Khomeini regime in Geneva, Switzerland.**

**Hassan Massali, Ph.D.  
February 2016**

## **Chapter 1**

### **A Short Autobiography of Hassan Massali, Ph.D.**

**I was born in Massal (Tavalesh), Iran, I become involved in political activities by supporting Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh's quest for nationalization of the Iranian oil industry during my high school years. In 1958, I went to Germany to further my education. There, I worked to organize Iranian students, and that effort led to the formation of the Confederation of Iranian Students (National Union). From its inception, I was among its top leaders and remained so until 1971. I was also instrumental in the formation of the Iranian National Front in Europe, and I was the head of that organization until 1976. I, along with my friends and supporters, was actively involved in the Iranian Revolution demanding the establishment of a constitutional and democratic government, which would observe the rule of law and respect human rights. Shortly after Khomeini reached Tehran in 1979, he became an absolute ruler.**

**In 1980, I announced my candidacy for the newly formed Parliament to represent my hometown of Tavalesh in North Iran. Although I was elected with a comfortable majority, I was denied the seat in parliament and declared a religious apostate, a declaration that carries with it death within the Islamic System. Consequently, I formed the Democratic Revolutionary Movement of Iranian Toilers in North Iran in Gilan and Mazandaran, which began a struggle against Khomeini's regime. And for three years I collaborated with Dr. Abdulrahman Ghassemlou and his Democratic Party of Kurdistan for attainment of the democratic principle that I had fought for all my life. Following the assassination of Dr. Ghassemlou in Vienna in 1989, and later the murder of the leadership of the Kurdish Democratic Party in Berlin by the agents of the Islamic Republic, I moved permanently to Europe to start a new political process outside Iran.**

**Hassan Massali, Ph.D.**

**In 1990, I met the exiled Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar, the former Prime Minister of Iran during the waning days of the reign of Shah Pahlavi, and I decided to establish a new unified democratic front. Shortly thereafter, the agents of Islamic Republic of Iran assassinated Dr. Bakhtiar and his long-time associate Dr. Abdulrahman Boroumand in Paris. Prior to their assassinations, I was invited to join the National Resistance Movement of Iran created by Dr. Bakhtiar, and I was elected to the leadership of this organization.**

**In 1995, after countless political assassinations inside and outside Iran by the agents of Islamic regime in Tehran and the failure of any political opposition to deal with crimes of Islamic Republic, I invited all Iranians of diverse political positions, who desired the formation of a society in Iran based on separation of church and state, observance of the rule of law and respect for international law and human rights, to meet and deal within our common destiny.**

**The first "Iranian National Congress" finally met in July 1995 in Germany, as a beginning step towards our national unity.**

**These events have been repeated by Iranian patriots all over the world. Their unity outside of Iran, often reflects the aspiration of Iranians who suffer under a despotic medieval regime that has threatened the security and peace in the region and the world at large since the Islamic regime was established in Iran.**

**EDUCATION:**

**Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Germany, July 1999**

**Degree: Ph.D., Political Science**

**Dissertation Topic: “*Die Entstehung, Entwicklung und die fortwährende Krise der Marxistisch-Leninistischen Organisationen Irans seit 1963.*”(Development and Permanent Crisis of the Iranian Marxist-Leninist Organizations since 1963)**

**College of Social Work Education, Wiesbaden, Germany, October 1991-June 1996**

**POLITICAL BACKGROUND:**

**Confederation of Iranian Students, Organizer and Leader, 1960-1971**

**Iranian National Front in Europe, Organizer and Leader, 1960-1976**

**Iranian National Front in the Middle East, Organizer and Leader, 1964-1978**

**Democratic Revolutionary Movement of Iranian Toilers, Organizer and Leader, 1980-1990**

**National Resistance Movement, Organizer and Leader, 1990-1995**

**Iranian National Congress, Organizer and Leader, 1995-1998**

**Iranian Cultural Center in Germany, Founder and President, 1985-2002**

**Multicultural Events in Saarbrücken, Frankfurt and Wiesbaden, Germany**

**Conference on Democracy in Iran, American University, Organizer, 2003**

**Iran Democratic Front in Iran, Overseas Representative, May 2003-Nov. 2004**

**National Alliance Front in Iran, Overseas Representative, Oct. 2004-Feb. 2006**

**Founder and President of the nonprofit foundation: Action for Democracy and Human Rights in the Middle East.**

**PUBLICATIONS & PRESENTATIONS:**

*Collection of Articles on Causes of Dictatorship and Culture of Democracy in Iran, November 1998, published by the Iranian National Front in the Middle East, Europe and the U.S.*

*Development of the Left- Movement in Iran and the Causes of its Permanent Crisis, May 2001, self-published*

*Mentality and Conflicts of Immigrant Workers and Political Refugees Intercultural Learning while Living in Youth Houses*

*Learning Styles and Educational Formats*

**OTHER ACTIVITIES:**

**Member of "Iran Azad," Editorial Board, Persian Publication of Iranian National Front in Europe, 1971-1976.**

**Member of "Bakhtar Emrooz" Editorial Board, a Persian Publication of the Iranian National Front in the Middle East, 1971-1976.**

**Member of the Editorial Board of "Iran Al-Soura," the Arabic Publication of the Iranian National Front in the Middle East, 1971-1976.**

**Organizing the Secular-Democrat Movement in the Middle East to oppose the dictatorship of the shah and other reactionary regimes in the Middle East, in solidarity with the Palestinian Movement to create an Independent Palestinian State, supporting the peace between Arabs and Israel, and cooperating with political personalities like Yasser Arafat (Abu Ammar), Khalil Vazir (Abu Jihad) and George**

**Habash, 1964-1978.**

## **EXPERIENCE**

**Educational Counselor, Arbeiter Wohlfahrt, Voehl, Germany  
1991-1997**

- **Counseled and mentored children and young adults from a multitude of cultures and ethnic backgrounds**
- **Conducted employment training and career counseling with participants**
- **Worked with parents, family members and their countries of origin**
- **Organized sports, recreational, social activities and multicultural activities**
- **Served as liaison to people in the community**

**Seasoned professional with extensive experience working with and advocating for immigrant and refugee communities and youth exiled**

**Published author of articles, Books and Conference Presentations on political issues affecting refugee communities exiled.**

**Editor of numerous journals and collections of articles**

**Organized political conferences abroad.**

**Languages: English, German, Persian/Farsi, Taleshi, Gilaki.**

**Research, Writing and Editing**

**Iranian, U.S. and German Citizenship**

**Recently, I have published several research books in Persian, English and German.**

**Personal Status: Married, Citizen of Iran, U.S.A. and Germany**

**I have conducted numerous interviews with leading international media such as BBC, Voice of America, Radio France International, Radio Israel, Radio Cairo, Deutsche Welle, Radio Free-Iran and local press, radio, TV in Europe, U.S. and Canada. Here are some video,**

**photos and other documents about my family and political background and as well as my activities in Iran and in exile:  
[www.youtube.com/user/democracyiran](http://www.youtube.com/user/democracyiran)  
[www.iranomid.de](http://www.iranomid.de) [www.adhr.info](http://www.adhr.info) [www.iran-isip.com](http://www.iran-isip.com)**

**Dr. Eghbal, the Prime Minister of Iran, and several members of his Administration, visited Massal, and honored my father for his constructive activities after the Second World War in North Iran.**

**My father worked for the reconstruction of Massal, Tavalesh, (North Iran).**

**The beautiful green mountains in Massal, Tavalesh (North Iran)**

**The family house in Massal, North Iran**

**Between Gilan and Ayarbazjan, 1956**

**I was also very active in sports -- here with my friends and Mr. Dawaran, the President, and Mr. Tashakori, the Sport Trainer, of Adib School, 1956.**

**In Tübingen, Germany, 1959**

**The University Degree in Political Science (Ph.D.)  
From the J. W. Goethe University in Frankfurt/M., Germany.**

**The Congress of Iranian National Front in Europe, 1963 in Mainz, Germany (I was one of the founders of INF in Europe.)**



**Meeting with Representatives of Hong Kong Students Organization in Hong Kong, June 1966.**

**Meeting with Representatives of Parliament in Manila, Philippines, 1966**

**As a representative of Confederation of Iranian Students (National Union), I participated in the International Students Seminar in Manila, Philippines, June 1966.**

**Demonstration against the dictatorship of the shah in New York City, 1970**

**Demonstration against the shah regime, in Germany in 1967**

**Demonstration against the shah in Bonn, Germany, in 1967, (from left to right: Pahlavan, Navaii, Massali)**

**Statement about my Job & Activities as an “Educational Counselor”  
in Vöhl, Germany.**

**I was supported from the people in Talesh, North Iran, and I was elected for the Parliament in 1980. But Khomeini refused to accept the people’s vote and secretly issued an order to kill me. I started “underground activities” and became involved in the armed struggle in Kurdistan and Gilan, Iran, and I was resisting from 1980 until 1984 inside Iran.**

**I created a new organization and became involved in the armed struggle against the Khomeini regime in Gilan and Kurdistan, Iran from 1980 to 1984.**

**Crossing the mountain between Kurdistan and Gilan in Iran**

## **Chapter 2**

# **The Foreign and Colonialist Intervention in Iran**

**The Origins of U.S. Support for an Autocratic Iran**

**(By: Habib Ladjvardi, 1983 Cambridge University Press, Int. J. Middle East Stud.15 (1983))**

**At a time when the history of relations between the United States and the former Iranian regime (as well as other autocratic states) is being reconsidered, it is important to recognize that U.S. support for one-man rule in Iran did not commence in 1953 subsequent to the fall of the government of Dr. Mossadegh. A study of the diplomatic records of the U.S. State Department and the British Foreign Office indicates an earlier beginning.**

**The above records reveal three important facts about the subject of our study: (1) as soon as the 21 year-old Crown Prince Mohammad Reza Pahlavi replaced his father on the throne in September 1941 as a result of the invasion of Iran by the Anglo-Soviet forces—with the proviso that henceforth, in accordance with Iran's constitution, he must reign rather than rule—the young shah launched a gradual but persistent campaign to regain the absolute powers of Reza Shah and to reverse the movement toward a constitutional monarchy; (2) within five years after the reestablishment of constitutional government, Great Britain and the United States decided to assist the shah to become "the strong man" of Iran because they concluded that through a single "strong" individual—rather than through a parliamentary democracy—they could better protect and promote their geopolitical as well as commercial interests; (3) the State Department and the Foreign Office were surprisingly well aware of the consequences and the risks inherent in their decision to assist the shah to gain absolute power.**

**Much has been said (mostly off the record) about the inappropriateness and the prematurity of constitutional government for Iran—for that matter for most "developing" countries.**

**Incompatibility with third-world history, tradition, character and culture are often cited. It is true that Iran's experience with a working constitutional government has been brief and inconclusive—probably no more than a total of 20 years since the constitutional revolution of 1906. What is important to remember, however, is that on the two occasions when Iran endeavored to learn to live under the rule of law**

**(1906-25 and 1941-53) the experience was aborted as a foreign power intervened on the side of Iranian opponents of constitutional government.**

**From 1941 to 1946 Iran was probably closer to being a functional constitutional monarchy than at any other time before or after. During these years executive powers lay with the prime minister and the cabinet and not with the person of the shah. The Majlis (parliament), particularly the XIVth session (1944-46), asserted its constitutional prerogatives, demanding and achieving some accountability by the executive branch. It is true that men of wealth and power, representing a very small minority of the population, continued to control the majority of the seats in the Majlis (mainly those of the provinces). Still, there were important departures from the previous autocratic rule of Reza Shah (1925-41). The Malik majority, not having been hand-picked by the monarch, no longer followed his will; rather it considered the interests of its own constituency. One would expect that such a Majlis would have totally disregarded public opinion—as had its predecessors. But this was not the case. The limited freedom provided by the return of constitutional monarchy was sufficient for the people of Tehran and a few other major cities to send their own representatives to the Majlis. Because some of these deputies enjoyed wide public support, they were able, in spite of their small number, to transform the Majlis into an open forum for the expression of views of the middle- and lower-middle class Iranians.**

**Bills presented by the government were vigorously debated in and out of the Majlis and then truly voted upon. The Majlis also became a sanctuary and a court of appeals for individuals and groups to present their grievances against the excesses of the executive branch and the military. A free press, though on occasion acting irresponsibly, provided another means of exposing governmental abuses, informing the public about important issues before the Majlis, and even occasionally forcing the Majlis majority to vote with the minority. Perhaps as a result of this experience, the shah in later years rejected the advice of some advisors to allow a token number of freely elected deputies to enter the Majlis so as to give the appearance of a genuine legislature. In short, as an observer of Iranian history has stated, Iran's political system during this period became pluralistic although not democratic.**

**Iran's post-war constitutional government, however, received a major**

setback in October 1946 when Great Britain, once again, and the United States for the first time, played a critical role in ousting a legally elected prime minister. This was done by urging the shah to threaten Prime Minister Qavam with arrest if he did not offer the resignation of his cabinet. With this move, the two Western powers pointed Iran, once again, toward absolute monarchy.

It had been obvious for some time that the shah was discontented with the secondary and inactive role assigned to him by Iran's constitution. In this connection, a review of the relevant articles of the constitution of 1906 may be of interest. According to Article 44 of the Fundamental Laws, "The person of the shah is exempted from responsibility. The ministers of state are responsible to the Majlis in all affairs." Article 66 made the relationship of the monarch and cabinet ministers even more explicit. It stated: "The ministers cannot use verbal or written orders of the shah to divest themselves of responsibility." As far back as December 1942, slightly over a year after taking the throne, the shah—then only 23 years old—had urged Prime Minister Qavam to resign and place the government under the military—over which the monarch already had some influence. Qavam, however, supported by the British Minister Sir Reader Bullard, had repelled the shah's first attempt "to dominate the government through his own trusted supporters (acting) as ministers."

The monarch was not about to abandon his dream of continuing in his father's footsteps. In July 1943, the Office of Strategic Services (O.S.S.) told Washington that the shah had been energetically, though cautiously, strengthening ties with the officers of the army. In August, the same source reported that the shah had succeeded in taking control of the army. Although a high level commission had concluded that under Iran's constitution, the General Staff was subordinate to the minister of war (and thus under the control of the prime minister), the shah had refused to sign regulations implementing this decision. Instead the shah had ordered the minister of war to tell the press and the Majlis that he (the minister of war) was fully responsible for the army and the General Staff.

By September 1943, the monarch was issuing orders directly to the General Staff, thus undermining the constitutional authority of the minister of war. He justified this seizure of executive powers by contending that constitutional government was premature for Iran. In December 1944, the shah had said to the visiting Averell Harriman: "The country could not be truly democratic, which he desired, until

**the people had acquired sufficient education to understand the principle of democratic government and be able to form intelligent individual opinion."**

**It is not recorded that dignitaries such as Averell Harriman ever asked the youthful shah how many decades were to pass for the Iranian people to understand the principles of democratic government, when only 3-6 percent of the national budget was being allocated to education—while 30 to 40 percent was devoted to the army and police. This rationalization (unpreparedness of the people) in support of one-man rule was repeated frequently by the shah and echoed by his foreign and domestic supporters for the next 35 years. For example, only two weeks after the shah's meeting with Harriman a report by the O.S.S. officer in Tehran stated: "Iran, like a small child, needs a strong governing hand until education has done its work, political consciousness has developed and a group of properly trained public officials been established.**

**Possibly the shah, in some moods, initially did wish to see Iran become a democracy, and so assumed autocratic powers with mixed feelings. Abbas Eskandari, a veteran politician who knew both the shah and his father well, said in 1948 of the young shah: "He is one-half the son of Reza Shah and one-half a sincere democrat." Because of bad advisors, however, "the son of Reza Shah is in the ascendancy. . . and the democratic, social justice-minded young king less and less evident."**

**Still, in 1941 after 16 years of absolute rule by Reza Shah, a large number of middle- and working-class Iranians were unwilling to easily surrender their newly found political freedoms. Workers in most factories and civil servants in the central government, for instance, had formed their own trade unions. Wages had been increased as a result of unionization. Workers discharged without cause could appeal their case through their union, the press and even the Grievance Committee of the Majlis. Consequently the shah may not have succeeded in seizing greater power without the support of the two Western powers who (with the departure of Soviet troops) were able to wield considerable influence in Iranian affairs by the summer of 1946.**

**The attention of the United States had been attracted to Iran as soon as American troops arrived in late 1941 to expedite war shipments to the Soviet Union. Even in September 1942, the means of gaining influence over the Iranian government was being considered by the**

**American legation in Tehran. One U.S. memorandum discussed: “The urgent advisability of placing Americans in strategic positions in the Iranian Government, and, in particular ... the necessity of sending a military mission to observe and, if possible, check any internal plots in the Iranian Army.**

**During the war years, the aim of these arrangements may have been to prevent pro-German sabotage within the Iranian government. Later, however, the aim became the furtherance of post-war U.S. policy as it evolved. Subsequently, American missions took their places at the ministries of finance, interior and war. According to an agreement signed with the United States in November 1943, the chief of American military advisors, who remained under the command of the United States War Department, was granted access to “any and all records, correspondence and plans relating to the administration of the Army needed by him.” He was also given the power to investigate, summon and question “any member of the Army” in “matters which in his opinion will assist him” in his duties; and the option to recommend appointment, transfer or dismissal of Iranian officers to the shah.**

**Appointment of foreign nationals to governmental posts invariably led to conflicts of interest. As an example, a January 1945 dispatch from Col. Norman H. Schwartzkopf to the American ambassador in Tehran is noteworthy. Schwartzkopf, an American in command of the Iranian gendarmerie, was organizationally subordinate to the Minister of Interior. Still, in the concluding paragraph of the above letter, reporting an incident involving industrial workers at the Shahi factory in Mazandaran and a group of Russian soldiers, Schwartzkopf wrote: “It is my definite and expressed intention to conform with American policy, and information is respectfully requested as to what action on my part American policy dictates in this situation.”**

**As the war neared its conclusion, both military and civilian planners considered more seriously Iran's post-war strategic importance to the West—especially in the light of Britain's decline as a world power. In 1945, a United States military planner stated:**

**“Unfortunately, Iran's position geographically, bordering Russia on the north, with British oil interests in the south, and its important strategic location in any war, will continue to make this country an object of basic interest to the major powers. It must be borne in mind that in any future war control of any part of Iran will allow the bombing either of the**

**Russian oil fields in the north or of the British oil fields in the south. In the post-war period Iran's location is of importance in connection with... transit landing facilities for the various world airway projects. It is these inescapable factors that give Iran an international importance and one beyond what its size and population would otherwise warrant.**

**It is, therefore, not for any sentimental reasons nor even for any idealistic democratic principles, worthy as these may be, that the United States is forced to take a continuing interest in Iran.”**

**The United States’ interest in Iran had been whetted by the Tehran Conference of December 1943, attended by President Franklin Roosevelt. In a memorandum to the State Department after the conference, the president stated: “I was rather thrilled with the idea of using Iran as an example of what we could do by unselfish American policy.” Dean Acheson's argument, in 1944, for American involvement in Iran was more pragmatic:**

**“The military, political and commercial security of the United States requires stability and order in the vast belt of territory, from Casablanca to India and beyond, which constitutes the Mohammadan and Hindu world. Certainly we favor the evolution of self-government for the diverse peoples of that area, as we favor the restoration of their liberties to the democratic peoples of France and Spain. But we have a stake of our own in their political development.”**

**As the United States’ major objective in Iran narrowed to “stability and order,” American diplomats cast about for the means of achieving that goal. According to State Department records, at an early stage the shah became a key factor in this strategy. Reporting on his first audience with the monarch, Ambassador Leland Morris stated on September 15, 1944:**

**“On the whole, I received a good impression of the shah, and it might be possible that the strengthening of his hand would be one of the roads out of the internal political dilemma in which this country finds itself. One thing is certain, that the weakness at the top which is apparent here must be eliminated either through the hands of the shah or by the rise of a strong individual.”**

**While the new U.S. ambassador was advocating “the rise of a strong individual,” he was at the same time demonstrating impatience with**



**Iran's infant constitutional government. In discussing the future of the Majlis, the cornerstone of government of law, the ambassador reported that Iran's legislature by its past actions had not shown itself to be “an intelligent, patriotic and sincere body.” As was often the case, the diagnosis was partially accurate but the prescription totally misguided.**

**If the Majlis was not paying sufficient heed to the interests of the entire Iranian population, it was because the majority of its members represented a small fraction of the electorate; in particular, the court, the landlords, the merchants and other members of the privileged classes. The XIIIth session of the Majlis, whose members had been “elected” during the authoritarian rule of Reza Shah, was the first to complete its term of two years after the abdication of the former monarch. The XIVth session, in which for the first time in 20 years a handful of popularly elected deputies were seated, had been in session for less than a year when the ambassador was condemning the constitutional system rather than its implementation. If a legislature of a state in his own country was seen as “unpatriotic,” the automatic remedy would have been to call for reform of the electoral process so as to make that body more representative of the electorate.**

**Instead of proposing in the host country the remedy that would have been prescribed in his home country, Ambassador Morris advocated “the rise of a strong individual.” Consequently, while warning Iranians of the evils of totalitarianism and working toward the defeat of the local communists, the representatives of the world's foremost democracies supported the reestablishment of a system of government in Iran that embodied many features of the political system they so fiercely opposed.**

**In the spring of 1946, George V. Allen replaced Morris as ambassador. During Allen's tenure, the United States became more deeply involved in Iran's domestic politics. Some researchers have suggested that the Iranians in these years were engaged in manipulating the United States government as actively and perhaps more successfully than the Americans were manipulating the Iranian government. One writer has contended that the U.S., after World War II, was “sucked” into involvement in Iran and that far from imposing itself on a reluctant Tehran government for its own purposes, the Iranian government was working hard to increase American involvement in Iranian affairs as a counterweight to Great Britain and the Soviet Union. In June 1946, Ambassador Allen expressed a similar view contending that he was**

being besieged by “Iranians” urging a more active role by the United States in the internal affairs of their country.

The “Iranians” referred to above were, in the main, Iran's men of wealth and power who opposed the implementation of the constitution, which would lead to greater participation of the public in political affairs. As the Soviets endeavored to present themselves as the ally of the underprivileged, Iran's privileged desperately sought a new partner to replace the declining power of Great Britain. Thus in their frequent contacts with embassy officials, they urged greater U.S. involvement in Iranian affairs as the only means of preserving Iran's “independence.” While the opinion of these men was duly recorded and reported by the embassy to Washington, little notice was taken of a much larger group of middle- and lower-middle class Iranians who believed that national independence and political freedom were interdependent and that Iran's only salvation lay in a government of law and in the absence of foreign influence rather than its balance. According to the U.S. military attaché in Tehran, a major advocate of United States involvement in Iranian affairs was the shah, whom he described as “extremely pro-American, even to the extent of ... the United States to accept a valuable oil concession.” In return the shah wished to be fully supported by the United States in his quest for absolute power. Reportedly the monarch had told Allen: “The Iranian people had not reached the stage where the king could only be a symbol. If he continued to exercise no substantive authority in Iranian affairs, the people would become unaware, after a time, of the value of a monarchy and unappreciative of the needs thereafter.” Ambassador Allen initially turned down the shah's proposal to strengthen the court by reducing the constitutional powers of the prime minister. In the words of Allen: “I was not confident the shah was strong enough to succeed, did not think a king should be meddling in politics anyway, and was not certain where he would stop if he did succeed in whatever actions he might attempt.” In May 1946, Allen considered Prime Minister Qavam better equipped to achieve the main objective of the United States in Iran, which was “to prevent one more country from falling completely into the Moscow orbit.” In the American ambassador's view, Qavam was “the most energetic and forceful man on the scene in Iran at the present time. If anyone can steer this ship of state through the dangerous waters it is now traversing. Qavam is the most likely instrument for the purpose.”

