

Statement of Resignation

from

The National Assembly

Dr. Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri

Published by:

Minhaj-ul-Quran Publications

365 M, Model Town, Lahore, Pakistan.

Ph. +92 42 111-140-140, 5168514

Fax. +92 42 5168184

www.minhaj.org

www.minhaj.tv

tehreek@minhaj.org

Page 2 of 59

Historic Step

Dr. Tahir-ul-Qadri is a famous and popular Pakistani religious and political leader who shocked the nation with his surprise resignation as a Member of the National Assembly. This move no doubt multiplied his popularity as the public finally saw some body who could shun the on going mockery and deception being carried out in the name of democracy and stand up to the dictatorship to condemn its militarization of democracy in Pakistan.

This step by Dr.Tahir-ul-Qadri was indeed an historic one, as no such example is found in our history other than that of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah who also issued his resignation in protest of the passing of specific legislation.

Dr Tahir-ul-Qadri's resignation sent shockwaves through governmental ranks especially those clandestine hands in which true power and authority lies. It has been welcomed throughout the nation as the public saw it as a decisive 'punch' in the ongoing fight between democracy and authoritarianism.

This document critically analyses the role of the National Assembly and exposes the deliberate conspiracies which have been enacted by Musharraf's government to make the Assembly defunct, idol and insignificant in practical terms. It also exposes the string of Musharraf's broken promises and the blatant failure of the regime's five years in office.

This document is a wakeup call for all Pakistanis. It clearly portrays the deception and fraud which has been carried out with the Pakistani people over the past five years in the name of 'true democracy'; that in actual fact the roots of democracy are being obliterated with the foundations of an eternal military dictatorship being laid and strengthened.

Dr. Tahir-ul-Qadri, in order to safeguard the ideology of Pakistan, has done us all a great favour in awakening us from the hypnosis of anti-Pakistan powers. Every patriotic Pakistani must read this document if there is any hope of averting the road map to destruction which we have been blindly lead towards.

Minhaj-ul-Quran Publications has decided to publish this document due to its criticality to the supreme national interest of Pakistan.

Contents Page

1. Introduction
2. The President's Broken Promises to the Nation
 - A. Political Corruption and Blackmailing
 - B. Undemocratic Democracy
 - C. Institutional Instability
 - D. Failure of Accountability
3. Sabotage of the National Assembly
 - A. Global Issues
 - i. Pak-American Relations
 - ii. International Terrorism and US Global Domination
 - iii. Israeli Aggression
 - iv. Iraq War
 - B. Regional Issues
 - i. Pak-India Relations and the Kashmir Dispute
 - ii. Pak-Afghan Relations
 - C. National/Domestic Issues
 - i. Defence and Nuclear Policy
 - ii. Internal Terrorism & Conspiracy
 - iii. Devolution and Flawed Electoral Process
 - iv. Poverty, Illiteracy and Unemployment
4. Conclusion
5. Appendices

**Mr. Speaker,
National Assembly of Pakistan**

1. Introduction

On 15th October 2004 I announced my resignation as a member of the National Assembly and this document consists of my resignation statement highlighting the reasons that have led me to this drastic step. Although I submitted my resignation after the ‘dual-uniform’ bill was passed by the National Assembly, this was in fact a catalyst to my decision, which I undertook as a result of the accumulated failures of the current regime in bringing about peace, prosperity, tolerance and democracy to Pakistan. After the military coup on October 12, 1999 General Musharraf announced his future agenda to the Pakistani people, promising ‘his fellow citizens’ that he would rid the country of problems which were halting its advance towards betterment. He promised to root out corruption in all fields of society and bring the looters of the nation’s wealth to justice through across the board accountability. He also promised to clean up the political system, stabilise civil institutions, improve the economy and bring true and real democracy to the country. In an interview in Chicago, General Musharraf said his main goal was to lay the foundation for "real, sustainable democracy," and part of that process, in his view, was the election of a new parliament. Real power, he insisted, would lie not with him but with elected leaders.¹ He declared that his role had been exaggerated and said what mattered was “the authority to govern and legislate. Let me tell you, that authority will remain with the elected prime minister and parliament.”

It was due to these promises that I decided to support the agenda put forward by General Musharraf as I saw this as a unique opportunity to clean up Pakistan once and for all. All were aware that the power a military government could wield was not one possessed by a civilian administration, and an honest military government was needed to bring about tough measures to rid the country of the in-bred corruption that had crippled it.

¹ “Is a Dictator Building Democracy in Pakistan”, Steve Chapman, Townhall.com

Sadly, as the world saw, the General turned on his heels, and failed to implement any of his promises outlined in the agenda, thus leaving me no choice but to withdraw my support for his government a few months before the general election of October 2002.

On 14th October 2004 the 'dual uniform bill' was passed by the National Assembly, which entrenched General Musharraf's power even further and provided the foundations for the introduction of a presidential form of government for the future, once parliamentary democracy was abolished. In reality this became the last straw after a catalogue of truly astonishing events that have occurred within the last two and a half years. In particular the events that have occurred during this tenure have had an absolute disrespect for the rule of law, consisting of unfair and unjust parliamentary proceedings as well as having no concern for the welfare of the people of Pakistan. This dossier will therefore highlight, in brief, the issues that have caused me grave concern and left me no alternative but to tender my resignation from the membership of the National Assembly.

2. The President's Broken Promises to the Nation

(A) Political Corruption and Blackmailing

One of General Musharraf's first and foremost promises when he came into power in October 1999 was to put an end to corruption in politics, to clean up the political system and bring about clear, visible and reliable transparency within the political and executive structure of the country. However the government failed to bring about any significant changes and has failed to rid the country of fraudsters. Instead, through unprecedented moves, various forms of corruption and political blackmailing, in all its manifestations, have been effectively used in an almost technical manner to control Parliament. The manoeuvring of political parties through rigged elections, floor crossing and formation of new patriotic groups is ample proof of this fact.

(B) An Undemocratic Democracy

The tri-dimensional split of Parliament, being controlled and allowed to function in a pseudo-environment has merely created a **mockery** of the entire democratic process. I sincerely believe that this Parliament can play no role in restoring and developing any kind of 'true' democracy or clean and stabilize the political system of the country since from its inception its daily work is totally based upon tactical corruption, strategic black mailing, malicious conspiracy and hidden manoeuvring. Unfortunately Parliament has no agenda of its own and has to work for the accomplishment of a pre-ordained "agenda" given by its creators and thus its sole role is to fulfil the objectives for which it was manufactured for. Parliament can now only be deemed as the 'House of Corrupt Politicians', a title which cannot be denied in any form or manner the reasons being clearly apparent. The current regime claims that democracy has been popularised and expanded to the gross root level by establishing a local system of government. Unfortunately the entire process aims at up rooting true democracy by establishing a so called 'elected network', which in reality only provides 'Popular Political Support' to future dictatorial plans, since only those who pander to the current regime are given the opportunity to be elected. Moreover these local bodies, along with their

unlimited and unaccounted funds are being used, and will be continued to be used, to cut the socio-political roots of all political opponents and competitors. No effective opposition is being allowed to survive, being squeezed out of the political arena through bribes or just plain harassment. The National Assembly, in practical terms is not considered suitable for addressing this issue nor any other issue. Matters which do not lie within the 'pre-ordained scheme' are not debated in a proper and conclusive way as practiced in parliaments all over the world. Instead members may only raise a point, receive a 'ready made answer' which is then frozen in files, without coming to any solution or conclusion.

I personally have never witnessed a single problem being raised on the floor of the National Assembly which has reached a conclusion. Parliament has lost most of its democratic character of challenging undemocratic and unconstitutional acts performed by the 'Rulers'. Instead it is merely deputed to appreciate the unappreciable, to commend the uncommendable and to approve the dis-approvable. This is why Parliament could not object to an unconstitutional and undemocratic act of the President, whereby he nominated a person, not being a member of the National Assembly as the next Prime Minister while the elected Prime Minister was still sitting in office. An interim Prime Minister was inducted for this transitory period and why was it that the sitting Prime Minister could not continue for another three months until the prime minister in waiting was elected is still a mystery.