**Qavam, a true aristocrat, was about 70 years old in 1946. He had first served in government in 1909 as undersecretary of the Ministry of Interior. In 1921 he became prime minister, with Dr. Mossadegh as his minister of finance and Reza Khan as his minister of war. In 1923, Qavam was arrested for an alleged plot against the then Prime Minister Reza Khan, and his estates were confiscated. After his release, he retired from public life until August 1942 when he formed his first post-Reza Shah cabinet.**

**In January 1946, he was elected prime minister during the final days of the XIVth Majlis to deal with a number of acute political problems: to respond to Soviet demands for an oil concession in the north, to get Soviet troops out of Iran, to resolve the dispute with the province of Azarbaijan over the question of local autonomy, and to contain the growing influence of the Tudeh party.**

**Qavam demonstrated his mastery of the political process by dealing effectively with each of the above. He signed an agreement with the Soviets giving them an oil concession. The Russians, in turn, agreed to remove their troops from Iran and to wait for the ratification of the agreement by the still-to-be-elected XVth Majlis. Qavam then opened negotiations with Pishevari's Democrats in Azarbaijan, thereby reducing tensions. He then formed his own political party, the Iranian Democrats, as a rival to the Tudeh. In August 1946, he formed a coalition cabinet including three Tudeh leaders. Without going into the details of this decision, the following passage from Ambassador Allen's dispatch makes Qavam's motives clear. It also discounts claims made only two months later that Qavam was a "helpless" tool of the Tudeh and the Soviet Union: "I feel confident changes of ministers resulted from Qavam's belief [that] he can handle [the] Tudeh better inside government than out and from his effort to absorb [the] Tudeh organization into his political party."**

**Confirming Allen's prediction, no sooner had the Tudeh joined Qavam's cabinet than the provincial officials in Khuzistan, Isfahan, and other localities began to smash Tudeh organizations. The British ambassador confirmed the erosion of Tudeh power subsequent to their inclusion in the cabinet. He reported on October 8th that although during the first six months of 1946 the strength of the Tudeh party had developed rapidly, "during the last three months it has encountered set-backs in spite of the inclusion of three Tudeh leaders in the cabinet at the beginning of August."**

**Ironically, as Qavam proceeded systematically to weaken the Tudeh**

party and to strengthen his own Democrat party, George Allen decided that it was time to join forces with the court and oust the prime minister. The background to this important event was the following: In early October 1946 Qavam had ended the tribal uprising in the south by forming an alliance with the Qashqais who promised to help him fight the Tudeh by supporting the Iran Democrat Party. This alliance had greatly displeased the monarch, who had wished to eliminate not only the Tudeh, but in the process also remove all obstacles to his one-man rule—even if they were anticommunists. According to Ambassador Allen, in the above instance the shah: “had wanted to wipe out the Qashqais, and the agreement left them with their arms and also meant a major political victory for Qavam. But the shah could not do anything about it, and at any rate the Tudeh advance into south Persia was halted.” It was thus not surprising that a few days after the conclusion of the Qavam-Qashqai agreement a court emissary called on Allen asking him to confer his blessings on what the visitor described as a coup d’état against Qavam. Consequently (as Allen reported it later to the State Department), on October 14, 1946, Ambassador Allen told the shah that he had “finally reached the conclusion that he [the shah] should force Qavam out and should make him leave the country or put him in ‘jail if he caused trouble.” In explaining this totally new attitude, George Allen gave Washington several reasons—some of which were not totally consistent with the record, including that of the British Embassy quoted above. The major justification provided by Allen and the one cited most by other researchers of the period was the following:

“Things had been going from bad to worse for several weeks, with the Tudeh members of the cabinet tearing the government to pieces, installing Tudeh party members in all the ministries they could control, and Qavam seemed helpless before their organized attack, engineered by the Soviet Embassy here.”

Another, and a more plausible, reason why Allen decided (apparently without prior State Department authorization) to throw his weight behind the shah was to prevent the conclusion of an air agreement with the Soviet Union:

“The Soviets had some time previously suggested the foundation of a joint aviation company to have a monopoly of all air traffic in northern Iran. The Soviets were to furnish all planes. equipment. personnel, weather stations. etc., with the Iranians furnishing merely the air through which the planes

would fly. Profits were to be shared 50-50. It was a wonderful proposition, generous to a fault! On October 11,... manager of Iranian Airways, told Randy Williams [an Embassy secretary] that he had learned that at a cabinet meeting 10 days previously. General Firuz. Minister of Roads and Communications, had presented the Soviet proposal urgently to the cabinet and strongly supported its adoption. The only member of the cabinet to oppose it actively had been Hajir, Minister of Finance. Iraj Iskandari, president of the Tudeh Party and Minister of Commerce, had spoken in favor but had pointed out that since he had been told that the Soviet proposal might be contrary to the Chicago Aviation Convention, it might be better for Iran first to denounce its signature to the Chicago Convention and then agree to the Soviet proposal.

Within 12 hours Muzzafar Firuz had told all the details of the meeting to the Soviet Embassy and the Soviet First Secretary had called on Iraj Iskandari, raising hell about Iraj's disloyalty to USSR by his suggestion for delay. Iraj protested his deepest friendship for the USSR. As soon as the Secretary left, he went to Qavam complaining bitterly about 'the traitor in the cabinet who is telling the Soviet Ambassador that I am opposing the USSR.'

As soon as Randy Williams passed the story on to me I seized on it as just what I'd been looking for. As you will recall. I'd been trying to find means for driving the Soviet airplanes out of cabotage business in Iran, and I was delighted with a chance to hit a blow on this subject and against the Soviet stooges in the cabinet at the same time. I did not realize what a goldmine [sic] we'd struck, as it turned out.

I asked for an appointment with Qavam immediately. I told him he had a traitor in his cabinet who was running to the Soviet Embassy with the most secret discussions in his official family, thereby enabling the Soviets to hold a pistol at the head of any minister who might be brave enough to express a patriotic sentiment in cabinet meetings. I said he would have to do something about the situation promptly, since I desired to recommend to my government whether to continue to consider his government as independent and worthy of continued treatment as such.

I waited three days and nothing happened. It became clear to

me that Firuz (and perhaps the Tudeh crowd) had too strong a hold over Qavam to permit him to break loose from them. His own party was not yet strong enough to challenge the Tudeh, but perhaps more important. Qavam knew that if he lost the Tudeh and the Soviet support, the shah would be able to push him around. On October 14, 1946, I had the conversation with the shah which disturbed Dean Acheson and others in the Department considerably, and which the shah now refers to as our famous talk of last summer.”

Thus, the American ambassador in pursuit of his own country's interests and perhaps in his perception of what was best for Iran, delivered a devastating blow to Iran's infant constitutional government—a blow from which Iran has not yet recovered. Qavam himself unwittingly helped bring about his own doom. Having decided to delay elections for the XVth Majlis, Iran was without a parliament after March 1946. Consequently, Qavam was unable to enlist the support of the legislature, and through it the public, to prevent the shah's take-over of the executive branch. Under threat of arrest, Qavam succumbed to the shah and replaced six members of his cabinet with men more acceptable to the shah. Qavam's purge of his cabinet, which took place on October 16th, was correctly described by Ambassador Allen as “the turning point in Iranian history.” This event alone, obviously, did not put an end to constitutional monarchy. Iran's return to autocracy was accomplished in stages. Within a period of two and one-half years—beginning with October 16, 1946—three different Western ambassadors gleefully referred to three specific instances of usurpation of power by the shah as “historical.”

The second “historical” advance toward one-man rule occurred in December 1947. By that time Russian troops had been pressured out of Iran by the United States and the United Nations, the province of Azarbaijan had been brought back under central government authority (as a result of the joint effort of the shah and Qavam), the Tudeh party was put in disarray, the XVth Majlis (with a few exceptions) was packed with members of the so-called thousand families, and the Soviet oil concession had been rejected by the Majlis. It was at this juncture that the two Western ambassadors finally agreed with the shah's long-standing desire to discharge Prime Minister Qavam, who now seemed expendable. Using as a pretext an allegedly veiled criticism of himself by Qavam, the shah let it be

known that continuation of Qavam's cabinet was intolerable. As a result on December 4, 1947, all members of the cabinet (except two who were absent from Tehran) resigned, leaving Qavam totally isolated.

Following the resignation of the cabinet, the XVth Majlis, dominated by the supporters of status quo, gave the prime minister a vote of no confidence. He was not only relieved of his duties, but was also refused the diplomatic passport normally granted to former officials. Instead, Qavam, the most powerful man in Iran only a year and a-half earlier, was allowed to leave the country on an ordinary passport. This was the first demonstration of the shah's ability to out-manuever and defeat his potential rivals—even Qavam, the highly experienced Iranian politician under whom the shah's own father had once served. This was not an ordinary change of cabinet. Clearly, the shah had acted after securing the blessings of the British as well as the American ambassador. British dispatches mention that their ambassador, John Le Rougetel, had discussed the removal of Qavam with the shah on November 12, 1947. The tone of the following passage from the American ambassador's report indicates that he too was sympathetic with the move:

“The shah kept Qavam in power to make him assume responsibility for refusing the Soviet oil concession, since the shah did not want Qavam ever to be able to return to power with Soviet support. Finally, when Qavam had served his usefulness, the shah gave the nod, and the Majlis kicked him out.”

Thus December 1947 marked the second "historical" event that propelled Iran toward autocracy. In the words of the British ambassador:

“The fall of Qavam seems likely to mark the end of a phase in the development of Persian politics. Earlier in the year, there had already been signs of increased political activity by the court. The shah had felt, since December 1946 (when the central government took control of Azarbaijan), that too much credit had been given Qavam and insufficient to himself...”

A most surprising aspect of the diplomatic records consulted was that neither the State Department nor the Foreign Office was under any illusions as to the consequences of reestablishing one-man rule in Iran. Ambassador Le Rougetel correctly predicted in December 1947 that henceforth the shah would exert a direct and increasing influence,

backed by the military authorities, in the government of the country. In the United States, the decision to support an autocratic monarchy was preceded by a vigorous debate within the State Department. Some officials argued that an increase of power by the shah "might not be a bad thing since strong governments in countries bordering the Soviet Union have generally been better able to resist Soviet domination. John D. Jernegan, acting chief of the Division of Greek-Turkish-Iranian affairs, made a spirited reply. Although subscribing to the principle of containing Soviet power by strong, bordering governments, he doubted the applicability of this principle to Iran and the person of the shah. The shah had deplored the lack of progress in Iran and attributed it to his personal lack of constitutional power, Jernegan said. But where he did have control, as over the army, his record had been less than inspiring.

Oddly enough, George Allen, who had played a key role in the shah's rise to power, agreed with Jernegan's analysis:

“One is tempted by the thought that, although a dictatorship of the Reza Shah variety should be undesirable, perhaps a middle ground of a somewhat stronger government would be preferable to the chaotic and corrupt conditions we now have. However, I have steadfastly resisted the temptation, and my policy continues to be based firmly on support of democratic principles no matter how badly they may be carried out in practice. The shah sometimes uses cogent arguments with one on the subject, but I continue to argue for the ways of democracy.

The best way for Iran to become a decent democracy, it seems to me, is to work at it. through trial and error. I am not convinced by the genuinely held view of many people that democracy should be handed down gradually from above.”

Unfortunately, neither Allen nor his successors followed this advice. Time and again when the shah took a critical step toward autocratic rule, they either applauded and justified his action or maintained an approving silence, explaining their behavior as “non-interference.” The position of the Foreign Office was similar. On November 1, 1947, the shah had solicited the British ambassador's advice regarding changes in the constitution. After much discussion with the Foreign Office, Ambassador Le Rougetel concurred that the composition of the XVth Majlis made it virtually impossible for the shah's government to reform the administration or to enact a constructive



economic policy. No reference was made, however, to the fact that only a few weeks earlier the same Majlis had demonstrated its willingness to collaborate with the shah by deposing Prime Minister Qavam, who was the founder and leader of the political party through which most of the deputies had entered the Majlis.

The third step toward the reestablishment of autocracy was taken in April 1949, when a constitutional assembly was hastily and undemocratically convened and the constitution amended to grant greater power to the shah. The assembly was precipitated, in part, by an assassination attempt on the shah two months earlier.

Referring to the increased domination of the shah over the executive branch as a "turning point in the current history of Iran," the new American ambassador, John C. Wiley, stated:

"Iran is now in a new orientation. It must be watched with greatest care. The shah must be prevented from leaping on his horse and charging simultaneously in all directions. There is so much good he wants to do and so much harm he might do—if he does not proceed wisely.

It is important that we and the British . . . leave nothing undone to follow closely the immediate course of events."

Confirming the forecast of Ambassador Wiley that henceforth "the shah will rule and not merely reign, the monarch reduced the powers of the prime minister further by personally presiding over cabinet meetings. Wiley, reporting on his conversation with a former Iranian prime minister stated that the shah was dedicating himself to the minutiae of administration. On even the smallest detail he was communicating directive, even to section heads. He was . . . wasting his energy and time and undermining governmental coordination. The worst phase of the situation, according to [former Prime Minister) Ali Mansur, was the fact that the shah accompanied by an entourage that did not serve him well. He was surrounded by sycophantic advisors who were constantly urging [upon) him the necessity of increasing his royal prerogatives, exercising authority and ruling in the pattern of his late father. He had been given the concept of regal strength on a basis of weakness of the government; namely, that the shah would be strong in the measure in which the government would be weak.

Having revised the constitution in his favor and taken direct command of the executive branch, the shah focused his attention on the legislative branch, with the intent of making it completely

dependent upon himself. In September 1949, the U.S. ambassador reported that the shah had cast aside his plans for free elections for the XVth Majlis because he believed that:

**“Corrupt and venal political influences were effectively working to take improper advantage of free elections. The shah was now convinced that with the great illiteracy among and backwardness of the great mass of Iranian people any application of electoral principles of Western democracies would be premature and bad. His Imperial Majesty was determined to have a Majlis with which he could work in harmony. He intended moreover to make considerable reforms of governmental structure but he wanted me to be completely assured that he had no idea whatsoever of setting up a dictatorship.”**

Despite his assurances to Ambassador Wiley, the shah was indeed bent on setting up a dictatorship. Gradually he removed all semblance of independence from the Majlis, the judiciary, the press, political parties, trade unions, universities, professional associations and even the chambers of commerce. Thus no institution or public figure remained who could question his decisions and actions.

One would have thought Great Britain and the United States, being themselves democracies, would have expressed sympathy for constitutional government in Iran. But they decided that a "stable autocratic monarchy" better protected their interests in Iran than an "unstable constitutional monarchy."

The West's perception of political realities in Iran was not totally inaccurate. The initial stage of political development in Iran was inherently uncertain. The communists could take advantage of the dissatisfaction of the masses and perhaps gain control of the government. The West's response to the situation, however, was shortsighted and eventually self-defeating. Instead of using its considerable influence to promote the development of democratic institutions and thus assist the people (or at least the educated middle class) in gaining a stake in their country's political system, it shattered the fragile institutions that just beginning to form. Whereas this course of action may have been the safer of the two, and certainly the more profitable in the short run, it was also an indication that Great Britain and the United States held little faith in the applicability of their own democratic system of government to third-world countries. In the long run, this attitude would mean the surrender of a great

advantage to their communist adversary who in contrast truly believed that its political system was applicable to the entire world.

## **Chapter 3**

### **The Role of Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh and The Creation a Democratic State in Iran**

**Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh studied law at the University of Neuchâtel in Switzerland, earning a Doctorate of Laws in June 1913. After his graduation, he returned to Iran and became involved in politics. He was a liberal Democrat activist. He held several positions in the local, regional and national Iranian government administrations. He was against foreign occupation and civil war in Iran. He was an active member of Iranian Parliament, and in 1951 he was elected Prime Minister by the Parliament and then his election was confirmed by an appointment by the shah. Among his many political positions, he supported the nationalization of Iranian oil industry, and he opposed all neo-colonialist policies and dictatorship in Iran.**

**Dr. Mossadegh and his friends created a political organization- a coalition that was called The Iranian National Front (INF). The Iranian National Front declared:**

**The Iranian National Front fights corruption, dictatorship and tyranny in Iran. Its main aim is the establishment of a popular-based democratic and honest government in Iran. It seeks to combat poverty, ignorance and social and economic injustice. And it opposes colonialism and economic exploitation in Iran's foreign policy.**

**Dr. Mossadegh and his supporters at the Parliament in Tehran, Iran in 1951**

**Dr. Mossadegh and the members of his government**

**Dr. Mossadegh and his Foreign Minister Dr. Hossein Fatemi**

**Alahyar Saleh, one of the leaders of Iranian National Front and close advisor to Dr. Mossadegh**

**The majority of the people of Iran supported Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh as the Prime Minister of Iran.**

**Dr. Mossadegh was very popular as Prime Minister of Iran.**

**The oil fields in Iran were under the control of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, an arm of the British government, until Dr. Mossadegh nationalized the oil industry and declared an independent foreign policy for Iran.**

**The Iranian people were the owners of the oil in Iran, but they lived in poverty.**

**Dr. Mossadegh visited the United States and tried to have friendly relations with the U.S. and all nations worldwide. But the superpowers were not interested in peace and democracy in Iran. Instead they were committed to a new colonialist policy of exploitation and conspiracy.**

**Dr. Mossadegh visited Cairo, Egypt, in 1951, and more than 2 million people warmly received him.**

## Chapter 4

### **The U.S. and U.K. Coup D'état and the Conspiracy against Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh and the Iranian People**

#### **The Creation of Dictatorship, Hate and Terrorism in Iran**

The governments of the United Kingdom and the United States together planned the overthrow of the government of Dr. Mossadegh because they did not want accept the democratic rights of the Iranian people and the sovereignty of Iran.

In 2013, the CIA admitted its role in the coup d'état in Iran in 1953 and the creation of a dictatorship for Iran. Here is a report of that admission in The Guardian:

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/aug/19/cia-admits-role-1953-iranian-coup>

The CIA has publicly admitted for the first time that it was behind the notorious 1953 coup against Iran's democratically elected prime minister Mohammad Mosaddeq in documents that also show how the British government tried to block the release of information about its own involvement in his overthrow.

On the 60th anniversary of an event often invoked by Iranians as evidence of western meddling, the U.S. national security archive at George Washington University published a series of declassified CIA documents.

"The military coup that overthrew Mossadegh and his National Front cabinet was carried out under CIA direction as an act of U.S. foreign policy, conceived and approved at the highest levels of government," reads a previously excised section of an internal CIA history titled, "The Battle for Iran."

The documents, published on the archive's website under freedom of information laws, describe in detail how the U.S. – with British help – engineered the coup, code-named TP-AJAX by the CIA and Operation Boot by Britain's MI6.

Britain, and in particular Sir Anthony Eden, the foreign

secretary, regarded Mossadeqh as a serious threat to its strategic and economic interests after the Iranian leader nationalized the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, latterly known as BP. But the U.K. needed U.S. support. The Eisenhower administration in Washington was easily persuaded.

British documents show how senior officials in the 1970s tried to stop Washington from releasing documents that would be "very embarrassing" to the U.K.

Official papers in the U.K. remain secret, even though accounts of Britain's role in the coup are widespread. In 2009 the former foreign secretary Jack Straw publicly referred to many British "interferences" in 20th-century Iranian affairs. On Monday the Foreign Office said it could neither confirm nor deny Britain's involvement in the coup.

The previously classified U.S. documents include telegrams from Kermit Roosevelt, the senior CIA officer on the ground in Iran during the coup. Others, including a draft in-house CIA history by Scott Kock titled Zendebad, Shah! (Viva, Shah!), say that according to Monty Woodhouse, MI6's station chief in Tehran at the time, Britain needed U.S. support for a coup. Eden agreed. "Woodhouse took his words as tantamount to permission to pursue the idea" with the U.S., Kock wrote.

Mossadeqh's overthrow, still given as a reason for the Iranian mistrust of British and American politicians, consolidated the shah's rule for the next 26 years until the 1979 Islamic revolution. It was aimed at making sure the Iranian monarchy would safeguard the west's oil interests in the country.

The archived CIA documents include a draft internal history of the coup titled "Campaign to install a pro-western government in Iran," which defines the objective of the campaign as "through legal, or quasi-legal, methods to effect the fall of the Mossadeqh government; and to replace it with a pro-western government under the shah's leadership with Zahedi as its prime minister."

One document describes Mossadeqh as one of the "most

**mercurial, maddening, adroit and provocative leaders with whom they [the U.S. and Britain] had ever dealt." The document says Mossadegh "found the British evil, not incomprehensible" and "he and millions of Iranians believed that for centuries Britain had manipulated their country for British ends." Another document refers to conducting a "war of nerves" against Mossadegh.**

**The Iranian-Armenian historian Ervand Abrahamian, author of "The Coup: 1953, the CIA and the Roots of Modern U.S.-Iranian Relations," said in a recent interview that the coup was designed "to get rid of a nationalist figure who insisted that oil should be nationalized."**

**Unlike other nationalist leaders, including Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, Mossadegh epitomized a unique "anti-colonial" figure who was also committed to democratic values and human rights, Abrahamian argued.**

**Some analysts argue that Mossadegh failed to compromise with the West and the coup took place against the backdrop of communism fears in Iran.**

**"My study of the documents proves to me that there was never really a fair compromise offered to Mossadegh, what they wanted Mossadegh to do is to give up oil nationalization and if he'd given that of course then the national movement would have been meaningless," Abrahamian told the Iranian online publication, Tableau magazine.**

**"My argument is that there was never really a realistic threat of communism ... discourse and the way justifying any act was to talk about communist danger, so it was something used for the public, especially the American and the British public."**

**Despite the latest releases, a significant number of documents about the coup remain secret. Malcolm Byrne, deputy director of the national security archive, has called on the U.S. intelligence authorities to release the remaining records and documents. "There is no longer good reason to keep secrets about such a**

**critical episode in our recent past. The basic facts are widely known to every school child in Iran," he said. "Suppressing the details only distorts the history, and feeds into myth-making on all sides."**

**In recent years Iranian politicians have sought to compare the dispute over the country's nuclear activities to that of the oil nationalization under Mossadegh: supporters of the former president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad often invoke the coup.**

**U.S. officials have previously expressed regret about the coup but have fallen short of issuing an official apology. The British government has never acknowledged its role.**

**(Here is another document from the National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 28)**

## **The Secret CIA History of the Iran Coup, 1953**

**Edited by Malcolm Byrne, April 21, 2000**

**The CIA history of operation TPAJAX excerpted below was first disclosed by James Risen of the New York Times in its editions of April 16 and June 18, 2000, and posted in this form on its website at <http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/mideast/041600iran-cia-index.html>.**

**This extremely important document is one of the last major pieces of the puzzle explaining American and British roles in the August 1953 coup against Iranian Premier Mohammad Mossadegh. Written in March 1954 by Donald Wilber, one of the operation's chief planners, the 200-page document is essentially an after-action report, apparently based in part on agency cable traffic and Wilber's interviews with agents who had been on the ground in Iran as the operation lurched to its conclusion.**

**Long-sought by historians, the Wilber history is all the more valuable because it is one of the relatively few documents that still exists after an unknown quantity of materials was destroyed by CIA operatives — reportedly "routinely" — in the 1960s, according to former CIA Director James Woolsey. However, according to an investigation by the National Archives and Records Administration, released in March 2000, "no schedules in effect during the period 1959-1963 provided for the disposal of records related to covert actions and, therefore, the**



destruction of records related to Iran was unauthorized." (p. 22) The CIA now says that about 1,000 pages of documentation remain locked in agency vaults.