(C) Institutional Instability

The President made another promise of bringing stability to all state institutions which are known to be the foundations of any democratic society. However against his promise, over the last five years, every institution has been weakened through militarization reaching a climax never achieved in the past fifty eight years. It is a sad fact that Parliament, despite being the supreme institution according to the constitution of Pakistan, has now become just a fake actor in this "puppetry drama" losing the respect and trust of the people.

The Judicial system, in particular, has become a hundred percent politicised because of the appointments, promotions and placements of those persons who accede to the political wish and demand of its rulers.

Courts such as the National Accountability Bureau (NAB) are also being used for political objectives and gone have the days when we could expect any kind of relief by the courts against the Government's political decision or strategy. Instead a hand full of judges are always kept available upon an adhoc basis to obtain the "required justice" in special matters where cases are registered and appeals kept pending in the courts for political settlements. Similar practices have existed in the periods of other 'terminated' governments, but not up to the extent being practiced in the period of our 'terminators and pseudo-reformers'.

(D) Failure of Accountability

The National Accountability Bureau (NAB) has been from the very beginning literally 'nabbed' by a secret political agenda, functioning as a device for exercising political pressure and black mailing. Many members of Parliament sitting on government benches, who have not yet been cleared by NAB and having many outstanding cases of dishonesty, corruption and misappropriation against them, are allegedly said to be working for the promised transparent and corruption free democracy. Then there are others who were punished for corruption, fined, jailed and disqualified by NAB and the courts of law but still managed to be elected as members of Parliament. Moreover, there are numerous others who were undoubtedly known to be the sources, promoters and patrons of corruption, violence, tyranny and all other kinds of political and economic malpractices and misappropriations, but have been indemnified, sanctified and glorified by becoming the torch bearers of our "holy and glorious democracy", which was introduced by the removal of "corrupt politicians". However they were given this esteemed status only by "changing their dress" and declaring there blind faith and absolute loyalty in their *MEHRBANS* a fact not hidden or a reality not known to the architects, engineers and manufacturers of the alleged progressive and accountable democracy. What kind of respect has been left for the courts of law, for accountability and for democracy? What title should we give to this phenomenon? Is this the corruption free political system promised by General Musharraf? Can this jugglery be known as the provision of honest leadership? Is this mockery to be viewed as the guarantee of transparency?

3. Sabotage of the National Assembly

The purpose of the National Assembly is to represent and safe guard the interests of the people of the country as a whole. As stated by the Constitution of Pakistan, the State exercises its powers and authority through the elected representatives of the people which is why Parliament is known to be the supreme body with all constitutional powers vesting in it. Unfortunately the present Parliament has been turned into a defunct and dummy institution and the members are expected to sit on its floor as if they are dumb, deaf and blind. They are not allowed to say anything of their own choice even if they honestly feel that it is in the supreme national interest of their country. They are not allowed to be privy to what is being discussed within the country or abroad even if they know that matters being agreed upon are extremely shocking and detrimental to the respectful existence of their nation. They are not allowed to see what is happening in their own land even if they believe that it is highly damaging and totally against the ideology and the integrity of Quaid-e-Azam's Pakistan. The last two and a half years of the proceedings of Parliament are witness to the fact that no major issue of international, regional and domestic concern have been allowed to be discussed on the floor. Instead national policies which were to be formulated by the Parliament are always decided on, in an unknown house outside the Parliament. The fate of our country and character building of our nation is being decided through "White Blessings", where the members of the "Black House" incidentally known as MNAs and Senators are not considered worthy enough, wise enough nor loyal and competent enough to discuss national polices or to decide upon the major issues which they were elected for.

Only one person has been given awesome and far-ranging powers to dismiss the Prime Minister, to dissolve the National Assembly and to appoint military and armed chief forces, judges of the Supreme Court and heads of other important constitutional bureaus, councils and departments which have a decisive role in the areas of domestic and foreign policies. A supreme political role has been given to the non political institution of the military of this country, by institutionalising its authoritarian and supra-parliamentary control over every institution in the form of the National Security Council (NSC) which is meant to deal with the matters related to "national security and crisis management." This act has marked

the formalisation of the military's political power which can create an undesirable situation, against every respectable and undisputable character of the Pak. Armed Forces, which has always been a significant part of the pride of our history. The civil government is just a façade, a "puppetry actor" to pretend to the outer world that democracy exists in Pakistan.