During the 1990s, three successive CIA heads pledged to review and release historically valuable materials on this and 10 other widely-known covert operations from the period of the Cold War, but in 1998, citing resource restrictions, Director George Tenet reneged on these promises, a decision which prompted the National Security Archive to file a lawsuit in 1999 for this history of the 1953 operation and one other that is known to exist. So far, the CIA has effectively refused to declassify either document, releasing just one sentence out of 339 pages at issue. That sentence reads: "Headquarters spent a day featured by depression and despair." In a sworn statement by William McNair, the information review officer for the CIA's directorate of operations, McNair claimed the release of any other part of this document other than the one line that had previously appeared in Wilber's memoirs, would "reasonably expected to cause serious damage to the national security of the United States." Clearly the "former official" who gave this document to the New York Times disagreed with McNair, and we suspect you will too, once you read this for yourself. The case is currently pending before a federal judge. In disclosing this history, the Times, initially reproduced only a summary and four appendixes to the original document because the main text is replete with names and descriptions of Iranians who collaborated with the CIA and may still be alive in Iran, and who therefore might face reprisals for their deeds in 1953.

The CIA's secret history of the 1953 coup in Iran was a nearly 200-page document, comprising the author's own account of the operation and a set of planning documents he attached. The New York Times on the Web is publishing the introduction and many of the planning documents. But the Times decided not to publish the main body of the text after consulting prominent historians who believed there might be serious risk that some of those named as foreign agents would face retribution in Iran.

Because the introductory summary and the main body of the document are inconsistent on a few dates and facts, readers may note discrepancies between accounts. In its reporting, the Times has relied upon details in the CIA document not published here. In addition, certain names and identifying descriptions have been removed from the documents available on the Web.

**The Archive has decided to reproduce the portions of the history published by the Times on its website in order to ensure as wide a circulation of this extraordinary document as possible. Thanks to Payman Arabshahi, this version, unlike the Times' version, may be downloaded and printed. (There is no copyright on U.S. government documents.)**

**As a brief substantive introduction, the Archive is reproducing a preliminary analysis of the document by Prof Mark Gasiorowski (Louisiana State University), the most prominent scholar of the coup, and a member of the Advisory Panel of the Archive's Project on Iran-U.S. Relations. It takes the form of a response to a request for his "take" on the document from the listserv Gulf2000, directed by Dr. Gary Sick of Columbia University. From June 7-8, 2000, the archive co-sponsored an international conference in Tehran on Iran and the great powers during the early 1950s, specifically focusing on the Mossadegh coup.**

**Jump to the Documents**

**"What's New on the Iran 1953 Coup in the New York Times Article (April 16, 2000, front page) and the Documents Posted on the Web" By Professor Mark Gasiorowski, 19 April 2000.**

**There is not much in the NYT article itself that is not covered in my article on the coup ("The 1953 Coup d'état in Iran" published in 1987 in the International Journal of Middle East Studies, and available in the Gulf2000 archives) or other sources on the coup. The most interesting new tidbit here is that the CIA's agents harassed religious leaders and bombed one's home in order to turn them against Mossadegh. The article does not say, but this was probably done by Iranians working in the BEDAMN network, which is described in my article. There are also some new details on how that US persuaded the shah to agree to the coup, including a statement that Assadollah Rashidian was involved in this effort and that General Schwartzkopf, Sr. played a larger role in this than was previously known. There are also a few details reported in the article that I knew about but chose not to reveal, including that Donald Wilber and Norman Derbyshire developed the original coup plan and that the plan was known as TPAJAX, rather than simply AJAX. (The TP prefix indicated that the operation was to be carried out in Iran.) The NYT article does not say anything about a couple of matters that remain controversial about the coup, including whether Ayatollah Kashani played a role in organizing the crowds and whether the CIA team organized "fake"**

**Tudeh Party crowds as part of the effort. There may be something on these issues in the 200-page history itself.**

**Much more important than the NYT articles are the two documents appended to the summary document giving operational plans for the coup. These contain a wealth of interesting information. They indicate that the British played a larger-though still subordinate-role in the coup than was previously known, providing part of the financing for it and using their intelligence network (led by the Rashidian brothers) to influence members of the parliament and do other things. The CIA described the coup plan as “quasi-legal,” referring to the fact that the shah legally dismissed Mossadegh but presumably acknowledging that he did not do so on his own initiative. These documents make clear that the CIA was prepared to go forward with the coup even if the shah opposed it. There is a suggestion that the CIA use counterfeit Iranian currency to somehow show that Mossadegh was ruining the economy, though I'm not sure this was ever done. The documents indicate that Fazlollah Zahedi and his military colleagues were given large sums of money (at least \$50,000) before the coup, perhaps to buy their support. Most interestingly, they indicate that various clerical leaders and organizations—whose names are blanked out—were to play a major role in the coup. Finally, the author (s) of the London plan—presumably Wilber and Derbyshire—say some rather nasty things about the Iranians, including that there is a “recognized incapacity of Iranians to plan or act in a thoroughly logical manner.”**

**Perhaps the most general conclusion that can be drawn from these documents is that the CIA extensively stage-managed the entire coup, not only carrying it out but also preparing the groundwork for it by subordinating various important Iranian political actors and using propaganda and other instruments to influence public opinion against Mossadegh. This is a point that was made in my article and other published accounts, but it is strongly confirmed in these documents. In my view, this thoroughly refutes the argument that is commonly made in Iranian monarchist exile circles that the coup was a legitimate “popular uprising” on behalf of the shah.**

**In reply to Nikki Keddie's (UCLA) questions about whether the NYT article got the story right, I would say it is impossible to tell until the 200- page document comes out. Nikki's additional comment that these documents may not be entirely factual but may instead reveal certain biases held by their authors is an important one. Wilber was not in Iran while the coup was occurring, and his account of it can**

only have been based on his debriefing of Kermit Roosevelt and other participants. Some facts were inevitably lost or misinterpreted in this process, especially since this was a rapidly changing series of events. This being said, I doubt that there will be any major errors in the 200-page history. While Wilber had his biases, he certainly was a competent historian. I can think of no reason he might have wanted to distort this account.

Here are a few other notes. It is my understanding that these documents were given to the NYT well before Secretary Albright's recent speech, implying that they were not an attempt to upstage or add to the speech by the unnamed "former official" who provided them to the NYT. I think there is still some reason to hope that the 200-page document will be released with excisions by the NYT. I certainly hope they do so.

### **The Documents**

CIA Clandestine Service History, "Overthrow of Premier Mossadegh of Iran, November 1952-August 1953," March 1954 [excerpt], by Donald Wilber.

The National Security Archive online provides links to the following documents:

**Cover Sheet, Table of Contents and Summary**

**Appendix A - Initial Operational Plan for TPAJAX as Cabled from Nicosia to Headquarters on 1 June 1953**

**Appendix B - "London" Draft of the TPAJAX Operational Plan**

**Appendix C - Foreign Office Memorandum of 23 July 1953 from British Ambassador Makins to Assistant Secretary of State Smith**

**Appendix E - Military Critique - Lessons Learned from TPAJAX re Military Planning Aspects of Coup d'état**

**The CIA's Broken Promises on Declassification**

Follow the link above for information on the Archive's lawsuit against the CIA to force the declassification of key documents on the agency's role in the European elections of 1948 and the 1953 coup in Iran, and to read what five former CIA directors and others have said about the agency's declassification policies. From there, follow the link at the bottom to view the complaint filed with the U.S. District court on May 13, 1999.

The national Security Archive, Plaintiff, v. United States Central Intelligence Agency, Defendant

**Defendant's Notice of Filing of Defendant's 'Vaughn Index', Which includes Defendants "Glomar" Response to plaintiff's Request for**

**certain Documentation**

**Declaration of William H. McNair, Information Review Officer,  
Directorate of Operations, United States Central Intelligence Agency.**

**In August 1953, the Iranian People protested against the dictatorship of the shah, as a puppet of Western Powers, and against the New Colonialist Policy in Iran.**

**During the coup d'état implemented by a conspiracy of the CIA and the British Intelligence Service, Dr. Mossadegh was arrested in 1953.**

**After a conspiracy and coup d'état by the CIA and the British Intelligence Service, Dr. M. Mossadegh--a freely elected Prime Minister of Iran--was arrested and many Freedom Fighters were executed. (Photo: Mossadegh in a Military Court).**

**The terrorist groups of shah, under leadership of Shaaban Jafari, attacked supporters of Mossadegh on the streets.**

## **Chapter 5**

## **The Role of the Shah as a “Puppet” of U.S. and U.K. in Iran and the Region**

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey was quoted by Newsweek in May 1961 as saying “Do you know what the head of the Iranian army told one of our people? He said the army is in good shape, thanks to the U.S. aid – it was capable of coping with the civilian population. That army isn’t planning to fight the Russians. It is planning to fight the Iranian people.”

I propose to take Iran as a case study of what the West means by the “free world.” One of the outcomes of that study, I am certain, will be the realization that neither “freedom” nor “social well-being” are characteristics of governments which are Free World members. I hope citizens of the West will begin to enquire why their taxes and their armies have been given over to support tyranny and corruption the world over. Such enquiry may hasten the day when the industrial-military complex will be exposed and the Cold War will be brought to an end. Only then can world planning and world government occur. Only in such a world can freedom have a chance to coexist with the development necessary to enhance the lives of the great majority of mankind.

The Central Intelligence Agency plays an important role behind the scenes in this global dynamic. The agency proudly admits its role in the deposition of Mohammad Mossadegh after he nationalized the oil industry in Iran.

The behavior of secret police is an important component in the tradition of tyranny.

The Research and Information Commission of the International Students Conference reported that in December 1953, the Royal military guard and police agents entered the University of Tehran and shot to death three unarmed students suspected of dissident views. During this time, frequent invasions of the university by armed soldiers in uniform, police and secret agents occurred, and if three or more students were observed talking together they were approached and warned to cease their discussion.

On May 2, 1961, government troops attacked 4,000 teachers in Tehran because of a teachers’ strike for higher pay. One teacher was killed and three were wounded according to a first-hand report by Dr. Burton W. Marvin, chairman of the American Exchange Division at the University of Tehran (Saturday Evening Post, December 30, 1961).

**Six months later, in January 1962, paratroopers of the shah broke into the university, charged students with bayonets and injured 500 of them, disabling many permanently. The crime of the students was a request that secondary school students who have been expelled for spoken criticisms of the government should be re-admitted, (Time Magazine, February 2, 1962). The Chancellor of the University of Tehran sent the following message to the Prime Minister:**

**“Pursuant to our conversation at 11:00 a.m., soldiers and paratroopers have occupied Tehran University. There was no reason or excuse for the violation of the rights or regulations of the University.**

**Soldiers and paratroopers after entry attacked boys and girls in the dormitory. Many of the students were beaten to the point of death.**

**I have never seen or heard of so much cruelty, sadism, atrocity and vandalism on the part of government forces. Some of the girls of the University were criminally attacked in the classrooms by the soldiers.**

**When we inspect the university buildings, we were faced with the situation as if an army of barbarians had invaded an enemy territory. Books were torn, shelves were broken, typewriters smashed, laboratory equipment stolen or destroyed, desks, chairs, doors, windows and walls were vandalized by the troops fighting unarmed students.**

**Even the University Hospital had not been immune from the soldiers. Many of the nurses and patients were beaten or wounded. The same pattern was followed in the faculty club and the foreign students’ dormitory. At present, a great number of students are severely injured and are patients at the University Hospital.**

**As the Chancellor of the University, also as the representative of the faculty and the student body, I take this opportunity to protest against this atrocious and criminal action.**

**As long as the responsible individuals are not punished for their beastly actions, all the deans of the college and I submit our resignations.” (Dr. A. Farhad, the Chancellor of Tehran University. As quoted in the report of the RIC of the International Student Conference).**

**It will be enlightening to study the shah’s own private interests in this paragon country of liberty and enlightenment.**

**The Minority of One, in December 1962 documented how the shah, while portraying himself as a reforming monarch giving land to the landless, owned a monopoly of all opium plantations. Whereas in 1955, heroin was unknown in Iran, today 20 percent of Iranians under 30 are addicted. The shah introduced heroin in addition to opium because it was more profitable. Millions of dollars were earned annually by the shah, and in 1960 his sister, Princess Ashraf, was arrested by the Swiss police for having suitcases full of heroin. The United States Customs Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation apparently knew beyond doubt that Iran was the primary source of narcotics smuggled into the United States, but the shah's value to Western oil interests and the other like members of the "free world" granted him immunity.**

**The shah remained the largest holder of land in the country. Over 2,000 villages were accumulated during the 1930s by his father through confiscation and terror. When the shah's father left in 1941 for exile his accumulated holdings were given to the state to be freely distributed to the landless peasants. The decision was "postponed" until 1951. The shah then took possession of the title to this land personally. He proclaimed his intention to distribute the land and obtained 18,000,000 rials from the United States Operations Mission for "provision of credit" to the new peasant owners. The shah received this amount into his private bank established for the purpose, as well as a further 9,000,000 rials for "personnel and expenditure." Sixty percent of the funds in this bank were "donated" by public agencies to "help out" the peasants.**

**On April 16, 1964, the New York Times gave an account, which is instructive. That article reported that 16 percent of the villages were distributed in the manner described above. The article stated that the remainder would be "very difficult to distribute." There were 100,000 landowners who possessed one village or less, and they oversaw the labor of almost 15 million people. Of 3,500 "cooperatives," about 2,800 are in working condition. Their main function was the collection of peasant membership fees of 2,000 rials per year.**

**The secret police and high-ranking Army officers at that time received salaries of \$1,500 to \$2,000 monthly. The average income of an Iranian was \$80 a year.**

**If and when the national uprising might occur, will the United States work to protect Iranian "freedom"? The answer to this question depends on our ability to bring to the people of America and the West**



**the truth about what America means by the “free world.”**

**LORD BERTRAND RUSSELL’S STATEMENT IN 1964  
CONCERNING THE SHAH’S PLANS TO TOUR THE USA**

The following statement was issued by Lord Russell in response to an appeal made on behalf of the Confederation of Iranian Students (National Union). The students thanked Lord Russell for his sympathetic attitude and his untiring effort for the cause of human rights and values in Iran. The students (I was among them.) expressed the hope that his example would be followed by other humanists of this country.

**May 1964**

**The royal tour of the shah must not be allowed to obscure the appalling conditions of persecution present now in Iran. Poverty, repression and the suppression of all critical opinion are widespread. It is important that these facts are known and publicly objected to by all who oppose such conditions.**

**I hope students and teachers at University of California will demand an amnesty for teachers and students now in prison as a minimal condition for the invitation extended to the shah.**

**BERTRAND RUSSELL O.M., F • R. S.**

**After overthrowing the Prime Minister Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh, the shah met with Shaaban Jafari, the leader of terrorist groups, and ordered the elimination of opposition groups and the burning of the offices of the newspaper “Bakhtar Emrooz.”**

**The followers of shah attacked and burned the offices of opposition newspapers (1953).**

**Dr. Hossein Fatemi, Foreign Minister in the administration of Prime Minister Mossadegh, was arrested and executed (1953).**

**Iranian patriots were tortured and assassinated during the shah’s regime. The majority of the Iranian people were impoverished.**

**A copy of a record of the secret bank account of the shah in Switzerland**

**The shah was acting as a dictator inside Iran, and he was living like a “Playboy” outside the country.**

**The shah’s villa in St. Moritz, Switzerland.**

## **The Criminal Activities of SAVAK, the Secret Police of the Shah**

### **The Cooperation with CIA, European Intelligence Services and Mossad**

**During time of the shah’s regime, I, along with many colleagues were working to create a political uprising to oppose the shah. My colleagues and I acquired secret information that SAVAK, the secret police of the shah had established secret offices in Cologne, Germany and in Geneva, Switzerland. We learned that authorities of both countries were cooperating with SAVAK.**

**At that time, I was one of the executive members of the Iranian Students Organization (CISNU) and the Iranian National Front (INF). We decided to occupy those offices. While there, we discovered and were able to get in our possession thousands of secret SAVAK documents. We were able to publish many of those documents. We also shared with the news media in Europe information about the secret cooperation between SAVAK, the CIA and Israel’s Mossad, as well as the involvement of some European governments in a conspiracy against Iranian democratic movements. At about the same time, some top members of SAVAK contacted us. They delivered more information and explained to us that they were unhappy about the conditions in Iran, and that they wanted cooperate with us in our opposition to the shah regime.**

**The information they delivered to us included information about the different departments of SAVAK, the names of officers who were responsible for different sections and the training programs provided**

to SAVAK members in the U.S. and in Israel.

We learned that SAVAK, with the cooperation of the CIA and Mossad were using new technology to bug the telephones and watch various contacts in Iran. The center for these operations was in Shemiran in north Tehran.

We also received the names of agents who were trying to infiltrate the Iranian Students Organization and other political organizations. At that time, we published some of these secret documents in Persian and Arabic. This information and our activities came as a surprise to the shah.

Subsequently, A. Ardalan, the Iranian ambassador to Germany, contacted me and said, "You must cooperate with the shah and, if you do, you will get an important job. Otherwise your Iranian passport will not be renewed, and you will be forced to go back to Iran." My answer was: "I will continue to fight against the dictatorship in Iran." The Iranian government did not renew my passport, and with the cooperation of the German conservative government, they also did not renew my student visa in Germany, and they tried to force me to leave Germany. I sought the help of a German lawyer, who also happened to be a good friend, and my case was publicized in several German newspapers. The lawyer presented and argued my case in the high court, and the court decided to protect my democratic and human rights in Germany. The German government was forced to issue me a German "Fremdenpass," which is a passport for foreigners, and they were ordered to renew my legal residency in Germany.

Below is documentation of the conspiracy against Hassan Massali by the German conservative government in collaboration with the shah's regime.

Migration and Activism in Europe Since 1945, edited by Wendy Pojmann

Quinn Slobodian, *Foreign Front. Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany*, Duke University Press, Durham & London, 2012

*Chapter 1 "Dissident guests"*

[...]

p. 38 – 39:

The political activity of foreign students challenged official West Germany strategies of policing. To the expressed annoyance of the

federal ministries, foreigners in West Germany not only enjoyed the same right to free political expression and assembly as Germans, but were also being defended by politicians. Pressured by foreign embassies and by their own anxiety about the intrusion of non-state actors into the realm of foreign relations, the Foreign Ministry and Interior Ministry resorted to methods of “administration (Verwaltung)” to eliminate troublesome elements of protest, seizing signs, making arrests, prohibiting demonstrations, and limiting the movement of foreigners. As the passport issue became public, an internal memo sent by a Foreign Ministry official to the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz) suggested that the strategy of authorities was to avoid the light of publicity as much as possible and treat foreign dissidents as a police matter. The official wrote that the original decision to put the mark in the passport of the Iranian dissident Hassan Massali had been “clumsy ... It would have sufficed at first to make Massali aware that he had injured the *Gastrecht* (the right of hospitality) granted to him and that he would be threatened with not having his residence permit extended if he continued to do so.” (n. 135: Reinhard Schlagintweit, Division IB4, to Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz, July 8 1963, PAAA, B82, Bd. 520.)

[...]

p. 46-47: Public interventions affected the internal decision making of authorities. This became clear in the coordinated attempt between the West German and Iranian governments to deport the dissident Hassan Massali. A leader of the opposition to the shah in West Germany, Massali had first deflected attempts for his deportation through application for asylum in 1964. (n. 183: Kurt Breull, BMI, to Bundestag, Petitions Committee, November 19, 1964, PAAA, B82, Bd. 520.). Although officials rejected his application, he appealed his case a year later and was not compelled to leave the country. (n. 184: Hans Karl von Borries, Division V3, note, November 10, 1965, *ibid.*). A Foreign Ministry official vented his frustration about the obstacle of a generous asylum law in a marginal note on a letter on Massali’s application, writing, “Sure. First make yourself punishable through your own behavior and place yourself in a condition of ‘political persecution’ so you can ‘place an application’ for political asylum. That’s how you gotta do it!” (n. 185: Marginal note to Heuer, BMI, to Division Ib3, July 30, 1964, *ibid.*).

The official's cynicism about the legitimacy of Massali's claim was belied by the fact that in 1970, another member of the Iranian dissident group Confederation of Iranian Students/National Union, Hossein Rezai, from the University of Mainz, visited Iran to observe a political trial with Hans Heinz Heldmann and was seized, imprisoned, and not released until the Iranian Revolution in 1978-79, despite hunger strikes and embassy occupations in protests across Western Europe. (n. 186: Matin-Asgari, Iranian Student Opposition to the shah, 119-20; Rainer Gohr, „Reise nach Tehran – Reise ins Gefängnis“, Süddeutsche Zeitung, December 15, 1970.).

By 1968, Iranian dissidents and sympathetic journalists had successfully publicized the attempts of the West German authorities to restrict the political activity of Massali, and articles on the topic appeared in several major newspapers. (n. 187: Seee.g. Ulrich Weithoff, „Hassan Massali hat Angst vor SAVAK<sup>2</sup>, Handelsblatt, June 20, 1967; Anton-Andreas Gruber, „Ausländer zwischen Grundgesetz und Staatsräson“, Frankfurter Rundschau February 8, 1968).

In internal correspondence, a BMI (Bundesministerium des Innern – the Ministry of Internal Affairs) official referred to Massali bitterly as a “star martyr.” (n. 188: Heuer to Kanein [November 29, 1967]).

Deferring to the advocacy of a critical public, West German officials in Hessen abandoned attempts to silence or deport Massali in 1968 on the grounds that “proceeding against Massali would likely be criticized in press, radio and television.” (n. 189: Department V, BMI, Record of „Ausländerrechtliche Maßnahmen gegen den iranischen Staatsangehörigen Hassan Massali“, March 19, 1968, PAAA, B82, Bd. 520.)

[...]

*Chapter 4 „The missing bodies of June 2“*

[...]

p. 128-129

The politicized treatment of Iranian residents in West Germany continued after June 2. In a stark case of political justice, courts found the three pro-shah counter-demonstrators guilty of physical assault, a crime routinely warranting deportation, but freed them on probation and allowed them to remain in the Federal Republic. (n. 167: Friedrich-Wilhelm Grunst, Office of the West Berlin Senator of the

**Interior, to the BMI, on “Ausländer -Angelegenheiten,” January 9, 1969, PAAA, B82/801.).**

**Internal governmental correspondence reveals a heated discussion about the case. From the outset, the senator for the interior of West Berlin wanted to deport the three men for reasons of constitutional equality and to avoid the “expected criticism from the public.” (n. 168: Kurt Neubauer to the BMI, on „Ausländerangelegenheiten“, January 17, 1968, *ibid.*). Federal authorities countered by insisting that they be allowed to stay. A Foreign Office official argued that the “case needs to be judged not only from a legal but a political viewpoint” and asked how deportation of supporters of the shah would appear to the Iranian government in light of the failure to deport dissidents such as Hassan Massali, as that government had repeatedly requested. (n. 169: Walter Truckenbrodt, Division V3, AA, record, March 8, 1968, *ibid.*).**

**The German newspaper Frankfurter Rundschau wrote about my activity against the shah in June 1967.**

**The German magazine Konkret-Extra published an article about SAVAK activity in Europe on Feb. 1, 1966.**

**The German magazine Der Spiegel, No. 37 (1976), published an article about the SAVAK Center and their activities in Europe**

**The shah visited many European countries, and all the superpowers gave him a very favorable reception, and they supported him as their agent in the Middle East. But the Iranian Students Movement in Exile organized protest demonstrations against him and against the “New Colonial Powers.”**

**In June 1967, the shah visited Berlin and other cities in Germany. While he was there, Iranian and German students mobilized several thousand people to participate in protests against the shah in Berlin, Hamburg, Bonn and Frankfurt am Main. But SAVAK, the Secret Police of Shah, with cooperation of German Police, attacked the students and one German student. Benno Ohnesorg, was killed in Berlin.**

Here is a photo and a report about the protests in Berlin -- The agents of the shah attacked the protestors (from Der Spiegel magazine, June 12, 1967).

### **But the shah was eventually kicked out of Iran**

During the administration of President Jimmy Carter, the CIA learned that the shah had lymphatic cancer and as a result he was expected to die soon. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's National Security Advisor, at that time was promoting the idea that the U.S. needed to create a green belt around the Soviet Union, which in effect would be an Islamic belt with the collaboration of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. This policy started to connect the Islamic extremists in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran. And the U.S. started to collaborate with people such as Osama Bin Laden and Ayatollah Khomeini. Indeed, they brought Khomeini, an Islamic extremist to Paris to meet with European allies. The result was the decision to kick out the shah and make Khomeini the leader of the "Islamic Revolution" in Iran. Subsequently, the shah was removed from power in Iran. He was not allowed to reside in the U.S. even though he was allowed to get medical treatment there. The shah was shocked at the treatment he received from his old friends in the U.S. He died in Cairo, Egypt in 1980.

President Carter's Secretary of State, Cyrus R. Vance opposed the policy behind these events, and reportedly supported the democratic forces in Iran. Vance later resigned in protest of Carter's decision to launch a military rescue of the American hostages in Iran.

The video provided by the link below shows Zbigniew Brzezinski arriving on the border of Pakistan and Afghanistan in 1979 to announce the U.S. support of the Mujahideen, the Taliban and Al-Qaeda, which would be done in cooperation with Osama bin Laden and Saudi Arabia.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kYvO3qAlyTg>

**And the shah was kicked out!!!**

## **Chapter 6**

### **The Creation of Khomeini Regime;**

## **An Islamic Fascist Republic in Iran**

**Minority religious fundamentalists existed in Iran prior to the Iranian Revolution in 1979.**

**In the late 1970s, the CIA learned that the shah had lymphatic cancer, and as a result they knew he did not have a long time to live. (Dr. Jean A. Bernard, a French hematologist, diagnosed lymphatic cancer in the shah.) The shah managed to keep his illness a secret for many years, but eventually he died in Cairo, Egypt in July 1980.**

**During this time, the U.S., U.K. and France began to worry about the possibility that their interests in the Middle East may be threatened or diminished. So, they developed a plan to create a new Puppet Regime in Iran that would be based on Islamic extremist ideology and which would serve as opposition to the Soviet Union. The CIA, with the cooperation of Dr. Ibrahim Yazdi, Sadegh Ghotbzadeh, and Hassan Habibi, brought Ayatollah Khomeini from Iraq to France. And with the cooperation of the BBC, Radio France and many other foreign media, they introduced him as the leader of the Iranian people!!!**

**(I knew Dr. Ibrahim Yazdi. During this time, he was trying carry out his activities under the names of the Iranian National Front and the Mujahideen. But later he created an Islamic Association in Texas and established a relationship with the CIA and the Carter Administration in 1978. He was also traveling to Europe, Lebanon and Iraq to drum up support for Khomeini.)**

**A few months after Khomeini's return to Iran, freedom started to disappear. And the Islamist extremists started oppressing the democratic forces in a very methodical and systemic way.**

**The main reason that the democratic forces lost what little power they had was the fact that they were not organized enough to fill the vacuum left by the shah's departure.**

**The fundamentalists enforced their rules and values by the following actions:**

**1) They made people believe that it was sinful to resist the mandate from God, i.e., the arrival of Khomeini to assume power and turn Iran into an Islamic state. Rational thinking and critical analysis of political, economic and social events were prohibited.**

**2) Women became second-class citizens and lost most of the rights they had received during the Pahlavi dynasty. Educated and professional women suffered great losses in terms of respect, social dignity and economically since they were removed from high positions. This was especially true for**



women who were judges in the judiciary system. For instance, in 1982 just three years after the revolution, on one day 70 female judges were laid off. Some were called back later to lower-level jobs, such as assistant advisors, etc. But none was called back to the same position they held before.

3) The Khomeini regime, still intoxicated from their easy victory in Iran, developed more ambitious plans of expanding Islamic ideology beyond the Iranian borders. They dreamed of the globalization of Islam by exporting zealots or terrorists to other regions of the Middle East to create chaos and destabilize governments deemed corrupt in the eyes of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

4) The Islamic Republic of Iran sought to strengthen and unify its power base in the face of opposition inside and outside Iran by brainwashing the population with propaganda messages in print, television and radio media, as well as in Friday prayers. They said that people should forget the materialistic world and turn to the spiritual world beyond this life. Encouraging sacrifice for one's religion and choosing martyrdom were considered the highest honors one can bestow on one's family. Families of war casualties were given funds, easy access to jobs and a university education despite the fact that these individuals often lacked the education and background required. That caused havoc in the country's higher education institutions. Faculty had to accommodate these people by teaching at a much lower level, with the result that degrees from the universities were worthless.

5) The exaltation and admiration of martyrdom is very deeply rooted in the traditions of Shi'ite Muslims. The government utilized this concept to cover up its dismal record of managing the affairs of the country. Since many intellectuals and educated people either left the country or were executed, many novice clerics with little experience or education were given power to make critical decisions. Consequently, many bad decisions were made. Those who questioned those decisions were subjected to torture and jail, and some were executed. In fact, in 1988, 10,000 intellectuals and youth were executed because of their opposition to the regime. Some women were raped prior to their execution to instill fear and intimidation to all women throughout the country.

6) This use of coercion and absolute power to force people do whatever the government leaders wanted provoked a huge

exodus from Iran. Among those leaving were doctors, engineers, teachers, university faculty and wealthy tradesmen who knew that they could survive and even prosper outside Iran because of their knowledge, education, expertise or money which they could use for investment. Around 3,000,000 Iranians emigrated and are now scattered around the world. The countries with heaviest concentration of Iranian immigrants are Europe, U. S, Australia, Canada, Turkey and the Philippines. This exodus created a huge flow of brain power and money to these regions. The impact on some countries such as Canada was so overwhelming that the Canadian government publicly thanked the Khomeini's regime for sending them so many engineers and doctors, which had no cost to Canadian educational system.

7) In order to visibly show the Iranians and the rest of the world their power, the Islamic Republic of Iran forced women to wear the so-called "Islamic Hijab." They not only dictated what women should wear and what kind of profession they could have, they also wanted to control the relationship between men and women in the society especially when it came to those who were unmarried. Harassment, imprisonment and fines were all tools used to intimidate the population, with a special emphasis on the youth. Heavy punishments, such as stoning for sexual indiscretion, started to take Iran back to the Dark Ages.

A forced Islamization of the society that did not deliver what it had promised began to create an insurgence of resistance to these cultural and social changes. For instance:

- a) Even people with strong religious beliefs began to question the legitimacy of the government, and there was an emerging hope that eventually the resistance movement would bring secularism to Iran in the future.
- b) Music, art, poetry, literature, films and plays were censored and sometimes outlawed. However, these severe restrictions actually created the opposite effect of what the government had intended. Many people began to yearn for pop music from the U.S., as well as for traditional Persian music from Iranian artists and artists from all over the world.
- c) The new communications technology of the world is making the people of Iran more politically aware. The government has little control over access to the internet, cable TV, cell phones and other hand-held devices.. It is impossible for the police to

**monitor all communications on all of these media and devices. This has caused a crisis in Iran since the government cannot suppress these modes of communication. Even with the so-called reformist government of Khatami, the crisis continued. Khatami served as the fifth president of Iran from 1997 to 2005, and he made his success in politics by advocating liberalism and reform. He was elected by the population and supported by the establishment (religious fundamentalists) in order to provide a quasi-release to the peoples' sense of frustration with the republic. This political maneuvering attempted to buy the regime some time by giving people a false sense of security and quasi-democracy.**

**d) Because of this crisis, the Iranian government, i.e., the Islamic Republic, is looking for creative ways to solve the crisis. They are currently using the U.S. foreign policy mistake of invading Iraq as a way to get concessions from the Americans. The support of hardline Shiites of military and political activities in southern Iraq is aimed at making stability in Iraq more difficult to achieve. However, if these hard-liners can get concessions from the U.S., they will cease to support their collaborators in Iraq. They are solely motivated by their desire to further unify their power in Iran and maintain their own survival.**

**The agents of the Khomeini regime were also very active in exile. They killed Dr. Abdolrahman Boroumand (April 18, 1991), and Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar (August 9, 1991) in Paris; Dr. Ghassemlou and other Kurdish activists (July 13, 1989) in Vienna, Austria; and Dr. Sharafkandi and other Kurdish activists (September 17, 1992) in Berlin, Germany.**

**Dr. Sharafkandi and Dr. Ghassemlou with other Kurdish leaders and activists**

**The agents of the Khomeini regime killed Dr. S. Sharafkandi, Homayoun Ardalan and Fattah Abdoli on September 17, 1992, in Berlin, Germany**

**Dr. A. Boroumand, the friend and advisor of Dr. Bakhtiar, was killed in Paris (April 18, 1991)  
Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar was killed in Paris (August 9, 1991)**

**Hassan Massali and friends participating in a memorial ceremony for Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar**

**Dr. A. Ghassemlou and his friends were killed in Vienna, Austria (July 13, 1989). The killer was captured, but he was released immediately, and he went back to Iran.**

## **Chapter 7**

### **Victims of State Terrorism -- The Khomeini Regime in Iran**

**Report on the Islamic Republic's Terrorism Abroad  
By The National Movement of Iranian Resistance (NAMIR),**

**(NAMIR was founded by Shapour Bakhtiar, the last prime minister of Iran under the Shah Pahlavi. He has assassinated in France in 1991.)**

Since the advent of the Islamic Republic in Iran, terrorist attempts have targeted exiled Iranians as well as citizens of other countries, condemned as heretics, around the world. These attacks were ordered by the government of Iran. The following is a list of some of those attacks:

- **In July 1980, Shapour Bakhtiar escaped an assassination attempt in Paris, France. A French policeman and a neighbor were killed, and one policeman was seriously injured.**
- **In July 1980, Ali Tabatabai was killed in Bethesda, Maryland, a suburb of Washington, D.C. in the United States.**
- **In 1981, Shahriar Shafigh was killed in Paris, France.**
- **In January 1982, Shahrokh Missaghi was killed in Manila, Philippines.**
- **In April 1982, a young German student was killed during an attack on the residence of Iranian students in Mainz, Germany by the pro-Iranian Hezbollah.**
- **In June 1982, Shahram Mirani was fatally wounded in India.**
- **In August 1982, Ahmad Zol-Anvar was fatally wounded in Karachi, Pakistan.**
- **In September 1982, Abdolamir Rahdar was killed in India.**
- **In 1982, Colonel Ahmad Hamed was killed in Istanbul, Turkey.**
- **In February 1983, Esfandiar Rahimi was killed in Manila, Philippines.**
- **In February 1984, Gholam-Ali Oveissi and his brother, Gholam-Hosseini, were killed in Paris, France.**
- **In August 1985, Behrouz Shahverdilu was killed in Istanbul, Turkey.**
- **In December 1985, Hadi Aziz-Moradi was killed in Istanbul, Turkey.**
- **In August 1986, Bijan Fazeli was killed in London, Great Britain.**
- **In December 1986, Vali Mohammad Van was killed in Pakistan.**
- **In January 1987, Ali-Akbar Mohammadi was killed in Hamburg, Germany.**
- **In May 1987, Hamid Reza Chitgar disappeared in Vienna, Austria and was found assassinated in July 1987.**
- **In July 1987, Faramarz-Aghaï and Ali-Reza Pourshafizadeh were killed and 23 persons were wounded in residences of Iranian refugees in Karachi and Quetta, Pakistan.**
- **In July 1987, Amir-Hosseini Amir-Parviz was seriously**

wounded by the explosion of a bomb placed in his car in London, England.

- In July 1987, Mohammad-Hassan Mansouri was shot dead in his house in Istanbul, Turkey.
- In August 1987, Ahmad Moradi-Talebi was killed in Geneva, Switzerland.
- In October 1987, Mohammad-Ali Tavakoli-Nabavi and his youngest son, Nouredin, were killed in Wembley, Great Britain.
- In October 1987, Abol-Hassan Modjtahed-Zadeh was kidnapped in Istanbul, Turkey.
- In December 1988, an Iranian refugee was assassinated in front of the headquarters of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Karachi, Pakistan.
- In June 1989, Ataollah Bay Ahmadi was killed in the Emirate of Dubai.
- In July 1989, Abdol-Rahman Ghassemlou, Abdollah Ghaderi and Fazel Rassoul were killed in Vienna, Austria.
- In August 1989, Gholam Keshavarz was killed in Cyprus.
- In September 1989, Sadigh Kamangar was assassinated in the north of Iraq.
- In September 1989, Hossein Keshavarz, was a victim of a terrorist attempt and became paralyzed for life.
- In February 1990, Hadj Baloutch-Khan was killed by a terrorist commando in Pakistan.
- In March 1990, Hossein Mir-Abedini was wounded by an armed commando in the airport of Istanbul, Turkey.
- In April 1990, Kazem Radjavi was killed in Coppet, Switzerland.
- In July 1990, Ali Kashefpour was kidnapped and killed in Turkey.
- In September 1990, Efat Ghazi was killed in Sweden by a bomb intended for her husband.
- In October 1990, Cyrus Elahi was killed in Paris, France.
- In April 1991, Abdol-Rahman Boroumand was killed in Paris, France.
- In July 1991, Alberto Capriolo was wounded in Milan, Italy.
- In July 1991, Hitoshi Igarashi was killed in Tokyo, Japan.
- In July 1991, Ahad Agha was killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.
- In August 1991, Shapour Bakhtiar and Soroush Katibeh were killed in Suresnes, France.
- In September 1991, Saïd Yazdan-Panah was fatally wounded in

## **Iraq.**

- **In December 1991, Massoud Rajavi escaped a terrorist attempt in Baghdad, Iraq.**
- **In January 1992, Kamran Hedayati was wounded opening a letter bomb in Västerås, Sweden. He lost his sight and his hands.**
- **In May 1992, Shapour Firouzi was killed in Iraq.**
- **In July 1992, Kamran Mansour-Moghadam was killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **In August 1992, Fereydoun Farokhzad was killed in Bonn, Germany.**
- **In September 1992, Sadegh Sharafkandi, Fatah Abdoli, Homayoun Ardalan and Nouri Dehkordi were killed in Berlin, Germany.**
- **In January 1993, Ugur Mumcu was killed in Ankara, Turkey.**
- **In February 1993, the fundamentalist terrorists in Turkey admitted to having kidnapped and killed Ali-Akbar Ghorbani who had disappeared in June 1992 in Turkey.**
- **In March 1993, Mohammad-Hosseini Naghdi was killed in Rome, Italy.**
- **In June 1993, Mohammad-Hassan Arbab was killed in Karachi, Pakistan.**
- **In August 1993, Mohammad Ghaderi was kidnapped and assassinated in Turkey.**
- **In September 1993, Bahram Azadfar was killed in Turkey.**
- **In October 1993, Turkish fundamentalists admitted having tortured and killed for Iranian officials, including the kidnapping of Abbas Gholizadeh in Istanbul, Turkey in December 1992.**
- **In November 1993, William Nygaard was wounded in Oslo, Norway.**
- **On November 13, 1993, Shahrokh Moradi, Salah Moradi, Anvar Ibrahimy, Taher Manutchehri, Rashid Rostami and Karim Mohammad Fattah were killed in Darbandikhan, Iraq.**
- **On December 13, 1993, Mahmud Dol was killed in Ranya, Iraq.**
- **On January 4, 1994, Taha Kermanj was killed in Tchorim, Turkey.**
- **On January 12, 1994, Mohammad Bokani was killed in Kawlokani, Iraq.**
- **On January 13, 1994, Mustafa Hawrami was shot in Erbil, Iraq.**

- **On January 17, 1994, Abubakr Hedayati was seriously injured in Sweden.**
- **On January 28, 1994, Shafi Mohammadi, was killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **On January 29, 1994, Nasser Hadji Rashidi and his sister Mahtab Hadji Rashidi were injured in Syrace, Turkey.**
- **On April 2, 1994, Saleh Djahanghiri was killed in Halabja, Iraq.**
- **On April 23, 1994, Fattah Saidi was killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **On April 24, 1994, Ali Haydari Dejahang was injured in Darbandikhan, Iraq.**
- **On June 17, 1994, Ahmad Mohammadpour was killed in Iraq.**
- **On June 24, 1994, Ibrahim Gorgori was wounded in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **On June 24, 1994, Molla Osman Amini was found murdered in his apartment in Copenhagen, Denmark.**
- **On July 23, 1994, Mam Morad was shot in Basserma, Iraq.**
- **On July 24, 1994, Morad Mohammadzadeh was killed by the explosion of a grenade thrown into his home in Basserma, Iraq.**
- **On July 31, 1994, Abdullah Ladissani was assassinated in Darbandikhan, Iraq.**
- **In August 1994, Ghafour Hamzei'i was killed in Baghdad, Iraq.**
- **In November 1995, Cheder Mahmudi was killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **On December 27, 1995, Ghafour Mehdizadeh, Ali Amini and Saddig Abdulahi were killed in Koya, Iraq.**
- **On December 30, 1995, Usman Ruyan and Abubaker Rahimi were killed in Arbil, Iraq.**
- **On January 2, 1996, Rahman Shabannajad and Ali Abdulah were killed in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**
- **In February 1996, Zahra Rajabi and Ali Moradi were killed in Istanbul, Turkey.**
- **On March 24, 1996, Farmarz Keshvari, Osman Rahimi, Taher Azizi and Hassan Ebrahimzadeh were killed by gunmen while playing football in Bahraka, Iraq.**
- **In March 1996, Ali Mollazadeh was killed in Karachi, Pakistan.**
- **In May 1996, Reza Mazlouman was killed in Paris, France.**
- **On August 14, 1997, Qaleb Alizadeh and Anjad Mowlaii were murdered in Sulaymaniyah, Iraq. A resident of the city was**



**also killed in the attack, and four other residents were wounded.**

- **On August 19, 1997, Saeed Moradi, Ali Zokaleh and Isma'il Namaki were killed during an armed attack against the bus in which they were travelling towards Sulaymaniyah, Iraq.**

Due to the lack of reliable information, this list of terrorist attempts is not exhaustive. Undoubtedly, since the advent of the Islamic Republic, the number of extrajudicial executions outside Iran, in particular in Pakistan, Turkey and Iraq is higher. Also, this report deliberately leaves out well-known terrorist attacks ordered by Tehran, such as the hostage crisis of the U.S. embassy in Tehran in 1979; the kidnapping of British, American and French citizens in Lebanon by pro-Iranian Hezbollah; the explosive attack on the American and French military headquarters in Lebanon, which was publicly claimed by Mohsen Rafighdoust, then head of the Revolutionary Guards; the wave of terrorist bombings in Paris in 1986, which resulted in the death of 13 persons and the wounding of hundreds of others; the death sentence against Salman Rushdie for writing *The Satanic Verses*; and the Dahran terrorist attempts that targeted the American military in Saudi Arabia.

The identity of the victims listed above reveals the existence of a concerted plan aimed at eliminating political leaders and activists of the Iranian opposition in exile.

Shapour Bakhtiar was the leader of the National Movement of the Iranian Resistance (NAMIR). Abdol-Rahman Boroumand was a founding member and President of the Executive Bureau of the Movement, of which Colonel Ahmed Hamed, Colonel Shahverdilou and Colonel Hadi Aziz-Moradi were active members. Amir-Parviz was NAMIR's representative in London.

Ahmad Zol-Anvar, Esfandiar Rahimi, Faramarz Aghaï, Ali-Reza Pourshafizadeh, Zahra Rajabi and Ali Moradi were militant members of the People's Moudjahedin Organization of Iran (PMOI). Ali Akbar Ghorbani, Abol-Hassan Modjtahed-Zadeh, Hossein Keshavarz and Hossein Mir-Abedini were also active members of the PMOI, which was represented in Switzerland by Kazem Radjavi and in Italy by Mohammad Hossein Naghdi.

Shahrokh Missaghi and Shahram Mirani belonged to the organization of People's Fedayins of Iran, an opposition movement to the Islamic

Republic.

Abdolamir Rahdar was a member of Peykar, a Maoist organization that has been dissolved.

Hamid Reza Chitgar was the leader of Toufan or the Labor Party. Gholam Keshavarz and Sadigh Kamangar were officials of the Communist Party of Iran.

Ali Kashefpour was a member of the Iranian Kurdish Democratic Party, as were Shapour Firouzi, Ahad Agha and Saïd Yazdan-Panah. Mansour Moghadam was an active militant in the Union of the Iranian Communists.

Tabatabai, former high official of the Imperial Regime was a monarchist militant, as were Hadj Baloutch-Khan, Mohammed Ali Tavakoli-Nabavi and his son. General Gholam Ali Oveissi, former Military Governor of Tehran, was an active opponent of the Islamic Regime.

Cyrus Elahi and Colonel Ataollah Bay Ahmadi were members of The Organization Flag of Freedom (called today The Organization for the Defense of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Iran); Elahi was in charge of a radio program broadcast to Iran from Egypt, and had been openly criticized by Iranian officials. Abbas Gholizadeh, officer of the Imperial Army, and the singer Fereydoun Farokhzad were also members of this organization; the latter had been threatened several times for ridiculing and offending the Islamic Republic in his shows.

Shahriar Shafigh and Vali Mohammed Van, officers in the Iranian Navy, were also active opponents.

Abdol-Rahman Ghassemlou, Abdollah Ghaderi and Fazel Rasoul, killed in Vienna, as well as Sadegh Sharafkandi, Fatah Abdoli and Homayoun Ardalan, killed in Bonn, were all leaders and officials of the Democratic Party of Iranian Kurdistan (PDKI) which opposes the Tehran Regime. Ahad Agha, Kamran Hedayati Qaleb Alizadeh, Anjad Mowlaii, Saeed Moradi, Ali Zokaleh, Isma'il Namaki and Ghafour Hamzei'i were active members of PDKI. Nouri Dehkordi was a leftist sympathizer close to PDKI. Mrs. Efat Ghazi was the wife of the Kurdish opponent, Mohammed Ghazi, to whom the parcel bomb, which killed her, was addressed.

Ahmad Moradi-Talebi was an air force pilot like Mohammadi, who had been the private pilot of Ali Akbar Rafsandjani, then president of the Iranian Parliament. Both men had left Iran in order to protest the regime.

Alberto Capriolo and Hitoshi Igarashi had both translated the work of the condemned author, Salman Rushdie, which was published by William Nygaard in Norway.

Bijan Fazeli was selling opposition newspapers and videos of opposition artists in his shop and had been enjoined to stop this sale. Finally, Mohammed-Hassan Mansouri was an opponent of the Islamic Regime in Tehran.

No opposition movement has been spared. Often, they have lost high-ranking officials. These political refugees died violently because they actively contributed to the fight against the government of the Islamic Republic. No other motive than state repression was found by official investigations. All investigated tracks led to the single hypothesis of state ordered crimes.

### **A Coherent Set of Presumptions About the Islamic Regime**

The first victims of the Islamic Republic fell in demonstrations against the regime, organized around the world. Militants of the Hezbollah, supported by the Islamic Regime, armed with knives and clubs, attacked the demonstrators and killed them. This method, used until 1982, resulted in the death of Shahrokh Missaghi, Shahram Mirani, Rahdar and a young German Student. The regime has since embraced more covert methods and has developed a state machine devoted to the physical elimination of opponents.

The organization and execution of these crimes establish similarities that the Swiss prosecutor, Roland Chatelin, described as ‘common parameters’ following a ‘meticulous preparation.’ These analyses have created a coherent set of presumptions designating the government of the Islamic Republic as the instigator of these assassinations.

#### **Weapons:**

Automatic weapons were used in the cases of Shapour Bakhtiar in 1980, Aziz Moradi in 1985, the PMOI militants in Pakistan in 1987, Abdol Rahman Ghassemlou and his companions in 1989, Sadegh Charafkandi,

Fatah Abdoli, Nouri Dehkordi and Homayoun Ardalan in 1992 and Mohammad Hossein Naghdi in 1993.

Handguns were used in the murders of Hamed, Cyrus Elahi, Ataollah Bay Ahmadi, Tavakoli-Nabavi and his son, H. Chitgar, Mansour Moghadam and Shapour Firouzi. The Czech pistol, which killed C. Elahi in October 1990, is the same type that was used in the murder of Colonel Ataollah Bay Ahmadi in June 1989 in Dubai. This model is identified by the anti-terrorist section of the French criminal brigade as the type of weapon used by the Iranian Special Services.