Now, the National Assembly is merely supposed to legalise the illegal, legitimise the illegitimate and constitutionalise the unconstitutional. It has been assigned the duty of putting a democratic gloss over dictatorial commands. In fact Parliament is functioning as a pseudo-democratic conveyor belt, churning out decisions and passing out bills without any meaningful participation of the elected representatives of the country. The National Assembly sits to infect a pre-planned given agenda or to do just routine official work stripped of any policy making authority.

At present the major role of the National Assembly is not that what the National Assembly was created for. Issues of international relevance, regional significance, geo-political significance and grave domestic concern are never on the agenda of the National Assembly. These issues are neither allowed to become the part of the order of the day nor are they the subject of a point of order or a privilege motion. Instead, the National Assembly has been crippled through underhand dealings, powerful lobbying, harassing pressures and political, executive and monetary incentives. Parliamentary sessions are frustrated through pre-planned blockades so that no creative work can be done or any serious issue be discussed.

The remainder of this dossier will present issues which should have been discussed in the National Assembly of Pakistan. Evidence from global parliaments especially proceedings from 'the mother of the parliaments' the British Parliament have been documented in detail, to show how the parliaments do function and perform there legislative duties.

A. Global Issues:

As highlighted earlier, the authority and freedom of Parliament to formulate, discuss and decide its own agenda for the benefit of Pakistan and its people has been denied, forcing it to become a mere bystander in

Parliamentary proceedings. The issue of national security is often raised as a precursor to any criticism of the current malaise of Parliament. However arguing that national secrets will be at risk of leakage is a fallacy and simply untrue. The purpose of Parliament is to discuss matters of national security so that the peoples' representatives can decide the fate of their nation as opposed to leaving it in the hands of some government servants, willingly or unwillingly working as foreign agents. Throughout the world, most prominently in Western Parliamentary Democracies, members of parliament enjoy full opportunity and authority to discuss all international, regional and domestic issues that affect their national character and solidarity. In the United Kingdom, European States and other developing democracies, issues such as the War on Iraq, Nuclear Proliferation, State Security and Defence, International Relations, War on Terror and Terrorism, American Policies, Human Rights and all other important Global, Regional and National developments are always discussed in detail in parliament and relevant state policies are formulated in the light of their own national interests. Indeed, in democratic parliaments, there is always a weekly question time, when the Prime Minister is subject to sever scrutiny and bombarded by questions from the opposition and he is forced to justify his own actions as well as those of his Cabinet and the Government. Similarly even though there is a Presidential system in the United States of America all matters are still put to the floor of the Senate. The following areas mentioned below are just a few examples of international, regional and domestic issues that should have been discussed and decided in the National Assembly but were totally ignored.

(i) Pak-American Relations:

It is a sad fact that Pakistan has become Washington's newest gendarme in the Muslim world. Every step of ours has been taken to please Washington, by providing military bases, sharing intelligence information, allowing U.S. intelligence personnel and security officers to act on the soil of Pakistan etc. What is more incredible is that Pakistan foreign policies are discussed and decided at American headquarters and the members of the National Assembly only become aware of the decisions, through T.V. and Press reports of the next day alongside the rest of the 140 million people of Pakistan. Pakistan has indeed become a client state of America

and none dare object or question this servitude. In contrast the British Parliament regularly discusses Anglo-American relations in spite of being the biggest U.S. ally, it allows the matter to be deeply analysed and strongly criticised. An example of such proceedings is given below:

“Geraint Davies (Croydon, Central) (Lab): Many colleagues would delay action for a couple of weeks beyond the US election. I do not want President Bush re-elected, but with every day that passes terrorists in Falluja are killing Iraqi people and taking UK hostages, and there will be more and more Bigleys. Does my right hon. Friend agree that if there is a military imperative to act we should do it now, not sacrifice UK and Iraqi lives just because we do not like George Bush?”

Mr. Hoon: I agree with my hon. Friend to this extent, at any rate: it is important that we act on the request made to us not only by our US ally but, crucially, by the sovereign Government of Iraq, who want an end to the lawlessness, violence, terrorism, killing and kidnapping. This deployment will play a part in that process.