Knives were used in the murders of A. Boroumand, H. Igarashi, Sh. Bakhtiar, S. Katibeh, and F. Farokhzad.

#### Kidnapping:

The assassination of A. Gholizadeh confirms the existence of the Islamic Republic's active network in Turkey and points to kidnapping as Iran's latest method of dealing with its opponents. The Flag of Freedom Organization uncovered evidence of these criminal activities of the Islamic Republic and presented their information to the Iranian Embassy in Turkey. On January 25, 1993, a Turkish journalist of the paper Djomhuria died in Ankara, in the explosion of a bomb placed in his car. The Turkish Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility for his death. The investigators believe that the Islamic fundamentalists commandos had the support of a foreign neighboring power. Furthermore, the arrest following this murder led to the discovery of the tortured body of an Iranian opponent to the Islamic Regime believed to be Amini (kidnapped in June 1992). On January 29, more than 250,000 people gathered in front of the Iranian Embassy in Ankara, shouting slogans such as Turkey will never be Iran.

#### Bombing:

According to the Scotland Yard, the men who caused the explosion of Bijan Fazeli's shop came from Germany. One year later, a former high official of the Revolutionary Guards, now opposed to the Tehran Regime, confirms the existence of an operation base of the Islamic Republic in Mariembourg, a suburb of Couvin, Belgium. (*Check this information.*) This official admits that in 1984 he met Massoud Hendi, who was condemned in 1994 for complicity in the assassination of Bakhtiar. They met in an Iranian Embassy-owned villa. This official acknowledges having provided Hendi with explosives, guns and silencers for his missions in

Paris. He also admits meeting with Vahid Gordji, suspected of organizing the bomb attacks of September 1986 in Paris. The explosion in Bijan Fazeli's shop in London reveals similarities with those in Paris. It attests to the existence of an operation base as well as arms and explosives distribution networks managed by diplomatic representations of the Islamic Republic.

Four terrorists were tried in 1992 in connection with the Paris bombings in 1986-87, which killed 13 and injured more than 300. The investigators discovered that there was only one terrorist group behind the bombings: Hezbollah, an Iranian-backed group. One key piece of evidence was the use of an explosive device used by the same group in an attack against the French embassy in Kuwait and for which they claimed responsibility. The second reason to believe that Iran was behind the bombings is the terrorists' claims. They asked for the French to stop helping the Iraqis in their war against Iran. This argument was also used by Fouad Ali Aleh, one of the accused terrorists, to justify the bombings. He repeatedly said that the French government was responsible for the death of thousands of Iranian children. Another interesting point was that Fouad Ali Saleh studied theology for two years in Qom (Iran), during which he acquired his rhetoric.

According to foreign wire reports, a Bangkok criminal court had convicted Hossein Dastgiri, an Iranian citizen, of murder and of conspiring to set off a bomb at the Israeli embassy in Bangkok in 1994 and had sentenced him to life imprisonment. The Special Representative of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, was informed that the Islamic Human Rights Commission was seeking to improve his conditions of detention.

#### Falsified Identity Papers:

The killers of Hamid Reza Chitgar, as those of Shapour Bakhtiar were traveling with Turkish passports. Furthermore, in his visit to Turkey in September 1991, the French prosecutor Jean-Pierre Bruguière "was able to confirm the existence of a base in Istanbul." He established that a network of traffickers provided the forged identity papers. This network included a number of Iranian nationals. In fact, the departure of Revolutionary Guards from Ankara a few days before the assassination of Cyrus Elahi alerted Western intelligence services of the imminence of terrorist attempts in Europe.

### **Methods of Approach:**

The killers used similar methods of approach in order to reduce the victims' suspicion. A so-called opponent from Iran had contacted Hamid Reza Chitgar. A staff member of the Evin prison, allegedly anxious to help the opposition, approached Ataollah Bay Ahmadi. Shapour Bakhtiar had received his killers in his home under the false pretense that they were bearing important news from Iran. Abdol Rahman Ghassemlou was offered the opportunity to negotiate with Mohammad Sahraroudy, an officer of the Pasdaran and Rafsandjani's emissary. It is during these negotiations that the Kurdish leader was killed. In many cases, the killers succeeded in meeting their victims away from places where they had relative security. Hamid Chitgar, who lived in Strasbourg, was trapped in Vienna. His murderer's pretext was a visa refusal from Germany, where Chitgar had chosen to meet him. Ataollah Bay Ahmadi, who resided in France, left for a meeting in Dubai even though he preferred Istanbul where he felt more protected. General Gholam Ali Oveissi was assassinated while meeting his mother and brother whom the killers had followed from Iran. Gholam Keshavarz was killed while meeting his parents in Cyprus.

### **Infiltration:**

This method was frequently used by Iranian Secret Services. Faridoun Boyer Ahmadi infiltrated the National Movement of Iranian Resistance. With his assistance, assassins from Iran were able to enter the residence of Shapour Bakhtiar. Sadigh Kamangar, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Iran, was killed by a so-called zealous militant, who had insisted to be the watch guard the night of the murder. Although the information was not confirmed, according to a press release by the Iranian News Agency, in early 1992 Massoud Radjavi, leader of the PMOI, escaped an assassination attempt perpetrated by two of his bodyguards. The same procedure was used in the case of Reza Mazlouman whose murderer entered his apartment along with one of the victim's acquaintances.

Iranian terrorists also use a more cynical method to leave their trademark. In the cases of Ahmad Moradi Talebi, Kazem Radjavi and Abdol Rahman Ghassemlou, the police found a navy blue baseball cap at the scene of the murder.

Prosecutors and police in countries where these assassinations have taken place often share the conviction that the Iranian government was involved

in their conception and execution. The Viennese police for example suspected Ghassemlou's murder to be a political crime. The preliminary investigation of the assassination of Abdorrahman Boroumand, was assigned to the anti-terrorist section of the Paris Public Prosecutor Department.

On June 22, 1990, Roland Chatelain, the prosecutor in charge of Kazem Radjavi's case, asserted that the police had gathered various pieces of evidence indicating that one or more Iranian official agencies had been directly involved in the assassination.

During the spring of 1991, the D.S.T. (French Department for the Security of the Territory) informed the French Ministry of Interior that a Secret Services operation had been established in the Iranian Embassy in Paris beginning in the fall of 1990. The report's conclusion underlined the existence of a policy aimed at the physical elimination of opposition members, which had already led to the assassination in Paris of Chaudhry Zahoor Elahi and Abdorrahman Boroumand. The report was accompanied by a letter to the Minister of Interior, Philip Marchand, from the DST's director, Jacques Fournet, warning of the imminence of future eliminations. This appraisal was confirmed by the French Judiciary Police in charge of the Elahi and Boroumand cases. According to the French police, "the key to the assassination of Boroumand is in Tehran". Furthermore, a DGSE (French intelligence) note (October 23, 1992, *Espionage, Interference and Terrorism: the Iranian Threat*) warns that "by bringing political, logistic and financial support to radical organizations (of the Middle East), Iran plays thenceforth an essential role in the development of Middle Eastern terrorism."

In a meeting with the family of Abdorrahman Boroumand, the prosecutor Jean Louis Bruguière asserts that undoubtedly the cases of Bakhtiar and Boroumand were closely linked.

According to the People's Fedayins Organization, the persons arrested after the terrorist attempts aimed at Iranian refugees in Pakistan in July and October 1987, were the Revolutionary Guards. According to the Flag of Freedom Organization, Ataallah Bayahmadi had been contacted by a person who held a key position in the Evin Prison in Tehran. This official, who used several names, had introduced himself as Kabiri and had promised to obtain the release of 12 members of the Flag of Freedom held in Evin. The accuracy of the information given on these prisoners confirmed that Bayahmadi's contact was an official of the prison.

Dubai issued international arrest warrants for Kabiri and a man called Moharrebi. Both were suspects in the assassination of Bayahmadi. These two men were also wanted by Interpol.

In the case of the murder of Mohammad Hossein Naghdi in Rome in 1993, his killers escaped. The Italian Minister of Interior, Nicola Mancino, subsequently denounced the campaign of terror orchestrated by Islamist fundamentalism. The U.S. State Department also suspected that the Islamic Republic was behind Naghdi's assassination.

Furthermore, Amnesty International reported the deadly attacks on Abdorrahman Boroumand, Soroush Katibeh and Shapour Bakhtiar in a 1992 report and concluded that "several opponents of the government have been killed outside Iran in circumstances suggesting that they may have been extrajudicially executed."

Finally, a report submitted by the Secretary General of the United Nations to the members of the General Assembly during the 47th session in 1992-1993 denounced the Islamic Republic for the assassinations of Iranian opponents in exile. Drafted by the Representative of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations, Teynaldo Galindo Pohl, the report on human rights in the Islamic Republic also pointed to three cases of terrorist attempts outside Iran that resulted in the deaths of K. Radjavi, C. Bakhtiar, S. Katibeh and Fereydoun Farrokhzad.

### **Established Evidence on the Islamic Republic's Involvement in Extraterritorial Executions:**

In many cases, there seems to be a direct link between the alleged killers and their accomplices and the government of the Islamic Republic.

#### **Ghassemlou's Case:**

The arms used in A. Ghassemlou's assassination were found in a trash can with the receipt for the purchase of a motorcycle by Mohammad Sahraroudy, the negotiator for the Islamic Republic. The Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Alois Mock, publicly implicated the Islamic Republic in the case of Ghassemlou. Sahraroudy and Amir Mansour Bozorgian (who stood guard at the door at the time of the negotiations with Ghassemlou) were interrogated and detained for a short while since there were important discrepancies in their statements. They told the police that someone who broke into the apartment killed the Kurds. According to a senior Austrian-government official, "They lied. By all appearances, the



murderers were inside the room at the time of the crime.”

### **Radjavi’s Case:**

Following the assassination of Radjavi, a telephone conversation between an official in Tehran and his interlocutor in Switzerland was intercepted and a report of that conversation was included in the prosecution's file. During this conversation the names of Mohammed Malaek, the Iranian Ambassador in Bern, and Kazem Radjavi are mentioned. The investigation in the case of Kazem Radjavi led to a group of 13 persons, involved in the organization of the crime. They were carrying passports of the Islamic Republic stating “in charge of mission” and for some the passports were issued the same day. Most of them entered Switzerland together using a direct flight from Tehran to Geneva with plane tickets issued the same date and numbered sequentially. Most listed the same personal address in Iran, which turns out to be an intelligence-ministry building. Two of them were arrested in Paris in December 1992 when French and German Secret Services were alerted by rumors of new terrorist attempts. Ali Kamali and Mahmoud Sajadian are known to be elements of an operational team of the Iranian Ministry of Information. The Swiss government immediately asked for their extradition. Furthermore, the Swiss police found one of the cars used by the assassins of Radjavi hidden in the building of the Iranian delegation to the United Nations in Conches, a residential area in Geneva, where Tehran owns a large property protected by diplomatic immunity.

### **Elahi’s Case:**

Paris prosecutor Bruguière, investigating the assassination of Cyrus Elahi, ordered the arrest of two agents of the Islamic Republic accused of collusion in murder, conspiracy, violation of the law in relation to a terrorist action and drug trafficking. They were in charge of recruiting execution agents and locating opponents to be eliminated. On September 26, 1996, the 12<sup>th</sup> chamber of the *Tribunal de Grande instance de Paris* (Court of first instance) declared Mojlabi Mashadi and Hossein Yazdan Seta guilty of conspiracy to commit one or several crimes against Iranian opponents in France.

### **Bakhtiar and Katibeh’s Cases:**

In August 1991, the American and British Governments intercepted and decoded messages sent by the Iranian Ministry of Information to Europe. On Wednesday August 7, 24 hours before Shapour Bakhtiar's and Soroush

Katibeh's bodies were discovered, this ministry was allegedly asking for confirmation of their death. This information was substantiated by persistent rumors concerning Bakhtiar's death, which were circulating in Shiraz before his body was discovered in Suresnes.

Furthermore and above all, the investigation of Bakhtiar's assassination confirmed the Islamic Republic's involvement. It led to the charging of Massoud Hendi, a relative of Ayatollah Khomeini and a former representative for Iranian Television in Paris. Together with a member of the Ministry of Telecommunications, he had assisted in getting entry visas to France for the killers under the cover of electronic technicians. The name of Massoud Hendi had appeared previously in the investigations concerning the murder of General Oveissi. The analysis of phone calls made by Vakili and Azadi (Bakhtiar's assassins) led to an Iranian-born Turk, Edipsoy, who falsified Turkish passports for the killers. Before and after the murder of Bakhtiar, two Iranians involved in the plot called the Telecommunications Ministry several times from Edipsoy's apartment. The above mentioned Tehran number is known to be used by Iranian Secret Service and by members of the killers' alleged support team in Geneva. The other person charged, Fereshteh Djahanbani, had rented an apartment in which Boyerahmadi, one of the killers, found refuge after the crime. She admitted collaborating with Iran's Intelligence Agency VEVAK. The police found codes, a special pen and invisible ink in her apartment. She identified Amirolah Teimoury, chief of security at Iran Air in the Orly Airport (Paris), as her superior. Teimoury was also prosecuted for intelligence activities for a foreign power. Another individual charged and extradited to France, Zia Sarhadi, had made hotel reservations in Switzerland for the alleged killers. Sarhadi arrived in Switzerland on August 13, 1991, to work as an archivist in the Iranian embassy in Bern. According to Bruguière, his mission was to help Bakhtiar's murderers escape. Sarhadi's order of mission was issued on July 16, 1991, on the authority of Ali Akbar Velayati, the Iranian Foreign Minister. Since his extradition to France in 1992, the Iranian Ambassador has visited Bruguière several times trying to convince him to drop the charges against Sarhadi.. Two other Iranians, arrested in Istanbul for having provided forged identity papers to the alleged killers, are also said to belong to the Iranian Special Services.

On October 22, 1991, prosecutor Bruguière issued an international arrest warrant for Hossein Cheikhatar for collusion in murder, conspiracy and violation of the law in relation with a terrorist action." Cheikhatar was the technical adviser for the Satellite Communication Program to the Iranian Ministry of Telecommunications. This Ministry was known for its close

connections to Iranian Special Services. Bruguière issued two other arrest warrants on April 21, 1993, for two other Iranian officials. The first, Gholam Hossein Shoorideh Chirazi Nejad, already known in business circles, asked Comatra, a Swiss firm, to invite a “friend.” The “friend” was in fact one of the killers who obtained a visa to enter Switzerland. The other suspect was Nasser Ghassemi-Nejad, an official of the Secret Services who would have awaited the murderers in Geneva in order to send them back to Iran. The active contribution of Islamic Republic’s diplomatic representation was confirmed in a spectacular way in the investigation of the murder of Shapour Bakhtiar and Soroush Katibeh.

Finally, the French President François Mitterand acknowledged the involvement of Tehran's Islamic Regime in the assassination of Shapour Bakhtiar and cancelled his visit to Tehran scheduled for the fall of 1991. In December 1994, the Special Criminal Court of Paris (la Cour d’Assises Speciales) sentenced Ali Vakili-Rad to life imprisonment. He was one of Bakhtiar’s murderers and an alleged member of the Revolutionary Guards. Hendi, the employee of the Iranian Public Television, was sentenced to 10 years for his role as an accomplice of the terrorist conspiracy. Gholam Hossein Shoorideh Shirazi Nejad and Hossein Sheikhatar, an advisor to the Iranian Ministry of Telecommunications, Nasser Chassemi Nejad, Fereydoun Boyer-Ahamdi and Azadi, an officer of the Revolutionary Guards, were all sentenced to life, on June 16, 1995.

### **Boroumand’s Case:**

In an interview with the family of Abdorrahman Boroumand on April 7, 1993, prosecutor Bruguière asserted that the cases of Bakhtiar and Boroumand were inextricably connected. In the trial of Bakhtiar’s murderers in December 1994, the prosecuting attorney, Mouton, attributed the assassination of Abdorrahman Boroumand to the state-sponsored terrorism of the Islamic Republic of Iran. He asserted that this murder along with Bakhtiar’s assassination were aimed at neutralizing the National Movement for the Iranian Resistance.

### **Modjtahedzadeh’s Case:**

Kidnapping was increasingly used against the opponents of the Iranian Islamic Republic in Turkey. Investigations of these kidnapping cases, when allowed to progress, reveal the involvement of Iranian Secret Services. Turkish investigators learned that several men, disguised as Turkish Police, kidnapped Ali Kashefpour from his residence. His body

was discovered on a road. He had been tortured prior to his death. Kidnapping was evidently used by Iranian Secret Services in order to question their victims before eliminating them. Abdol Hassan Modjtahedzadeh was kidnapped on October 11, 1987. He was later found by the Turkish Police at the Iranian border in the trunk of a car owned by Iranian diplomats in Turkey.

### **Ghorbani's Case:**

Turkish fundamentalist terrorists, who were arrested for the assassination of the journalist Ugur Mumcu, admitted to their involvement in the kidnapping of Ali Akbar Ghorbani. The latter was allegedly questioned and tortured by special agents sent from Tehran. The Turkish terrorists also informed the police of the whereabouts of Ghorbani's body. The Turkish Minister of Interior, Ismet Sezgin, unveiled this information in a press conference on February 4, 1993. Sezgin indicated that 19 members of an illegal organization, "The Islamist Movement," had been arrested during police raids in several Turkish towns. According to Sezgin, most of these activists had been to Iran and had trained in a military camp located between Tehran and Qom. The training had specially "focused on assassination techniques." Referring to the confessions of members of the organization, Sezgin also affirmed that pro-Iranian militants founded the "Islamist Movement" in 1987 in Batman, Turkey.

### **Sharafkandi's Case:**

The first arrests following the investigations of the assassination of the Kurdish leader, Sadeh Sharafkandi, and his companions in Berlin in September 1992 revealed that the murderers were Iranian and Lebanese gunmen who had come from Iran. According to witnesses, armed men, breaking into the restaurant Mikonos, opened fire on the four Kurdish leaders after insulting them in Persian. Two members of the band were in fact Iranians; one is known under the pseudonym of Sharif and the other, Kazem Darabi, is an Islamic militant known to German Secret Services for being a member of the VEVAK, the political police of the Islamic Republic. According to the German prosecutors, he is an importer-exporter who, for years, was a link with the Lebanese Hezbollah. About seven months before the Berlin terrorist attempt, officials of German Secret Services had invited him to conduct his activities with more discretion. German prosecutors were convinced that Kazem Darabi was assigned to liquidate the Kurdish leader as a part of a persecution strategy against the Iranian opposition by the Iranian Minister for Intelligence and

Security. As a consequence, on March 14, 1996, German judicial authorities issued an international arrest warrant against Ali Fallahian, the Iranian Minister of Interior. On April 10, 1997, the German Criminal Court sentenced Kazem Darabi to life imprisonment. This court accused the highest authorities of the Islamic Republic, a committee composed of the Leader, the President and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Information, of having ordered the Berlin assassinations. This historic verdict was the judicial recognition of the terrorist nature of the Islamic Republic's leadership.

### **Zahra Rajabi and Ali Panah Moradi's Cases:**

The Seventh Criminal Court of Istanbul, Turkey, headed by Judge Iyhan Onal, issued a verdict on January 24, 1997, condemning Reza Barzegar Massoumi, an Iranian citizen born in Orumiyeh, to 32 years and 6 months of imprisonment with hard labor for his participation in the premeditated murder of Zahra Rajabi (also known as Maryam Javedan Jokar) and Ali Panah Moradi, two members of the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran. Massoumi was found guilty of using his acquaintance with the victims to open the door of their apartment to the murderers. According to the verdict, the accused stated in his confession that he had acted under instruction of the Iranian Intelligence Service, specifically of the agents Sa'eed Choobtrash (Asghar), Rahim Afshar (Rassoul), Haj Ghassem (Zargar-Panah) and Jalal (Mohsen Kargar-Azad), who planned and committed the murders carried out on February 20, 1996, in the Fateh suburb of Istanbul.

### **Assassins' Confessions:**

Although rare, confessions by assassins do occur. In an interview with ABC News 20/20, aired on January 20, 1996, Dawud Salahuddin, a black American Muslim, confessed to the killing of Ali Tabatabai in July 1980. Tabatabai was the first Iranian opposition member to be killed in the United States. Salahedin found refuge in Iran where he lives since the assassination.

The Islamic Jihad and the Iranian Revolutionary Organization for Liberty and Reform have claimed responsibility for the assassination of Gholam Ali Oveissi and his brother Gholam Hossein Oveissi. The Revolutionary Guards claimed the murder of Mohammad-Ali Tavakoli-Nabav. The Islamic Regime explicitly admitted its responsibility for the first terrorist attempt on the life of Shapour Bakhtiar. To secure the release of its

convicted terrorists led by Anis Naccache, Iran launched a bombing campaign in Paris in the fall of 1986. Tehran stated that this “liberation” was a condition for normalizing its relations with France.

Since the late 1980s, Iranian government agencies and press have denied the regime's involvement in the assassinations. Nevertheless, it was by these denials that the regime transmitted a message to its opponents. The report of the pro-government newspaper Etelaat on the assassination of Abdorrahman Boroumand was revealing. The article suggests that Shapour Bakhtiar, leader of the NAMIR, was the instigator of the murder of his closest collaborator and friend, Boroumand, who was referred to as a “corrupting element.” According to the revolutionary jurisprudence of the Islamic Republic, declaring a man “corrupter on earth” is equivalent to a death sentence. Sadeqh Khalkhali, the former judge of the Islamic revolutionary tribunals also used this concept in his memoirs, in which he discusses the death sentences he had handed out. In his list of people condemned to death and executed by his orders, Khalkhali mentions the name of Shahriar Shafigh, who was assassinated in Paris.

### **Terrorists’ arsenal:**

On March 14, 1996, a cargo of arms and ammunition was discovered on the Iranian ship Kolahdooz at the Belgian port, Antwerp. A spokesman for the District Attorney’s office in Antwerp said the mortar shells had a time-fuse allowing mid-air explosions, and that the launcher had a range of more than 700 meters. After the container in which the weapons were hidden was unloaded from the Kolahdooz in Belgium, the ship sailed for Germany, to the free port of Hamburg. There the German police questioned two Iranians, both employees of the Iranian Intelligence Ministry, who were on board the freighter. This arsenal seems to have been designed for the Iranian terrorist activities in Europe.

Various opposition organizations were unanimous in the denunciation of the Islamic Republic as the instigator of these assassinations. The Iranian opposition is convinced that the organization of such crimes requires resources that only a state could provide. It is also agreed that those murders committed by handguns or knives bear the signature of the Islamic Republic. This unanimity arises from evidence derived from investigations that implicate the Islamic Republic. It is also based on the declarations of the regime's officials, who, directly or indirectly, have warned the opposition in exile of the risks involved in their activities. Government representatives at various levels have, at various times,

claimed responsibility.

Presumptions, policy declarations from Tehran and formal evidence all point to the Islamic Republic, which launched a campaign to physically eliminate its opponents by a persevering and coldly calculated program of extra-judicial executions outside Iran. This assassination policy is the logical outcome of the Islamic Republic's policy of repression and violation of human rights inside Iran. Since 1979, the regime has killed several thousands of its opponents. As late as 1991-1992, riots in Arak, Shiraz and Meshed, fruits of dictatorship and misery, were violently repressed. The international press and Amnesty International reported this repression.

### **Western Democracies and Iranian Terrorism**

Most of these murders have not been punished. Anis Naccache and his accomplices were convicted and later pardoned in July 1990. Western governments have shown an obvious reluctance to deal with terrorist acts on Iranian opposition.

In the case of Ghassem lou, Austrian police released Bozorgian and Sahraroudi, despite the incriminating body of evidence and "important discrepancies" in their testimonies.

A few hours after the murder of Radjavi, Swiss police found the assailants' car at the airport. Even though they held up the Iran Air flight to Tehran for two hours and checked the identity of all the passengers, they made no arrest. It is now a well-known fact that several members of the hit team and two Iranian diplomats suspected of involvement in the killing were aboard.

The laxity shown by French authorities after the assassination of Bakhtiar eased the escape of two of his killers. Even though Bakhtiar was watched over by paramilitary police 24 hours a day with a verification routine, his body was not found until 36 hours after his death. Because the Swiss border police suspected they had forged entry visas, the killers were not admitted to Switzerland and wandered in France for a few days. It is only because of the insistence of Bakhtiar's son that the police reluctantly handed out the terrorists' pictures to border police and to the media. Furthermore, the French government expelled to Tehran Mohsen Sharif Esfahani and Ahmad Taheri, arrested in France on November 15, 1992. These two men were involved in the murder of Radjavi, and France

informed Switzerland that an extradition request would be granted. On December 29, 1993, violating the extradition convention, the French Prime Minister announced their expulsion to Tehran "for reasons linked to national interest."

In the case of Sharafkandi, the evidence against the five arrested members of the terrorist group was overwhelming. However, a police officer testified that a top aid of Chancellor Helmut Kohl ordered a key report to be removed from the evidence file.

These events have in no way harmed the political and economic relations of the Western governments with Iran.

The opposition organizations in exile have asked Western democracies to prevent Iran from pursuing its program of executions. They have argued that the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with Iran should not take place when refugees have been victims of terrorist attempts. The Iranian opposition has also asked for more protection for refugees. It hopes that every political and judicial measure will be taken to convict the assassins and to condemn the regime responsible for their deadly acts of terrorism. The Iranian opposition is concerned by the revelations of current investigations, which indicate that international diplomatic and business circles unknowingly assist Tehran's terrorism. Likewise, the information revealed during the investigation of the murders of Shapour Bakhtiar and Sorouche Katibeh causes concern. In the case of the assassination of Dr. Ghassemlou, the ease with which an important suspect, an envoy of Rafsandjani, was able to leave Vienna is alarming.

Western officials must remember that the Islamic Republic has no similarity with the classical pattern of the modern state. The specialization of political functions remains indistinct; the commercial representative with whom they deal could also be an active agent of Iran Special Services. The private person, the public person, the executing official or the murderer are often combined in one and the same person, the emissary of the Islamic Republic.

The National Movement of the Iranian Resistance can only warn Western democracies against these deleterious diplomatic and commercial relations that are fatal for the lives of men and women engaged in an arduous fight against tyranny. It is time for Western statesmen to consider the general interest of their countries above short-term electoral deadlines. If today, the distressed opposition is not allowed to speak up, tomorrow it will



testify. In the long-term, it is neither reasonable nor profitable to allow a great people to be subordinate to a small group of tyrants, a minority even in Iranian Shi'ism that has taken over the state apparatus.

**Here is a document that illustrates how the Khomeini Regime tried to conspire against me, Hassan Massali, and against the prominent political and human rights activists in Iran, during the “Berlin Conference” in May 2000:**

**(A True Translation From Persian(Farsi) Text)**

Kayhan, a newspaper that is published in Tehran by the appointed valets of Ministry of Intelligence, on the date of 22 Ordibehesht 79 (May 15, 2000) published an article under the title of "Who was behind the scene of the anti-revolution Berlin Conference?" The article reveals the terrorist, plotting nature of the backward religious regime and the ignorance of its followers. The plotters of the regime created a dossier with information critical of the participants of the Berlin Conference. They published some controversial, critical and false information about me personally. They claimed that I had an important role in arrangement of Berlin Conference, participated in it, and had secret meetings with different individuals who have come from Iran. Also they claimed that I was a supporter of the “Dissolution,” and that I have discussed with and cooperated with some individuals in pursuit of that goal.

For the record, I need to clarify and inform people of the facts as follows;

1) I have no connection to the Green Party and no role in the Heinrich Böll Foundation. I do not even know the leaders of these organizations. When this conference first began to take shape, I was opposed to it as they planned it. I stated my views early in the planning process to one Iranian who was active planning the arrangements for this conference. In fact, if they considered and approved my recommendations, the conference would have been something else entirely.

The member of Green Party and directors of Heinrich Böll Foundation did not have sufficient knowledge of the political forces inside and outside of Iran. On the one hand, Mr. Bahman Nirumand introduced himself as a representative of the Green Party and an administrator of the foundation. On the other hand, he also introduced himself as a “guardian” of the Iranian political forces outside of Iran. This destroyed any chance of creating an environment

where everyone would have equal rights and respect of one another. And it created an barrier for knowledgeable and democratic individuals from outside of Iran who wished to participate democratically in an open dialogue and the exchange of ideas. He did not recognize the sensitive situation of the country, and he purposefully omitted any discussion of details of this situation. He declared a superficial claim that he was a democrat and a supporter of democracy, yet the reality was that many ordinary people ended up only being spectators and not participants in the conference. This was an insult to individuals and core values of democracy. Some people protested peacefully, as they did not see the point of getting mixed up with such a person and such a situation. Others reacted by creating chaos and turmoil.

The conference had the opportunity to be a place for Iranians and Germans to discuss and exchange ideas and develop an understanding of each other, as well as the democratic forces inside and outside of Iran. However, this was not to be, because the conference was derailed from its intended goals from the very beginning.

For whatever reason, whether it was ignorance or disrespect of democratic egalitarian norms, some guests of the conference were treated far better than others. Many of the guests who were invited from Iran were provided travel by plane inside Germany, and each of them were assigned two or three guards. These special guests were also given the right to participate in some special sessions not in the regular program. They were also treated much better by the hotels. Other guests had no guards and even had to pay for their drinking water. The result was that it seemed there were first- and second-class participants at the conference, and that created dissension and ill feelings among many.

2) During the time of the conference, I was in United States. However, I sent an open letter to all conference participants in which I proposed that the conference should have an open dialogue with mutual respect and equal rights for all. This dialogue should be open to all democratic forces outside of Iran who are opposed to the religious dominant regime in Iran. I provided my name along with my fax and telephone number for people to respond and provide me with news about the conference proceedings. I heard nothing.

3) Contrary to the claims of the Ministry of Intelligence's valets, I not only had no role in the preparation and execution of the Berlin Conference, I also was opposed to the way the conference was

organized and presented. I did not visit with any of the guests or participants, nor did I have any secret or “behind the curtain” talks with any of them. I have declared openly on several occasions my political opposition to the terrorist, religious-dominated regime in Iran, and I have stated that its political, ideological and cultural domination must be obliterated.

Let me be clear. I do not now nor have I ever favored or supported “transmutation or transformation” of the current regime. A major political and cultural problem that is challenging opposition groups is that some intellectuals who pretend to subscribe to the mullahs’ religious beliefs support “transmutation” of the current regime. This faction creates an obstacle for the opposition and, in fact, represents a deviation from the essential tasks and goals of the opposition. The result is that the regime is able to persist in its ways. The competition and divisiveness among the various opposition factions derail the national struggle for democracy, and benefit and serve to enhance the chances that the governing regime will continue to survive and even thrive.

4) I have always believed that we must have a long-term plan that dictators must be prevented from returning and reviving their authoritarian undemocratic government. Society must be allowed to blossom. In order to establish democracy, freedom and national solidarity, it is necessary to form a “National Coalition” to strive toward these goals.

For this reason, in the summer of 1995 I took an active role in managing the arrangements for a “National Conference” in Stuttgart, Germany. This is also the reason that the illiterate, ignorant valets of the Intelligence Ministry wrongly said that I gave a speech at the conference in Stuttgart, confusing a lecture I gave at a gathering in Hamburg with my participation in the conference in Stuttgart. More importantly, I have never had a meeting with Mr. Ezzatollah Sahabi before, during and after the revolution. Considering that he introduced himself as person who was loyal to the religious governing system and constitution, we did not have any similar views or agreement with each other.

5) Publications of the Ministry of Intelligence have mentioned the names of some people who they say were my so-called political colleagues. In fact, I am not and have not been associated or politically aligned with any of those individuals. I am very committed to the fundamentals of my political thought and policies, and accordingly it

would not be possible to cooperate or collaborate with them. This would be obvious to everybody except the ignorant elements who are in power in Iran.

6) I unabashedly believe that diplomatic relations between all countries of the world, including the United States and Israel, are good for the world. I also believe that there must be a way to put a stop to the barbarous acts and international terrorism carried out by the Islamic Republic of Iran. However, if the religious system and dictatorship in Iran is going to be destroyed, it will be destroyed by a national organized force of people inside the country with the solidarity and support of Iranians outside of the country. To accomplish this feat, we cannot rely on a foreign country, which often will be our enemy, nor can we expect a miracle to happen because we hope others will intervene.

I would expect that news media worldwide, who are committed to freedom of speech would cover and report about the legitimate efforts to challenge and oppose the religious regime in Iran. And in the course of that reporting, I would hope that they would expose the insidious plot of the Islamic Republic to oppress and suppress people who aspire to freedom inside and outside of the country.

I propose to all people who support democracy and secularism in government, with complete respect for the religious beliefs of all people, that we should commit to the struggle for freedom in Iran and, consequently, should commit ourselves to the destruction and defeat of the religious governing system in Iran.

**HASSAN MASSALI, May 20, 2000**

**Khomeini-Regime used the children to fight in the war against Iraq  
During the war against Iraq, millions of Iranian and Iraqi people were killed, and more than a half million Iranians were permanently disabled because of injuries suffered in the war. As handicapped people, they face many problems in their daily life.**

**During the Khomeini regime, fascist clerics or mullahs killed several thousand freedom and human rights activists in Iran. (Above is a photo of Hadi Ghaffari, who engaged in terrorist actions.)**

**I (Hassan Massali) was a candidate for the National Parliament in 1980, in Tavalesh, Gilan, a city and province in North Iran. I was elected by the vote of the people. However, because I was a critic of the Khomeini Regime, Khomeini secretly issued an order to have me killed. Ayatollah Lahouti informed me about the plan for my assassination. I subsequently started underground activities and created a group that became involved in the armed struggle in Gilan and Kurdistan fighting against the Islamic fascist regime in Iran. The following two pages have photos of my activities during my campaign for a seat in the Parliament in 1980.**

**After it became clear that Khomeini was going to use force against democracy and the democratic forces in the country, with the cooperation of friends from Gilan, Mazandaran and Kurdistan, I created an armed group, which resisted and fought against the Khomeini regime in Gilan and Kurdistan in Iran (1980-1984).**

**Hassan Massali created a group that took up arms to fight against the Islamic fascist regime of Khomeini in Kurdistan, Iran from 1980 to 1984.**

## **Chapter 8**

### **Creation of Hate, Terrorism and Corruption in Afghanistan**

**Starting in 1839, British colonial forces based in India invaded and occupied Afghanistan several times only to be eventually beaten back. The Soviets became involved in Afghanistan and collaborated with a leftist coup to create a new puppet regime in 1978. Soviet troops**

**arrived in 1979. That same year, the U.S., through the direct intervention of President Jimmy Carter's National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, and with cooperation of Saudi Arabia and the Taliban, supported Islamic terrorist groups to oppose the Soviets. Before the Soviet invasion, I visited Afghanistan, and with the cooperation of my Afghan friends I was able to travel to much of the country. I was there for about one month, during which time I met many peoples and participated in many cultural programs. At that time, the majority of the Afghans were very poor, but although they were from different religious affiliations and different ethnic groups, they were living peacefully with each other. The U.S. and its allies have long supported dictators and corrupt regimes in Afghanistan. The superpowers have been involved in many war crimes. They have destroyed Afghanistan, and they have killed thousands of civilians. I have to wonder how such political leaders are able to talk about and publicly espouse democracy. The evidence clearly shows that the CIA and the various U.S. administrations supported many corrupt leaders and corrupt regimes in Afghanistan. (New York Times International, April 29, 2013) In fact, the U.S. and the CIA also supported and launched the terrorist Islamic regime in Iran.**

**Because of military occupation and strife, and because of the creation of divisive hate and terrorism, many Afghans are trying to leave Afghanistan.**

**Emigrants from Afghanistan and other occupied countries are not accepted as refugees in the U.K., the U.S. and France because of racism and new fascist policies.**

**The newspaper Le Monde diplomatique (German Language, Oct. 20, 2014) published an article by Thomas Rutting about the important economic and natural resources in Afghanistan.**

**It seems the superpowers are fighting for economic interests and the exploitation of the wealth of Afghanistan, and certainly not for democracy!!!**

## **Die Reichtümer Afghanistans (The Riches of Afghanistan)**

**President Reagan meets also the Islamist Extremist Burhanuddin Rabbani in 1986. The Reagan administration spent billions of dollars to support the Islamist extremists in Afghanistan.**

**President Reagan met the Islamist extremist Mohammed Yunis Khales in 1987.**

**Many U.S presidents with a cowboy culture and mentality created, supported and cooperated with terrorist groups, and corrupt regimes and dictators, all in the name of promoting democracy!!!?**

**Former President George H.W. Bush and the Bin Laden Family met at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in New York City one day before September 11, 2001.**

**The sociopolitical system in Saudi Arabia belongs to the Stone Ages. The royal family dominates the government in Saudi Arabia. They support Islamist terrorist groups, and they allow the trafficking and abuse of women as sex slaves.**

**Saudi Arabia is one of the best friends of the U.S. in the Middle East.**

**Zacarias Moussaoui, a member of Al Qaeda in U.S. prison**

## **Chapter 9**

### **The War and Military Occupation in Iraq**

**The Iraq region has also a long history going back to ancient times. However, the modern state of Iraq was created in the aftermath of World War I when the Ottoman Empire was dissolved, and the British took over the country. In fact, British colonial forces occupied much of the region which now comprises many Middle Eastern countries. Either through the establishment of puppet regimes or through outright invasion, the British were a dominant force in the region for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.**

**The eight years of war (1980-1988) between Iraq (Saddam Hussein) and Iran (Ayatollah Khomeini) were a tragedy for the Iranian and the Iraqi people. More than one million people were killed, and thousands were premanently disabled. During the military invasion and occupation of Iraq by the U.S. and its allies starting in 2003, the U.S., its allies, the Iraqi government and other factions were corrupt, selling weapons and making profit from the business of war.**

**The military occupation and presence of foreign forces in any country naturally produces strong nationalist feelings on the part of the country's people with a resulting animosity toward the foreign occupiers. The abuse of political prisoners, the killing of civilians and the bombing of cities, villages, schools and hospitals creates fierce hate, rampant terrorism and sometimes civil war.**

**During its invasion and occupation of Iraq, the U.S. was involved in a myriad of criminal actions.**

**The U.S. used sectarian and terrorist gangs under the leadership of Abdul Aziz Al-Hakim and Muqtada al-Sadr. These gangs were trained by Islamic terrorist regime in Iran. The U.S. also supported corrupt leaders such as Ahmed Chalabi and Nouri al-Maleki in Iraq.**

**The U.S. military occupation of Iraq created a civil or factional war between different religious and ethnic groups not only in Iraq but also throughout the Middle East. Moreover, since the U.S. invasion thousands of Iraqis are killed every year. President George W. Bush, Vice President Richard Cheney and many others were guilty of war crimes, corruption and interfering in the internal affairs of Iraq. They had the support of big money and corporate interests, as well as strong lobby groups. They were able to manipulate the American people for their selfish and criminal purposes.**



**The result of the U.S. military occupation in Iraq: Destruction, killing, torture and the creation of hate, terrorism and civil war.**

**Dick Cheney's Halliburton made \$39.5 Billion on Iraq War  
By Angelo Young, March 20, 2013**

**<http://readersupportednews.org/news-section2/308-12/16561-focus-cheney-halliburton-amde-395-billion-on-iraq-war.html>**

**The accounting of the financial cost of the more than a decade-long Iraq War will go on for years. But a recent analysis has shed light on the companies that made money off the war by providing support services resulting from the privatization of what were former U.S. military operations. This privatization rose to unprecedented levels, and private or publicly listed firms received at least \$138 billion of U.S. taxpayer money for government contracts to provide services that included private security, building infrastructure and feeding the troops.**

**Ten contractors received 52 percent of the funds, according to an analysis by the Financial Times. The No. 1 recipient? The Houston-based, energy-focused engineering and construction firm KBR, Inc., which was spun off from its parent, oilfield services provider Halliburton Co., in 2007.**

**The company was given \$39.5 billion in Iraq-related contracts over the past decade, with many of the deals being awarded without any bidding from competing firms, such as a \$568 million contract renewal in 2010 to provide housing, meals, water and bathroom services to soldiers, a deal that led to a Justice Department lawsuit over alleged kickbacks, as reported by Bloomberg.**

**Who were No.'s 2 and 3? Agility Logistics of Kuwait and the state-owned Kuwait Petroleum Corp. Together, these firms garnered \$13.5 billion of U.S. contracts.**

**As private enterprise entered the war zone at unprecedented levels, the amount of corruption ballooned, even if most contractors performed their duties as expected.**

**According to the bipartisan Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, the level of corruption by defense contractors**

may have been as high as \$60 billion. Disciplined soldiers that would traditionally do many of the tasks were commissioned by private and publicly listed companies.

Even without the graft, the costs of paying for these services were higher than paying government employees or soldiers to do them because of the profit motive involved. No-bid contracting - when companies get to name their price with no competing bid - didn't lower legitimate expenses. Despite promises by President Barack Obama to reel in this habit, the trend toward granting favored companies federal contracts without considering competing bids continued to grow, according to The Washington Post.

Even though the military has largely pulled out of Iraq, private contractors remain on the ground and continue to reap U.S. government contracts. For example, the U.S. State Department estimates that taxpayers will dole out \$3 billion to private guards for the government's sprawling embassy in Baghdad.

The costs of paying private and publicly listed war profiteers seem miniscule in light of the total bill for the war.

The Costs of War Project by the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University said the war in Iraq cost \$1.7 trillion dollars, not including the \$490 billion in immediate benefits owed to veterans of the war and the lifetime benefits that will be owed to them or their next of kin.

<http://readerssupportednews.org/news-section2/374-bush-administration/11420-war-tribunal-finds-bush-cheney-rumsfeld-guilty-of-war-crimes/>

**War Tribunal Finds Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld Guilty of War Crimes**

*By Common Dreams, May 14, 2012*

**Kuala Lumpur War Crimes Tribunal orders reparations be given to torture victims**

**Former U.S. President George W. Bush, his Vice-President Dick Cheney and six other members of his administration have been found guilty of war crimes by a tribunal in Malaysia.**

**Kuala Lumpur War Crimes Tribunal President Judge Tan Sri Lamin Mohd. Yunus delivered the verdict yesterday. He says reparations should be given to the victims of war crimes. Bush, Cheney, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and five of their legal advisors were tried in their absence and convicted on Saturday.**

**Victims of torture told a panel of five judges in Kuala Lumpur of their suffering at the hands of U.S. soldiers and contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan.**

**Among the evidence presented, Briton Moazzam Begg, an ex-Guantanamo detainee, said he was beaten, put in a hood and left in solitary confinement. An Iraqi woman Jameelah Abbas Hameedi said she was stripped and humiliated in the notorious Abu Ghraib prison. Transcripts of the five-day trial will be sent to the chief prosecutor at the International Criminal Court, the United Nations and the Security Council.**

**A member of the prosecution team, Professor Francis Boyle of Illinois University's College of Law, said he was hopeful that Bush and his colleagues could soon find themselves facing similar trials elsewhere in the world.**

**The eight accused are: President George W. Bush; former U.S. Vice President Richard Cheney; former U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld; former Counsel to Bush, Alberto Gonzales; former Counsel to the Vice President, David Addington; former Counsel to the Defense Secretary, William Haynes II; former Assistant Attorney General Jay Bybee and former Deputy Attorney General John Yoo.**

**Tribunal President Judge Tan Sri Lamin Mohd Yunus said the eight accused were also individually and jointly liable for crimes of torture in accordance with Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter. "The U.S. is subject to customary international law and to the principles of the Nuremberg Charter and exceptional circumstances such as war, instability and public emergency cannot excuse torture.**

**“Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia reports:**

### **Bush Found Guilty of War Crimes**

**KUALA LUMPUR:** The War Crimes Tribunal has convicted former U.S. President George W. Bush and seven of his associates of being war criminals for torture and inhumane treatment of war crime victims at U.S. military facilities.

However, being a tribunal of conscience, the five-member panel chaired by Tribunal President Judge Lamin Mod Yunus had no power to enforce or impose custodial sentence on the convicted eight. “We find the witnesses, who were victims placed in detention illegally by the convicted persons and their government, are entitled to payment of reparations,” said Lamin at a public hearing held in an open court at the Kuala Lumpur Foundation to Criminalize War yesterday.

He added that the tribunal’s award of reparations would be submitted to the War Crimes Commission and recommended the victims to find a judiciary entity that could enforce the verdict. The tribunal would also submit the finding and records of the proceedings to the Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, the United Nations’ Security Council.

The head of the prosecution Prof Gurdial Singh Nijar said Bush has issued an executive order to commit war crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Five former Iraqi detainees, who were tortured while being detained in various prisons, including Guantanamo Bay, were called to give their testimonies before the Tribunal during the trial which started on May 7.