Mr. Robin Cook (Livingston) (Lab): In the light of my right hon. Friend's remarkable statement that only a third of US troops are combat capable, would he agree with the US chiefs of staff when they warned Donald Rumsfeld that he was not sending enough US troops to Iraq in the first place? What assurances has he received from the US in return for this redeployment that, this time, it will listen to us as good and reliable allies when we advise it to minimise civilian casualties in Falluja, especially since, as a result of today's decision, we are much more likely to be held responsible for those casualties?”

Mr. Hoon: My right hon. Friend and I worked closely together on Iraq and have discussed on many occasions the organisation of our armed forces. He knows full well that in any force there are front-line combat forces and support forces. That was my point, which is self-evident, as I am sure he would accept. Inevitably, a certain proportion of the US forces deployed in Iraq will be front-line combat forces, and a smaller proportion still will be armoured capable. That is why this particular deployment is necessary.”²

² The government website of the British parliament:
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/cgi-bin/ukparl_hl?DB=ukparl&STEMMER=en&WORDS=bush+&COLOUR=Red&STYLE=s&URL=/pa/cm200304/cmhansrd/cm041021/debtext/41021-12.htm#41021-12_spnew2

Our National Assembly has become so helpless that our country has practically become a U.S. governed colony and it cannot challenge or even discuss the situation. U.S. dictations, wishes, priorities and directives, have become the sole source of our foreign policy. We are mere bystanders to American interests in this region as opposed to our own. We have no geo-political policies of our own except U.S. commandments. Our sovereignty, autonomy, authority, independence, national solidarity and liberty have been mortgaged to U.S. sweet pleasure. We have consciously accepted this slavery and seized the position of respectful slaves in a global comity of nations. The question arises as to whether the National Assembly, during the last two and a half years was capable enough to discuss the national interests of Pakistan in the light of ongoing Pak-American relations. Our President has visited the U.S many times, addressed the U.N. General Assembly, conducted meetings with the American President and its authorities, taking important decisions and made certain commitments and announcements which were later followed up by other governmental officials. Was the National Assembly ever taken into confidence? Was it ever informed about the agenda of discussions, the decisions and commitments? Was it ever allowed to discuss and frame its own opinion on the matter? Was this not more appropriate, constitutionally, that the Prime Minister would have performed all these duties? If we are a parliamentary democracy, then who was responsible for all of these matters and which was the competent house to decide all of these issues? The National Assembly has never bothered or has never been allowed to think over these happenings. This is not the way this country should be governed and is absolutely against the constitution, democracy and parliamentary norms. This form of ruling was being practiced before the passing of “Dual-Uniform Bill”. What is going to happen after it, no body knows or bothers to know.

(ii) International Terrorism and US Global Domination:

The National Assembly of Pakistan has neither been allowed to exhaustively discuss the issue of global terrorism nor to decide Pakistan’s stance on various issues related to the war on terror around the world. Pakistan has been an ally of the U.S.A. and the West in the continuing global war on terror and a self confessed ‘front line state’, but the nature

and the benefits of this role have never been discussed and reviewed by the National Assembly.

There is a need to differentiate between ‘organisational terrorism’ and ‘state terrorism’, between ‘preventive war’ and ‘aggressive war’ and between the ‘theory of self assumed fear’ and ‘act of barbaric fear’. We are instead moving forward with an unanalysed sole ‘character of front line state’, without appreciating the actual state of affairs. Yet the biggest menace to world peace has become state terrorism which is the major cause of all forms of terrorism. It was the duty of the National Assembly to discuss the subject of state terrorism along with the subject of the war on terrorism. If this had been allowed one could only come to the conclusion that the U.S.A. is one of the leading aggressors of the global community (**Appendix “A”**). The National Assembly could then have put forward some substantive reasons for reviewing and rebalancing our relationship with the U.S. and the rest of the world.

It is an undeniable fact that the US has defied the will of the whole world in the UN Security Council by vetoing over 140 resolutions which aimed to promote global peace and security, either standing alone or with Israel or some other nation each time. (**Appendix “B”**).