**The Malaysia Sun reports:**

[...] In a unanimous vote on Saturday the symbolic Malaysian war crimes tribunal, part of an initiative by former Malaysian premier Mahatir Mohamed, found the former U.S. president guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

**Former Malaysian Premier Mahatir Mohamed said of Bush and**

**others: “These are basically murderers, and they kill on large scale.”  
Seven of his former political associates, including former Vice President Dick Cheney and former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, were also found guilty of war crimes and torture.**

**Press TV has reported the court heard evidence from former detainees in Iraq and Guantanamo Bay of torture methods used by U.S. soldiers in prisons run by the American forces.**

**One former inmate described how he had been subjected to electric shocks, beatings and sexual abuse over a number of months.**

**A high ranking former U.S. official, former U.N. Assistant Secretary General Denis Halliday, who also attended the trial, later told the Press TV that the U.N. had been too weak during the Bush administration to enforce the Geneva Conventions.**

**He said: “The U.N. is a weak body, corrupted by member states, who use the Security Council for their own interests. They don’t respect the charter. They don’t respect the international law. They don’t respect the Geneva Conventions... A redundant, possibly a dangerous, and certainly corrupted organization.”**

**Following the hearing, former Malaysian premier Mahatir said of Bush and others: “These are basically murderers, and they kill on large scale.”**

**It was the second so-called war crimes tribunal in Malaysia. The token court was first held in November 2011 during which Bush and former British Prime Minister Tony Blair were found guilty of committing “Crimes against Peace” during the Iraq war.**

**Here is an interview with U.S. General Wesley Clark  
(Ret.), About the Iraq War  
Democracy Now. March 2, 2007**

<http://youtube/sxs3vw47m0E>

**A journalist threw shoes at Bush during a visit to Iraq.  
That was a reaction against the war and military occupation in Iraq**

**The Reagan Administration wanted to deliver weapons secretly to  
Iran and free the American hostages. Oliver North was involved in the  
Iran-Contra scandal. During this operation, representatives of the  
CIA, Mossad and agents of the Khomeini Regime met at a hotel in  
Geneva, Switzerland.**

**During a secret meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, they took photos and filmed prostitutes with some of the participants. This shows the political culture of the CIA, Mossad and the Islamist regime.**

**An Iranian who is a secret source delivered these photos to me and said that the A. Hashemi Rafsanjani and Mohsen Razaii (from the Revolutionary Guards), were informed about all these incidents.**

## **Chapter 10**

### **The Military Occupation in Libya The War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity in Libya**

**Perhaps the French people wanted to choose a corrupt person like Nicolas Sarkozy as their president. However, corrupt leaders should not be allowed to decide that their country would invade and occupy other countries and in the process kill people, create terrorist groups and destroy those countries.**

**Perhaps the British people wanted to elect someone intent on similar behavior as their prime minister, someone such as David Cameron who favors colonial power policies. However, Cameron and others of the same mind should not be allowed to occupy other countries.**

**Democratic forces all over the world will rise up to resist all versions of new colonialism and new fascism.**

**I have visited Libya twice, and I am very knowledgeable about the situation in Libya.**

**As the head of the Libyan government from 1969 to 2011, Colonel Muammar Gaddafi nationalized the oil industry and developed education and social services for all the people in the country.**

**But he wanted to be the “permanent” head of the government, and that was wrong.**

**France, the U.K. and the U.S. did not want to create democracy in Libya. All these new colonialist powers were only interested in the oil and gas industries in Libya.**

**The world saw what happened in Libya. We all saw how the new colonial forces bombarded the cities, killed civilians and destroyed the country. The historical record shows that France, the U.K. and the U.S. cooperated with corrupt elements and terrorist groups. The civil war in Libya and the creation of terrorism in Libya is the result of French, U.K. and U.S. foreign policy.**

**French President Nicolas Sarkozy and British Prime Minister David Cameron sent military forces to occupy Libya. France, the U.K. and the U.S. were responsible for bombing civilians, destroying the country, torturing prisoners and creating terrorist and hate groups in Libya. They wanted to get Libya's oil and gas, but they did not want to establish democracy!!!**

**French President Nicolas Sarkozy and British Prime Minister David Cameron were involved in war crimes and crimes against humanity.**

**Corrupt and criminal forces united to act against the sovereignty and rights of the people of Libya. They wanted get Libya's oil and gas for the benefit of Europe. So they occupied Libya, and tortured and killed Colonel Gaddafi and some of his family members. The criminals destroyed the whole country and created hate and civil war in Libya.**

**We must resist the war criminals all around the world.**

## **Chapter 11**

### **The Palestinian Cause and Peace in the Middle East**

#### **The Role of Superpowers and the Policies of Arab and Israeli Leaders**

**After World War II, the nation of Israel was founded in the Palestinian territories with the military support of Great Britain. Some democratic forces hoped that a Jewish nation, which represents**



**the oppressed Jews and victims of the Holocaust, would be the best example of democracy in the region. But on the contrary, Israel was dominated by Zionists along with both British and American lobbyists, and authorities in Israel executed criminal policies in the region. Examples of these policies were the Six-Day War in 1967 under the leadership of Moshe Dayan and the military occupation of Lebanon and the massacre of the Palestinian refugees in 1982 under the leadership of Ariel Sharon.**

**For many decades, the fate of the Palestinians has remained unclear, and it remains so today. Millions of Palestinians have lived in refugee camps all over the Middle East, specifically in Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Lebanon, for more than half a century. Corrupt and weak Arab governments have launched ill-fated attempts to resist the Israeli aggression, and their attempts have exacerbated the Palestinian problem and reduced regional security throughout the Middle East. Efforts to reach peace agreements were met with resistance. In 1995, after years of chaos, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by a Jewish extremist following his attempts to achieve a meaningful Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement.**

**The former prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, as well as the current prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, chose a path directly opposed to that of Yitzhak Rabin. These extremists believed that they could protect the security of Israel through military occupation, the killing the civilians and the assassination of Palestinian political leaders. Yet these acts have done nothing but create more hate, martyrs and suicide bombers.**

**Extremists within Israel have now amassed power. This is due in large part to the influence of lobbyist groups in the United States, the United Kingdom and France.**

**Nevertheless, I am still optimistic for hope and change. I believe that the creation of a Palestinian state and the Two-State Solution will stop the expansion of terrorism and slow the conflict between the democratic Jews and democratic Palestinians.**

**On September 13, 1993, Yitzhak Rabin, prime minister of Israel, and Yasser Arafat, chairman of the P.L.O., met at the White House with President Bill Clinton and agreed to a framework for peace. Arafat and Rabin along with Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres had met earlier in 1993 in Oslo, Norway.**

## **My letter to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin:**

**His Excellency Yitzhak Rabin  
Prime Minister of the State of Israel  
September 13, 1993**

**Your Excellency,**

**On behalf of our members, as well as all democratic and peace-loving Iranians who, due to the present circumstances in our country and the adoption of the most unsuitable and irresponsible political approach by the current regime, are unable to express their true feelings, the National Movement of Iranian Resistance (NAMIR) would like to congratulate you on the occasion of the historic event of the signing of the agreement between the State of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.**

**This historic accord will put an end to a volatile and explosive situation, which has been threatening the future of the two peoples, as well as the peace and stability of these times and the whole world. The agreement represents the beginning of a new era, and paves the way for the ultimate solution to the existing problems and the realization of the aspirations of the two nations and thereby the return of peace and stability to one of the most important and sensitive parts of the world.**

**Your Excellency:**

**The efforts by you to bring about this historic accord, and thereby opening a new chapter in the history of the Middle East, illustrate the fact that no matter how deep and complicated the differences are, there will always be solutions for peace, as long as nations enjoy the privilege of having men of vision and courage as leaders.**

**For the National Movement of Iranian Resistance, this extraordinary event brings back the memory of our late leader and founder of the movement Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar. He was a man of vision, who, throughout his political life and throughout his campaign for the restoration of democracy in Iran, was always a firm believer in and an advocate for the right of the Israeli nation to live within secured and recognized borders, and the right of the Palestinians to have their home and the right to self-determination. Unfortunately he is no longer among us to share the worldwide satisfaction and delight as a**

**result of this remarkable development.**

**Wishing peace, happiness and prosperity for the Israeli and Palestinian people.**

**The National Movement of the Iranian Resistance**

**On behalf of the Executive Committee**

**Secretary for International Relations**

**Hassan Massali**

**My Letter to Yasser Arafat, the chairman of the P.L.O.:**

**His Excellency Yasser Arafat**

**Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization**

**September 13, 1993**

**Your Excellency,**

**On behalf of our members, as well as all democratic and peace-loving Iranians who, due to the present circumstances in our country and the adoption of the most unsuitable and irresponsible political approach by the current regime, are unable to express their true feelings, the National Movement of Iranian Resistance (NAMIR) would like to congratulate you on the occasion of the historic event of the signing of the agreement between the State of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.**

**This historic accord will put an end to a volatile and explosive situation, which has been threatening the future of the two peoples, as well as the peace and stability of these times and the whole world.**

**The agreement represents the beginning of a new era, and paves the way for the ultimate solution to the existing problems and the realization of the aspirations of the two nations and thereby the return of peace and stability to one of the most important and sensitive parts of the world.**

**Your Excellency:**

**The efforts by you to bring about this historic accord, and thereby opening a new chapter in the history of the Middle East, illustrate the fact that no matter how deep and complicated the differences are, there will always be solutions for peace, as long as nations enjoy the privilege of having men of vision and courage as leaders.**

**For the National Movement of Iranian Resistance, this extraordinary event brings back the memory of our late leader and founder of the movement Dr. Shapour Bakhtiar. He was a man of vision, who, throughout his political life and throughout his campaign for the**

**restoration of democracy in Iran, was always a firm believer in and an advocate for the right of the Israeli nation to live within secured and recognized borders, and the right of the Palestinians to have their home and the right to self-determination. Unfortunately he is no longer among us to share the worldwide satisfaction and delight as a result of this remarkable development.**

**Wishing peace, happiness and prosperity for the Israeli and Palestinian people.**

**The National Movement of the Iranian Resistance**

**On behalf of the Executive Committee**

**Hassan Massali**

**The head of the Prime Minister's Bureau answered my letter. But unfortunately, Yitzhak Rabin was killed. After his assassination, Israeli officials invited me to Israel. I visited Israel and met the president of Israel and other Israeli officials. I also met some of my Iranian-Jewish friends.**

**Hassan Massali in Jerusalem in 1996.**

**I met many Israeli officials and many Iranian-Jewish friends in Israel. I was promoting the peace agreement between Israel and Palestine, as well as friendship among all Middle Eastern countries.**

**During my political activities in the Middle East, I met Abu Ali Ayad (the founder of Al-Fatah in 1964), Yasser Arafat, Khalil Vazir (Abu Jihad), George Habash, Mahmoud Hamshahri and the others. All of them wanted to defend the democratic rights of the Palestinian people and live peacefully with the Jewish people.**

**I participated in the "Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference" and met Yasser Arafat and many other leaders of the "Peoples Liberation Movement" from around the world.**

**New York Times, Monday, Jan. 26, 2015**

**The extremist government of Netanyahu bombed the schools and hospitals and killed Palestinian civilians, creating hate and terrorism. In 1982 Israel occupied Lebanon and killed hundreds of Palestinian refugees. This massacre was carried out in cooperation with the Kataeb Party, also called Phalange, which was supported mostly by Maronites.**

## **How to Combat the Extremists and Racists in the Middle East.**

**Rabbi Eli Ben Dahan, one of the leaders of his “Civil Administration,” has publicly declared that the Palestinians are “sub-human.”**

**In this environment, I believe:**

**First, the results of the Middle East peace negotiations must prove to be positive with a focus on the long-term stability, not short-term fixes.**

**Second, if political reform in Israel should take root, the results would be a refutation of the fundamentalism and radicalism in the region.**

**Third, cooperation between the U.S., Israel and the EU would bring the Two-State Solution into reality and end the long suffering of the Palestinian people.**

**To achieve peace in the Middle East, any negotiations should include provisions to meet long-term goals. In addition, if there is going to be a change towards democracy in the Middle East, it is imperative for the United States, EU, Israel and Middle Eastern governments to agree to a long-term cooperation to establish democracy and peace.**

## **Chapter 12**

### **The Anti-Democratic Condition in the U.S. and the U.S. Military's Policy of Invasion and Creation of Hate and Terrorism in the World**

I have been living in the United States for almost 20 years. During which time I have had an opportunity to observe the political and social issues of this country. I have traveled to many parts of the U.S., and I have met with many Americans whom I call friends. Due to my active political career, I have met with several members of the U.S. Congress, as well as officials from the State Department. I have also participated in many conferences and meetings in this country and abroad, sharing my views with the world.

Based on my experience and my research, I have made some observations about the political and social power structure in the U.S. that I would like to express:

- Perhaps the most remarkable of these is my observation of the makeup of the U.S. power structure and its two-party system of politics and governing.

Since World War II, there has always been a two-party system that shared the power in this country. Additionally there are various factions within each of these parties that sometimes take a totally opposing view of the party that they are representing.

This makes me pose the question: Why there is not a third party strong enough to provide a different view in this system?

In my interactions with various members of Congress from both parties, I have realized that there has not been a significant change in their way of thinking, and they still function as though we are still fighting a Cold War. To further complicate this issue is the fact that the majority of the members of Congress are supported by wealthy

**donors and corporate lobbyists. As a result, there has not been much opportunity for a third political party to flourish in this country, due to lack of financial support and media coverage.**

**I truly believe that the only way to maintain Democracy is by having a pluralistic Society where multiple parties have the opportunity to voice their views and share power. In order to maintain political power over the American people, the various government leaders have and continue to commit illegal and criminal acts while maintaining political impunity.**

**My experience living in the U.S. has made me realize that the majority of Americans are kind and support a democratic ideology. However, due to social and political roadblocks, they have not been able to fully engage in the political process of their country. The challenges facing some of the disfranchised population include the following:**

- More than 40 million Americans live below the poverty line. Many are homeless, living on streets. These people do not have any voice in the political process due to lack of money and power**
- In any capitalistic society, the middle class plays a significant role in the political process. Today, however, the American middle class has shrunk, and often middle-class Americans are busy working long hours and multiple shifts to make a living. Consequently, they have no time to devote to politics and challenge the control of the powerful lobbyists and corporate media. Furthermore, since there are few if any independent media, the masses are being brainwashed and manipulated by corporate media. They have no way of knowing the truth and will accept any excuses or any blame place on a scapegoat.**
- In a democratic society, the judiciary branch of the government should be completely independent. But in the U.S., the Supreme Court judges are nominated by the president and approved by the Senate. As a result, there is no true separation of power by the three branches of the U.S. government.**
- Some groups use the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution to support the right to bear arms. But the real motivation is to sell arms and keep the gun business as profitable as possible. Because of the big gun business in this country, a large number of people are killed or injured every day on the streets, in the malls and in the schools without any**

**real progress being made in curbing the control of gun sales. Additionally, there are hundreds of armed racist groups and gangs that use guns as a way of making money and financing their business. But to this day, no president, nor any politician has been able to counter the powerful gun lobbyists headed by the National Rifle Association (NRA).**

- **Some ultra conservative and uncultured politicians in the U.S. are always promoting: Bomb, Bomb, Bomb Iran, Iraq and Syria!!! I think they are not only anti-democratic, but they are also fascist.**

## **Who are the Best Friends of the U.S. in the Middle East?**

### **Saudi Arabia**

**In Saudi Arabia there are still barbaric and medieval laws and norms. Many women are treated almost like sex slaves. But the U.S. government and most European politicians remain silent about the inhumanity in Saudi Arabia and even try, with the help of Saudi Arabia, to support the Islamic terrorists who oppose the progressive and democratic elements in the region and seek to occupy the countries to exploit the wealth of these countries.**

**There is evidence that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Israel and the U.S. founded, and financially and militarily supported ISIS to fight for their interests in the Middle East. Now ISIS plans to establish an Islamic extremist superpower in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Libya and in all of Africa. The U.S., Great Britain and France will use this to justify further military intervention in the world.**

### **Turkey**

**Turkey has long served as a political and military base for the U.S., Great Britain, and France. The superpowers tried to achieve, first through CENTO, then through NATO, their political and military interests in this region through open and secret cooperation with the Turkish government.**

**The U.S. decided to back the supposed democracy in Turkey – the country that has been involved with systematic genocide for 100 years, starting with the massacre and genocide of the Armenians from 1915**



to 1917. Moreover, the Turkish government has permanently oppressed the Kurdish people and sought to eliminate them. Finally, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish president, officially announced that women do not enjoy equal rights because they were not built equally by nature!

From Turkey as base, a racist organization, named the “Grey wolves,” operates with support of the Turkish intelligence agency to agitate ethnic and religious groups against each other in neighboring countries. And they try to destabilize the region by provoking civil war. Yet the superpowers like the U.S. and Great Britain claim that they try to achieve democracy in the region with the support of Saudi Arabia and Turkey!

Some agents of the Turkish government, with the cooperation of some members of Iranian “Revolutionary Guards” have established a “commercial company” in Turkey, and they are smuggling valuable objects and transferring huge amounts of money to different countries, especially to Europe, Canada and the U.S.

Since 2005, they have been smuggling historical materials from the Iranian National Museum, as well as gold and cash. And they use forged passports and identification documents for their activities.

Some secret sources have delivered to me documents and videos about their activities, and for security reasons, I have informed the FBI about such activities. However, their activities have not stopped.

## Israel

After World War II, the nation of Israel was founded in the Palestinian territories with the military support of Great Britain. Some democratic forces hoped that a Jewish nation, which represents the oppressed Jews and victims of the Holocaust, would be the best example of democracy in the region. But on the contrary, Israel was dominated by Zionists and both British and American lobbyists, and many authorities in Israel executed a Zionist policy in the region -- for example, the Six-Day War in 1967 under the leadership of Moshe Dayan; and the 1982 military occupation of Lebanon including the massacre of the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon under the leadership of Ariel Sharon.

Israeli politicians like Yitzhak Rabin tried to live in peace with the Palestinians because of a peace treaty, but he was assassinated by a Jewish extremist and afterwards reactionary politicians like Benjamin Netanyahu gained power. Netanyahu initiated terrorist actions against

**the Palestinians. including bombing raids of civilians, schools and hospitals and the killing of hundreds of children. The superpowers like the U.S., Great Britain and France just watched these criminal actions without doing anything serious to challenge or confront them.**

**I have had the opportunity to meet some of the personalities of the Palestinian movement like Khalil Al-Vazir (Abu Jihad) and Mahmud Hamshahri. They were not “terrorists,” but members of the resistance who wished to live in peace with the Jews.**

**But Israelis killed Abu Jihad and other PLO leaders and members in 1988 in Tunis.**

**Mahmud Hamshahri was a PLO representative in France. He was married to a French woman (Marie Claude). In 1972, agents of Mossad, the Israeli National Intelligence Agency, placed a bomb under his telephone and killed him in Paris. It was obvious that the French police cooperated with Mossad in carrying out this assassination.**

**I have been informed by various legitimate sources that the U.S., as well as many European governments allow Mossad agents to use documents and passports, which were issued by the U.S. and European countries for use in carrying out their terroristic activities.**

**During the Iran-Iraq war from 1980-1988, the U.S. government and the government of Israel tried to provoke and incite Khomeini and Saddam Hussein against each other in order to destroy and disrupt those countries.**

**In conclusion, I believe that despite the rhetorical claim of maintaining a democracy in the U.S., both political parties are far from it and cannot maintain social order, nor provide support for millions of Americans who need financial help. The question then is why the U.S. is so eager to disseminate their so-called “democracy” to the rest of the world by attacking other countries or conducting proxy wars in those countries under the guise of maintaining security for people. Is this not a big deceit?**

**The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) reports that more than 784 armed fascist and criminal groups are active in U.S.**

**During the Vietnam War, the U.S. used chemical weapons, which was a crime against humanity**

**During the Second World War, the U.S. dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima, Japan. This was a war crime and a crime against humanity.**

**The allied forces of superpowers bombed many cities in Germany and killed millions of civilians. This was a crime against humanity. Representatives of superpowers met several times, and they agreed to “share” the world powers and to occupy different countries around the world. They legalized the policy of occupation, and step by step, the new fascism was created in the world.**

**Joseph Stalin and Winston Churchill are the symbols of New Fascism in the world.**

**The article below by Robert F.Kennedy, Jr., February 22,2016, was published by Politico.**

## **ISIS Leader Abu Bakr Al Baghdadi was trained by the Israeli Mossad, NSA documents reveal**

*Gulf Daily News, July 16, 2014*

The former employee at U.S. National Security Agency (NSA), Edward Snowden, has revealed that the British and American intelligence and the Mossad worked together to create the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

Snowdon said intelligence services of three countries created a terrorist organisation that is able to attract all extremists of the world to one place, using a strategy called “the hornet’s nest.”

NSA documents refer to recent implementation of the hornet’s nest to protect the Zionist entity by creating religious and Islamic slogans.

According to documents released by Snowden, “The only solution for the protection of the Jewish state is to create an enemy near its borders.”

Leaks revealed that ISIS leader and cleric Abu Bakr Al Baghdadi took intensive military training for a whole year in the hands of Mossad in addition to courses in theology and the art of speech.

**How America Helped ISIS**

**By ANDREW THOMPSON and JEREMI SURI**

**Oct. 1, 2014**

**Austin, Texas — The Islamic State terrorists who have emerged in Iraq and Syria are neither new nor unfamiliar. Many of them spent years in detention centers run by the United States and its coalition partners in Iraq after 2003. Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Islamic State, spent nearly five years imprisoned at Camp Bucca in southern Iraq. A majority of the other top Islamic State leaders were also former prisoners, including: Abu Muslim al-Turkmani, Abu Louay, Abu Kassem, Abu Jurnas, Abu Shema and Abu Suja.**

**Before their detention, Mr. al-Baghdadi and others were violent radicals, intent on attacking America. Their time in prison deepened their extremism and gave them opportunities to broaden their following. At Camp Bucca, for example, the most radical figures were held alongside less threatening individuals, some of whom were not guilty of any violent crime. Coalition prisons became recruitment centers and training grounds for the terrorists the United States is now fighting.**

**This process began when coalition forces arrived in Iraq in 2003 and detained alleged terrorists with little preparation or oversight. Although soldiers tried to document the circumstances behind the detentions of Iraqis and foreign fighters, the process broke down under the pressure of fighting, the shortage of trained Arabic speakers, and the fog of war.**

**Simply being a “suspicious looking” military-aged male in the vicinity of an attack was enough to land one behind bars. There were 26,000 detainees at the height of the war, and over 100,000 individuals passed through the gates of Camps Bucca, Cropper and Taji. Quite a few were dangerous insurgents; many others were innocent.**

**Small-time criminals, violent terrorists and unknown personalities were separated only along sectarian lines. This provided a space for extremists to spread their message. The detainees who rejected the radicals in their cells faced retribution from other prisoners through “Shariah courts” that infested the facilities.**

**The radicalization of the prison population was evident to anyone who paid attention. Unfortunately, few military leaders did.**

**At Camp Bucca, the extremists forced moderate detainees to listen to clerics who advocated jihad. The majority of prisoners were illiterate, so they were particularly susceptible. Prisoners frequently refused medical attention and vocational training for fear of breaking religious rules. The prisons became virtual terrorist universities: The hardened radicals were the professors, the other detainees were the students, and the prison authorities played the role of absent custodian.**

**Policies changed in 2007, as American military leaders began placing more emphasis on understanding the detainee population. Where possible, the military tried to separate hardline terrorists from moderates. Prisoners gained more access to programs that taught vocational skills, literacy and a moderate version of Islam. Some of these reforms worked, but the damage had already been done. The terrorists had four years to network, recruit and impose their extreme version of Islam on thousands of detainees.**

**One of us served at Camp Cropper in 2009 as a compound intelligence liaison officer with the tasks of collecting information on detainees and disrupting extremist activity. Fulfilling the first priority was relatively easy; the second was nearly impossible.**

**The compound's "emirs" controlled the prison population. Detainees, for example, refused to watch television or play ping-pong, lest they face the judgment of the Shariah courts. Moderate detainees suffered repeated physical assaults from radicals. When they fought back, they were punished by the prison authorities.**

**Insurgents with damning evidence against them were released because of the incompetence of the Iraqi court system and America's refusal to share classified evidence. Efforts at expediency drove both policies, and the mistakes compounded one another.**

**By December 2009, only a few thousand detainees remained in the prisons and Camp Bucca was closed. Although American soldiers, backed by intelligence agencies, tried to identify the most threatening detainees, that effort was doomed to failure. Poor record-keeping, limited language skills, detainee obfuscation and the pressure to cut costs prohibited the effective evaluation of prisoners.**

**The most extreme radicals were never slated for release. A number of them had already been sentenced to death and were awaiting transfer to the Iraqi justice system. But after the United States withdrew, these prisoners found themselves in Iraqi custody. The Islamic State made a priority of freeing these extremists as they conquered large parts of Iraq this past summer. With a new lease on life, these former prisoners are now some of the Islamic States' most dedicated fighters.**

**The United States should keep this lesson in mind as it begins another counterterrorism campaign in Iraq and Syria. Large detention facilities only create the seeds for further radicalization and violence. There is strong evidence that the prisons run by the Iraqi and Syrian governments have already had this effect.**

**The United States must convince its regional partners to avoid mixing radicals and moderates, and provide alternatives to prison for small-scale criminals. If we continue to replay the history of mass incarceration in the Middle East, we will remain stuck in the current cycle where our counterterrorism efforts create more terrorists.**

*Andrew Thompson, a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, served for eight years in the United States military. Jeremi Suri, a professor at the University of Texas at Austin, is the author of "Liberty's Surest Guardian: American Nation-Building from the Founders to Obama."*

**A version of this cartoon appeared in the October 2, 2014, issue of The International New York Times.**

**By: Avijit Roy**

**The question is: Who has created all these terrorist groups and who is**

**supporting them secretly?**

**Mr. Belal Erdogan, the son of the Turkish president, met with some of the leaders of Islamic States (ISIS) in Istanbul. They were collaborating at all levels selling oil and delivering weapons. in all levels.**

**Mehdi Al-Harati, one of the leaders of ISIS in Libya, is shown kissing Recep Erdogan, the president of Turkey.**

**Who killed John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy? Was J. Edgar Hoover, the director of the FBI, involved in this crime?**

**Mr. Trump is not alone. There are many racist and hate groups in the U.S.**

**The cowboy culture and racism have an important role in the U.S.**

**An Open Letter to the American People  
Why I will not accept being a second-tier citizen  
By Hassan Massali, Ph.D.**

**In the wake of the terrorist attacks in Paris and in San Bernardino, some fascist elements in Europe and the United States are**