Unfortunately such aspects have never been discussed in the National Assembly, in order to determine our own position and stance in international matters, which could only formulate the guideline of our foreign policy. In stark contrast the British Parliament (The biggest ally of the U.S.A.) has debated American state terrorism with many facts being exposed as to why the U.S. actually invaded Iraq. An extract is given below:

“Harry Cohen (Leyton and Wanstead) (Lab): I, too, pay tribute to my hon. Friend the Member for Hartlepool (Iain Wright) for an excellent maiden speech.

The war was wrong. It was undertaken under false pretences. There were no weapons of mass destruction. We were not greeted as liberators. Because of that false assumption, there was no proper plan to make the country safe post-war. It has not made the middle east safer or the Israel-

Palestine conflict less virulent. No link has been proven between Saddam's Iraq and al-Qaeda—they detested each other. A police state was turned into a failed state, making it more amenable for terrorists to operate in. As regards the war on terror, it was the wrong target. President Mubarak of Egypt warned:

"Instead of having one bin Laden, we will have one hundred bin Ladens." Up to 40,000 people, many of them civilians and innocents, have been killed in the war and its aftermath.

Apart from the continuation of an arms embargo, I did not support economic sanctions. Some have argued that they worked. Certainly there were no WMDs. But the sanctions targeted and impoverished the poor, in effect bringing early death to millions of Iraqis over the decade. Sanctions weakened the ability of the Opposition in Iraq to bring about change. However, the point is well made by my right hon. Friend the Member for Livingston (Mr. Cook) that

"had Al Gore won the 2000 US election, the sanctions policy would have continued and the UK Government would have continued to support them claiming 'containment worked'".

The war was a Bush family project. Saddam referred to George W. Bush as "son of the viper" and George W. reminded journalists in 1993 that Saddam

"tried to kill my dad".

Bush senior wrote in his book that in the Gulf war he did not push beyond Basra further into Iraq to Baghdad because there was no viable exit strategy and American troops would become occupiers in a bitterly hostile land. Bush junior saw that as not finishing the job. He and his neo-cons were determined to do so, whatever the relevance or the consequence.

The mass graves testify to the appalling nature of the Saddam regime, but they were a joint venture with the Reagan Administration. That Administration set out to weaken the Islamic revolution in Iran. It used Saddam as a client to initiate war. It supplied him with weapons, radar and targeting equipment and even facilitated the supply of chemical weapons from German sources. After the 1991 Gulf war, the Bush senior Administration, having exhorted Saddam's opponents to rise up, suddenly realised that many of them were Shi'as—likely allies of Iran—and refused them access to Saddam's weapons, but allowed his troops to come through their lines to perpetrate the slaughter of the Shi'as and thereby maintain him in power.

*Many people believe the war on Iraq was driven by greed for oil, and I agree, but there are two commentaries that are worth putting on the record in Parliament. First, Elaine Storkey, writing in *The Independent* on 17 April, stated that the war was underpinned by religious rationalisation, a belief that the "civilised world" must move in to "set the barbarians right", and an unfaltering conviction that "we are civilised and we will therefore do good".*

But, as she notes, "There is nothing Christian about seeing Iraq as a battleground for good and evil" and "there are no civilised people in the Christian world, just people created by God with intrinsic dignity and significance."

She continues:

"The danger of the mind-set based on our occupation of civilisation is evident. We do not face the questions straight."

*Secondly, Ben White stated in *Middle East International* on 23 January that it is possible to detect a "superhero mentality" in the American Administration—a conception of America as "a superhero figure who, while essentially law-abiding, is permitted to break the normal community regulations in order to protect everybody from a greater evil".*

In a flawed assessment of good and evil, the American Administration has afforded itself superiority above the law. These commentaries point to a false perception of superiority in the US and UK, justifying war even when it is contrary to international law and opinion.

The vast majority of UK troops in Iraq do a difficult and courageous job, but they have been misused in a bad cause. Their presence with the US troops is the very basis of insecurity. Deemed to be foreign troops occupying Iraq, they generate resistance in the form of a national war of liberation. The US does not plan to leave. It wants its hands on the oil reserves and leverage over neighbouring Arab states, so the insecurity and killing will not end.

There has been no serious effort at reconstruction or rebuilding Iraq for the people. Recently I pressed the case for a small amount of assistance to help the Karbala eye clinic get going in Basra, in the British sphere of influence. To my astonishment I was told that the UK cannot afford to provide second-hand furnishings and had only £200,000 a year for such purposes.

Cluster bomblets and other unexploded ordinance have not been cleared up.

*Reparations continue to bleed Iraq of its much-needed resources well after the fall of Saddam. They go to Kuwait and the big corporations, which have far less right to the money than impoverished Iraqis. We now know, thanks to Naomi Klein in *The Guardian*, that President Bush's envoy, James Baker, was playing a double game, officially calling for debt relief, but privately, on behalf of the Carlisle Group, promising to maintain the flow of money to Kuwait in exchange for a big payout. That amounted to extortion on the part of the Kuwaitis and theft from the Iraqis.*

The UN has been misused in this process. The Foreign Secretary claimed credit for the latest UN resolution, which allows the reparations to continue without being explicit. He cannot have been aware of the Baker role, so he must have been duped. Those reparations are unacceptable. As in the case of Germany after the first world war, they contribute to economic impoverishment and further conflict.

Using Iraqi business and workers rather than private contractors and corrupt US corporations should have been the priority in rebuilding the infrastructure. Why has the UK been voiceless about Halliburton getting huge contracts without competition?

The Abu Ghraib prison scandal continues to have implications, and not only for the United States. The Minister himself acknowledged that UK soldiers have been involved in the administration of Iraqi prisoners and has named two UK intelligence officers, Colonel Chris Terrington and Colonel Campbell James, who he says were "embedded within" the US unit responsible for the interrogations of Iraqi prisoners. It can be argued that, as with business, the legal principle of joint and several liability should apply. The Prime Minister, on behalf of the UK Government, claims credit for the removal of Saddam. In that case, we cannot properly disclaim responsibility for what the coalition forces do overall.

Many deaths in custody have occurred, and a number of which have been at the hands of British forces, and numerous cases are under ongoing investigation. The right-wing press in this country are applying pressure to stop the justice process. They point out that the war was illegal in the first place, but the law against wrongdoers must apply. Human rights for Iraqis must apply too, and it is dismaying to see the Government contesting that in the British courts.

The proposed January elections in Iraq are a fig leaf for the Bush election campaign. Elections are, of course, desirable, but they are impractical in current circumstances—I think that that will be acknowledged as soon as the US election is over. The Interim Government are a puppet Government with little support. Shi'as form 60 per cent. of the population, and Ayotollah Sistani is the leader of the vast majority of them. Government should be handed over to him, without elections if necessary, with the agreement that he ensures that Kurds, Sunnis, and Moqtada al-Sadr are represented in his Administration and that proper elections will be held as soon as practical. For that to work, a commitment should be made for the troops to leave.

The Prime Minister chose power—the Bush regime in the US—rather than the 2 million-person march of Britons against the war, who represented majority opinion in this country. That was his interpretation of the national interest. Almost certainly the decision to stand with Bush was made well in advance of the war itself. The justifications have fallen apart and we are left with "we got rid of Saddam". Well, we got rid of 40,000 others too. The UN Secretary-General has indicated his opinion that the war was illegal. There are many other dictators like Saddam, some of whom are worse than him, but they have not been targeted in that way. The Prime Minister told the House that Saddam could stay if he complied with UN resolution 1441, so getting rid of him was not, as we are supposed to accept, a purpose in itself.