**attempting to justify their crimes against humanity in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. There now exist daily discriminatory acts against political refugees that, because of military occupation from certain Western governments and Civil War, have been forced to flee their countries.**

**In recent weeks, and in public events swirling around the U.S. presidential elections, some citizens have promoted racist and fascist ideology very openly in the public. What's more, they classified some legal U.S. citizens as second-tier citizens.**

**In these instances when our rights are being violated, who will protect my, and our legally binding, constitutional rights? Will it be the president? The Department of Justice? Or do the country's founding members need to rise from the dead to accomplish what those who are living refuse to do?**

**Below, I have listed the reasons for the expansion of global terrorism, and the approach to ending this horrific, potentially life-ending dilemma in our modern world.**

**Reasons for the global expansion of terrorism include:**

**The lack of freedom and democracy, as well as the military occupation by the U.S., U.K. and France in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America.**

**Many countries in the Middle East, Asia and Africa have been ruled by autocratic and dictatorial regimes. For many years, the United States and several European countries (the U.K., France, to name a few) have adopted a misguided foreign policy – supporting repressive and corrupt governments – and also have created terrorist groups in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Libya and Syria, while crushing the liberal sentiments and democratic aspirations of entire societies.**

**Corrupt governments grossly violated human rights and accelerated their country's economic and cultural bankruptcy.**

**Religion became the political alternative to failed secular regimes.**

**The extreme political conditions allowed room for ideological groups to flourish into mainstream culture. Terrorist fundamentalist groups appealed to new members by advertising their nation's economic and political salvation through the destruction and eradication of real and perceived enemies. The extremist propaganda made it more difficult for the moderate liberal regimes to slow the growing number of Islamic extremists and to ignore the demands for a more fundamentalist religious state representation.**

**The Palestinian cause and the detrimental policies of Arab and Israeli leaders:**

**For many decades, the fate of the Palestinians has remained unclear, and it remains so today. Millions of Palestinians have lived in refugee camps all over the Middle East, specifically in Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon, for more than half a century. Corrupt and weak Arab governments in their ill-fated attempts to resist against Israeli policy of aggression have exacerbated the Palestinian problem and reduced regional security throughout the Middle East. Efforts to make peace were met with resistance; in 1995, after years of chaos, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by the hand of a Jewish extremist following attempts at achieving meaningful Israeli-Palestinian peace.**

**The former Prime Minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, as well as the current prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, had chosen a path directly opposed to that of Yitzhak Rabin. These extremists believed that they could protect the security of Israel with military occupation and the killing of civilians or the assassination of Palestinian political leaders. Yet these acts have done nothing but create more hate, martyrs and suicide bombers.**

**Nevertheless, I am still optimistic for hope and change. I believe that the creation of a Palestinian state, and the Two-State Solution, will stop the expansion of terrorism and slow the conflict between the democratic Jews and democratic Palestinians.**

**Here's an alternative approach:**

- 1) Create an "Independent International Criminal Court." One that summons all heads of state (from the U.S., U.K. and France), who are responsible for the creation of the Islamic terrorist groups and adjudicate war crimes against humanity.**
- 2) Organize an international solidarity conference with the representatives from peace and civil rights organizations with the ambition to promote peace, democracy and human rights around the world.**
- 3) Create an international coalition and solidarity union in the world -- one that takes the proper action in eliminating poverty and combating terrorism and extremism, while taking steps to end foreign military intervention in African, Asian and Latin American countries.**
- 4) Stop the power of the veto by the Security Council in the United Nations and promote equal rights for all members of United**





## **Chapter 13**

### **Summary: The Making and Formation of Terrorism in the World**

**Having achieved my high school diploma in Tehran I planned to study either in the U.S. or in the Federal Republic of Germany. I was very impressed by the American Revolution, which led to the declaration of independence as well as by the political ideas and deeds of former U.S. presidents like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. It was my father who decided that I should go to the Federal Republic of Germany because he valued diligence, punctuality and a sense of responsibility. And he felt that these values were best represented in Germany.**

**My inspiring example was Dr Mossadegh. In 1958 I began my studies in Tübingen (in Southern Germany), but I also continued my political activities. Although there have been periods in which I had problems with the conservative government, I am altogether happy that my father chose Germany as the country for my studies. In my opinion, the Federal Republic of Germany is a pluralistic society that achieved a democratic balance by the existence of various parties.**

**Comparing the foreign- und domestic policies between the BRD and the U.S.A., you will find, that in the domains of democracy, business, safety and social policy, the BRD is on top.**

**I acquired German citizenship, and I am proud to be a German. But my observations in recent years show that some German politicians act in an opportunistic way when it comes to the U.S. foreign and peace policy, and the democratic rights of the oppressed people.**

**For family reasons I also hold the American citizenship. And as an U.S. citizen I would like to express frankly my opinion about the U.S. and its undemocratic and criminal relations with many countries. I do not support and disagree with much of the U.S. domestic and foreign policy.**

**In the U.S. millions of people are currently living below the poverty level.**

**In the U.S. millions of people are homeless.**

**The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) reports that in the U.S. there are hundreds of armed gangster, criminal and racist groups, and everyday there are numerous reports of criminal offenses on the streets of America.**

**In the U.S. there are some billionaires who are very influential and even dominate through their lobbying activities in regards to the domestic and foreign policy of the U.S.A. They even play a substantial role in the Congressional and Senate election campaigns.**

**In the U.S. there are representatives who stay for more than 40-50 years in the Senate or the Congress and do not give the younger generation and the intellectuals a chance to take part in the decisions on the future of the country.**

**In the U.S. every citizen can buy and carry arms. This is the reason why so many people are killed daily. But many U.S. politicians with a “cowboy mentality” support the arms business and therefore countenance such a situation. A mixture of “cowboy mentality” and “racism” dominates the administration of the U.S. government and U.S. politics, and this political culture plays a crucial role within the U.S. foreign policy.**

**In the U.S. many politicians and the relevant people in the administration do not have a vision or a long-ranging concept for the foreign policy. This is why the Americans initially cooperated with numerous terroristic groups in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq and supported dictatorial and corrupt governments. They even helped such uncultivated beings as Khomeini to come to power; but**

**afterwards they tried to act militarily against these self-induced problems.**

**Within a democratic nation all departments of the administration and institutions should act in a democratic manner. They should defend democracy and oppose criminals. But the CIA, an important institution of the U.S. administration, is itself been involved in criminal and undemocratic actions worldwide. The CIA is violating human rights, disregards the sovereignty of other nations and supports dictators. For example: the CIA brought down the democratically elected governments in Chile and Iran, did not respect the right of self-determination of these countries and supported dictators. The result of this was that many people were killed in these countries.**

**The U.S. government has won a military conquest of Iraq, ruined the country and spread civil war and hate.**

**The U.S. government cooperated with Osama bin Laden and Saudi Arabia, and launched terroristic groups such as the Taliban and Al Qaeda and cooperated with them. That's why the terroristic actions on September 11 happened in New York. But George W. Bush tried to manipulate the American people and promoted slogans such as: "I am proud to be an American."**

**I like to stress that as long as such people rule the U.S.A. and as long as such crimes are realized officially in the world, no American should be "proud."**

**I like to emphasize that I met very many good people who work in the U.S. administration. The majority of the American population is very friendly, but they are absorbed by their daily problems and are unfortunately not sufficiently informed of their rights and duties.**

**In the U.S.A. there are some structural, political, cultural and economic problems. That's why both the Native Americans as well as the African Americans have been treated in a racist manner. Martin Luther King, who was an outspoken supporter of human rights, was killed April 4, 1968. John F. Kennedy, who planned with the aid of his consultant Walt Rostow, to establish a reform policy worldwide, was**

**assassinated on November 22, 1963. (Walt Rostow, an economist, was his consultant and had published a book with the title: “The Stage of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto.) Five years later his brother Robert (Bobby) Kennedy, who planned to carry on the ideas of John F. Kennedy, was also assassinated. I believe that behind the scenes dark powers (the ultra-conservatives) played a central role in the assassinations.**

**Personally, I think that the power structure in the U.S. should be changed fundamentally so that the U.S.A. will not suffer the same fate as the former USSR (that is, collapse).**

**Recommendations for the Genesis and Formation of a Peaceful and Democratic World System  
The Creation of an Open Society Encompassing Geopolitical, Economic and Cultural Cooperation**

**Since the fall of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact Alliance, the world’s political, economic and military dynamics have drastically changed. Three strong centers of economic, financial and political powers have emerged in Europe, East Asia and North America. The three powers are competitors at the regional economic level, while forming strategic partnerships at the global level.**

**Reasons for the global expansion of terrorism:**

**Background:**

**Communist governments, mainly in the former Soviet Union and China, during the Cold War found support among people in some underdeveloped countries with impoverished socioeconomic conditions, unstable or backward political and cultural infrastructures. In such situation, many heads of state and authorities in the United States, the United Kingdom and France were supported the extremist Islamic movement and created Islamic terrorist groups (as seen in Bin Laden’s Taliban or Khomeini’s Iranian regime). These extremist groups wielded power to use their destructive policies in opposition to the Soviet Union.**

**After the fall of the Soviet Union and communism, some political**



**movements – particularly in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa – were looking for new alternative ideologies and sources of support. In doing so, many groups rediscovered Islamic radicalism and fundamentalism. Many governments and radical organizations were able to exploit the religion, effectively using it as a vehicle for transmitting their own ideological agendas and gaining support for their perverted destructive policies.**

**Lack of freedom and democracy:**

**Many countries in the Middle East, Asia and Africa have been ruled by autocratic and dictatorial regimes. For many years the United States and several European countries (U.K. and France, to name a few) have adopted a misguided foreign policy, supporting repressive and corrupt governments in these regions while crushing the liberal sentiments and democratic aspirations of entire societies.**

**Corrupt governments grossly violated human rights and accelerated their country's economic and cultural bankruptcy. Religion became the political alternative to failed secular regimes. The extreme political conditions allowed room for ideological groups to flourish into mainstream culture. Terrorist fundamentalist groups appealed to new members by advertising their nation's economic and political salvation through the destruction and eradication of real and perceived enemies. The extremist propaganda made it more difficult for the moderate liberal regimes to slow the growing number of Islamic extremists and to ignore the demands for a more fundamentalist religious state. In addition, many civilian populations rejected the legitimacy of moderate governments because of the continued unemployment and poverty, as well as the lack of democratic representation.**

**The Palestinian cause and the detrimental policies of Arab and Israeli leaders:**

**For many decades, the fate of the Palestinians has remained unclear, and it remains so today. Millions of Palestinians have lived in refugee camps all over the Middle East, specifically in Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon, for more than half a century. Corrupt and weak Arab governments in their ill-fated attempts to resist against Israeli policies of aggression have exacerbated the Palestinian problem and reduced**

**regional security throughout the Middle East. Efforts to make peace were met with resistance. In 1995, after years of chaos, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by the hand of a Jewish extremist following his attempt to achieve a meaningful Israeli-Palestinian Peace.**

**The former prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, as well as the current prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, chose a path directly opposed to that of Yitzhak Rabin. These extremists believed that they could protect the security of Israel through military occupation and the killing of civilians and the assassination of Palestinian political leaders. Yet, these acts have done nothing but create more hate, martyrs and suicide bombers.**

**Extremists within Israel have amassed power. This is due in large part to lobbyist groups in the United States, the United Kingdom and France.**

**Nevertheless, we are still optimistic for hope and change. We believe that the creation of a Palestinian state, and the Two-State Solution will stop the expansion of terrorism and slow the conflict between the democratic Jews and democratic Palestinians.**

**How to combat terrorism and extremism:**

**Many so-called underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have vast reserves of natural resources, which give each country important strategic clout. However, internal conflicts, terrorism, religious fundamentalism and economic deprivation have created unstable political, economic, and social structures.**

**Example: Iran could play a crucial role in linking the Middle East to Central Asia as well as Turkey and Israel to EU if three pre-conditions are met:**

**First, the results of the Middle East peace negotiations must prove to be positive with a focus on the long-term stability, not short-term fixes.**

**Second, should political reform in Iran take root, the result would be the repudiation of fundamentalism and radicalism within the region.**

**Third, cooperation between the United States, Israel and the EU can bring the two-state vision into reality and end the long suffering of the Palestinian people.**

**To achieve the necessary peace in the Middle East, any negotiations should include provisions that meet long-term goals. In addition, with conditions for a democratic change in the Middle East, it is imperative that the United States, EU, Israel and Iran create an agreement that calls for long-term cooperation to establish democracy and peace.**

**A Strategic Alliance of the U.S., EU, Israel and Iran for Democracy and Peace in the Middle East and Central Asia will lead to:**

- **A new vision for cooperation among the three main powers. The global development, technological trade and political alignments can help the countries in the region both contribute to and shape global events.**
- **Economic and social developments and political stability through the establishment of democratic processes in the Middle East and Central Asia will be key to bringing long-term stability. The anchored environments within each region will go far in ending terrorism as well as internal conflicts.**

**Extensive research is still recommended to harness ideas that will help engineer solutions to these challenges, as well as implement effective short-term measures. Several questions should be raised in the formulation of this prospective plan:**

- **What are the parameters of the peace negotiations in the Middle East?**
- **What is the likely result of the peace negotiations between Israel and Palestine?**
- **What role should the United States and EU play in bringing about a meaningful solution to peace the Middle East?**
- **What impact will a peace settlement in the Middle East have on the rest of the region? North Africa? Central Asia?**
- **How can the Islamic Republic of Iran be transformed into a cooperating democratic power in the region?**
- **How can political stability and democracy in the Middle East**

and Central Asia be established?

Some possible pieces of the puzzle:

- The establishment of economic and social relations in the Middle East and Central Asia will slow the expansion of radicalism and the disruptive influence in the region.
- The establishment of democratic and social reforms could seriously undermine Islamic fundamentalism.
- The great powers' continuing promotion of Iran's future role as a strong democratic entity because of the significance of Iran's natural resources, financial might, and cultural and social ties to the Middle East and Central Asia.
- The abundance of natural resources, such as oil, gas and petrochemicals in Central Asia and the Middle East increases the importance of an alliance between the two regions.
- The capitalization of human resources and foreign investments to maximize economic growth, production and industrial development.
- The strategic regional alignments for economic and social developments, political stability and democracy will take the place of the previous environment of dictatorships, chaos, terrorism, fundamentalism and internal regional conflicts.

### **The Role of the European Democratic Parties and Democratic Forces in the Middle East and Central Asia:**

The people of the Middle East, Afghanistan and Pakistan, along with those Central Asian countries must serve as democratic forces in this region. They need support and solidarity from the European progressive political parties to promote democracy and defend human rights. The lack of freedom and democracy in some Middle Eastern and other Asian countries and the misguided foreign policies of the United States, United Kingdom, France and Israel (which for many years supported and kept in power repressive and corrupt governments) have left few alternatives for these people. These bad policies have fanned anti-western sentiments that have been used in turn by the Islamic extremists to further their cause. These are the main factors that can bring progressive and democratic European parties together with democratic forces in the Middle East and in Africa in order to eliminate poverty, promote democracy and adopt environment-friendly policies.

**Fundamentalist groups are not capable of grandiose operations and therefore can only proliferate and act when there is the financial and logistical support of fundamentalist and terrorist governments.**

**Isolated use of military forces by governments to combat terrorist organizations is counterproductive in the efforts to eliminate the root causes of such activity. Furthermore, the use of any foreign military force against a country's general population will only intensify hatred of the West, leading to an increased participation in attacks by terrorist groups. The United States – or any other country trying to combat terrorism – first needs to have a clear understanding of the root causes and ideologies of terrorist organizations. Only then can they devise a solution that attacks the root of extremism and prevents terrorist attacks.**

**In order to combat terrorism, western countries must do the following:**

- **Recognize the causes that launch extremism on a world scale, as well as a dedication to combating fundamentalism by supporting the democratic forces in the regions. Always, there has been a tendency in United States, United Kingdom and the French to support authoritarian, anti-democratic regimes that serve Western economic and strategic interests in the short-term. The problem is that this has created disinherited, volatile populations who flock to fundamentalist revolution in the long-term.**
- **Identify the terrorist groups and their networks across the world in order to penetrate the ranks of these groups to better gather intelligence.**
- **Identify and destroy extremist groups' financial backing and infrastructure.**
- **Identify the supporters of terrorism within governments, non-profit foundations and ideological organizations located in countries such as Iran, Lebanon, Palestine, Algeria, Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan, republics of Central Asia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines.**
- **Create a regional coalition of democratic forces in the Middle**

**East and Africa, to foster an international unity among democratic allies that would be able to curb the support of countries like the Islamic Republic of Iran and Saudi Arabia, which promote, coordinate and train fundamentalist terrorist groups in unstable countries such as Lebanon and Iraq. Lebanon and Iraq are currently planning and coordinating a center for terrorist groups funded covertly by countries such as the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and other international terrorists' networks. Disarmament of these terrorist groups is imperative. This cannot be stressed enough.**

- Change American, Russian and European foreign policies in order to stop military intervention and cooperation with governments that create and support terrorism. Without exception, democratic forces should be supported and human rights upheld, most specifically in Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.**
- Coordinate the fight against terrorism without jeopardizing the promotion of human rights, civil liberties and racial and gender equality in these regions.**
- Create a 24-hour radio/TV station for the Middle East, Central Asia and North Africa that promotes a democratic alternative, along with educational material about different cultures and religions around the world. The radio/TV station should be coordinated by democratic representatives of these countries, but remain independent of governmental regulations so a democratic message can directly reach the people.**
- Incorporate democratic, political activists from countries involved in the decision-making process of U.S. economic and political policy. The activists will be able to provide counsel and insights into the culture, socioeconomics and religion of the peoples with whom the United States is forming relations. The creation of a permanent institution and commission where ideas and understandings would be exchanged between American political and business interests and democratic activities in Africa, Asia and Latin-American countries would be greatly beneficial to both sides.**
- Most importantly, create and promote an economic development program, similar to the Marshall Plan implemented after World War II in Europe. The necessity for financial investment in the political, commercial, technological**

**and education infrastructure of these countries is paramount. The Middle East, Central Asia and Africa must be made partners with the United States and EU in this development.**

**Please note: This plan is devised by a group of Middle Eastern researchers and experts living in the U.S. and Europe. We are available to further discuss these proposals with appropriate foundations, institutions and government agencies, as well as democratic parties.**

**Additionally, there are some elements of an alternative approach that should be considered:**

**1) The creation of an "Independent International Criminal Court," a court that summons all the national leaders responsible for the creation of the Islamic terrorist groups. It is these important political figures, including those from various administrations in the United States, United Kingdom, France, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey, to name a few, that were in some way involved in the creation of the Islamic terrorist groups. The international laws governing war crimes against humanity must be enforced if we are going to claim any responsibility for what was created by their hands.**

**2) The organization of an international solidarity conference with representatives from peace and civil rights organizations that wish to promote peace, democracy and human rights around the world.**

**3) The creation an international coalition and solidarity union in the world that will take the proper action to eliminate poverty and combat terrorism and extremism, while taking steps to end foreign intervention in African, Asian and Latin-American countries.**

**4) The abolishment of the regulation in the United Nations which allows members of the Security Council to veto any resolution while promoting equal rights for all members of United Nations.**

**5) The ending of any support of corrupt regimes and dictators around the globe.**

**6) A shift in the United States internal and foreign policy through the creation of a strong progressive political party that is able to stop the**

**influence of the reactionary and anti-democratic lobbyist groups. With this serious change, the creation of a new democratic and progressive socio-political structure in the United States can finally be realized.**

**Hassan Massali, Ph.D.  
February 2016**

## **Acknowledgments and Notes**

### **The Main Subjects**

**Why should the East European nations accept communism, oppression and military occupation?**

**Why did the Soviet Union organize a coup d'état in South Yemen, Afghanistan, Somali and Ethiopia?**

**Who were the people behind the assassination of John F. Kennedy on Nov. 22, 1963, and Robert (Bobby) Kennedy on June 6, 1968? And who are the “Dark Forces” in the U.S.?**

**Why were the Western superpowers involved in a conspiracy against the Indonesian President Sukarno, and why did the Western superpowers kill more than one and a half million people (so-called “supporters of the Communist Party”) in Indonesia in 1963-1967?**

**The creation of Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan with the cooperation of Saudi Arabia and Osama bin Laden.**



**The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York, and George W. Bush's relationship with Osama bin Laden and Saudi Arabia.**

**The creation of the shah's dictatorship in Iran, and the creation of the Islamic-Fascist Regime under the leadership of Khomeini in Iran.**

**The coup d'état in Chile and military intervention in Latin America. Military occupation and the creation of a civil war in Iraq.**

**Military occupation in Libya and the creation of terrorism and civil war in Libya.**

**Military intervention in Syria and South Yemen, killing the people, destroying the country and creating hate.**

**Military intervention in many African countries, and the exploitation of people, plundering the countries and promoting racism in Africa. Creating military bases (CENTO and NATO) in Turkey and the cooperation with the racist regime in Turkey and the cooperation with the Stone-Age political system of Saudi Arabia.**

**Creating civil war and hate among different religions and ethnic groups around the world.**

**The poverty, homelessness and armed hate groups in the U.S.**

**The role of anti-democratic lobby groups, along with the reactionary and racists elements in the U.S.**

**The problems of poverty and refugees in the world.**

**Who are the "Best Friends" of the U.S., U.K. and France?**

**Since World War II, many adventurist politicians like Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Dick Cheney, Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin were involved in many war crimes, but still nothing has been changed in U.S. and European foreign policy.**

**But some honest and democratic politicians like U.S. Secretary of**

**State Cyrus R. Vance opposed reactionary policies, and Secretary Vance suggested that the democratic forces in Iran should be supported.**

**Michel Rocard, the former Prime Minister of France ( 1988-1991) and a member of the Socialist Party in France, was a honest politician. He published a book (ISBN: 978-2-227-48772-7), printed by Bayard, that criticized himself and the French government's policy.**

**Now we must raise the question: How can we unite against war, terrorism and new facism and promote democracy, peace and human rights in the world?**

**How can we abolish the right of members of the U.N. Security Council to veto any resolution, while promoting equal rights for all members of United Nations?**

**FINCA in Washington, D.C., says that more than 3 billion people around the world are living in poverty, trying to survive on \$2.50 a day, or less. (The majority of these people are in Africa, Asia and Latin America).**

**To get more information about the world crisis, please read the following books and literature:**

**Walt Rostow was a good advisor to President John F. Kennedy**



## **My Suggestions and a Proposal to Young People and Democratic Forces:**

**1) To Create an "Independent International Criminal Court," a court that summons all heads of state responsible for the creation of the Islamic terrorist groups. It is these important political figures, including those from various administrations in the United States, United Kingdom, France, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey, to name a few, that were in some way involved in the creation of Islamic terrorist groups. The international laws against war crimes against humanity must be enforced if we are going to claim any responsibility for what was created by their hands.**

**2) To organize an international solidarity conference with the representatives from peace and civil right organizations with the purpose of promoting peace, democracy and human rights around the world.**

**3) To create an international coalition and solidarity union in the world, a union that finds effective ways to eliminate poverty and combat terrorism and extremism, while taking steps to end foreign intervention in African, Asian and Latin-American countries.**

**4: To abolish the right of the U.N. Security Council to veto resolutions in the United Nations and to promote equal rights for all members of the United Nations.**

**5: To stop the support of corrupt regimes and dictators around the globe.**

**6: For a serious shift in the United States internal and foreign policy, it is necessary to create a strong progressive party, one that is able to stop the influence of the reactionary and anti-democratic lobbyist groups. With these serious and sweeping changes, the creation of a new democratic and progressive socio-political structure in the United States can finally be realized.**

**As Iranians, we must liberate Iran from fascism and terrorism, and we must work together for peace, democracy and socio-economic and cultural reconstruction and development  
in Iran**

**United Against War, Terrorism and New Fascism in the World**