I am running short of time, but I want to make this point: our troops who have been killed are victims of messy, unreasonable politics to ingratiate with the inflexible dogmatist in the White House, whose war on terror is unfocused and costly. Even if he is re-elected, our troops need not continue to die for his mistakes, and I will continue to support the campaign to bring them home at an early opportunity. That is not cutting and running; that is facing up to our responsibility to bring about a solution. No solution is possible while foreign troops, UK and US, occupy Iraq”³

³ The government website of the British parliament:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmhansrd/cm041021/debtext/41021-29.htm>

(iii) Israeli Aggression

Over the last few years Israel has continued its illegal and unlawful aggression on the Palestinian nation and is a consistent perpetrator of mass human rights violations through continual bombardment on the Palestinian territories. UN Security Council resolutions condemning Israel are being vetoed by the USA with the latest veto taking place on the 5th October 2004⁴ Yet the National Assembly of Pakistan failed to discuss these issues. Is Pakistan not part of the global community or the Muslim Ummah? Does it not have a significant role to play in World politics or have a strategic interest in the affairs of the Middle East? It is indeed a great shame that we as a Muslim nation are unable to discuss the plight of our fellow Muslims in Palestine whilst other countries such as the United Kingdom regularly discusses the situation in occupied Palestine. The British Parliament has on many occasions shown support for the Palestinian cause with regular criticisms of Israeli aggression. An extract from the 'prime ministers questions' is given below:

“Mr. Ernie Ross (Dundee, West): Although I welcome today's statement by my right hon. Friend, the real significance of the past few weeks has been the commitment offered by the American Government—and, more importantly, by the President—to a Palestinian state. Those of us who have been involved in the middle east for more than 30 years know that the Israel-Palestine question is the core of the middle east problem, and that only a resolution of it will provide general peace. We have been hoping for an American President who recognises the need for a Palestinian state, and the significance of the recent statement cannot be overstated. If Colin Powell arrives quickly and the Americans remain truly engaged, the Palestinians will begin to believe that the President and the American people really do recognise their right to a state. That would go a long way towards building peace.

The Prime Minister: I am sure that my hon. Friend is right about that. The commitment of the entire international community to a viable Palestinian state is, as I have said, one ray of hope in this ghastly situation.

Dr. Julian Lewis (New Forest, East): Some people view Yasser Arafat as being opposed to suicide bombings but unable to prevent them; others see him as being in favour of them and unwilling to prevent them. The Prime

⁴ Daily Dawn, 7th October 2004. <http://dawn.com/2004/10/07/top15.htm>

Minister has access to better sources of information than most of us: to which of those views does he subscribe?

The Prime Minister: I subscribe to the view that, if there is a proper peace process, the Palestinians are willing to engage in it. Although I concur with criticisms of the Palestinian Authority's inability, or refusal, to control terrorism properly, we have to recognise that we will be dealing with them, and that we cannot choose which of their members we will deal with. The truthful answer to the hon. Gentleman's point is that the real danger is that, as long as the bloodshed and violence continues, a growing indifference will come about—in fact, it is happening—to innocent blood being spilt on both sides.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I remind the House that early next week a full day's debate will be held on this subject.”⁵

Another Example from the British parliament:

“Mr. Home Robertson : That answer is welcome. Notwithstanding the incomprehensible public stance of the Palestine Liberation Organisation on the invasion of Kuwait, does the Secretary of State acknowledge that private pressure from the PLO led to, among other things, the release of British and other foreign hostages by Saddam Hussein back in December? Will he further acknowledge that there can be no security in the middle east until a just settlement is achieved for the Palestinian people? Will he join me in welcoming the acknowledgment by Secretary of State Baker of the continuing role of the PLO? Can we expect the British Government to start holding conversations with members of the PLO in the near future?

Mr. Hurd : It is certainly true that there cannot be a settlement of the Arab-Israel problems without a just settlement for the Palestinians. Unfortunately, it is also true that the present leadership of the PLO substantially weakened the authority with which it can speak on behalf of the Palestinians by supporting Saddam Hussein's aggression. That is a fact with which the Palestinians have to wrestle. I welcome the meeting that Secretary Baker had with Palestinians yesterday. As the hon.

⁵ The government website of the British parliament: <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020410/debtext/20410-09.htm>

Gentleman knows, we have our own contacts with Palestinians, both in the occupied territories and in Tunis.”⁶

Another example:

“Llew Smith (Blaenau Gwent) (Lab): “...We should also debate the 200 nuclear weapons deployed by Israel. We should never forget Mordechai Vanunu, who spent 16 years of his life telling and protesting the truth about Israel's nuclear weapons while all those around him were lying. Although he has been released from one form of imprisonment, he is now faced with another—being unable to leave Israel...”⁷

(iv) Iraq War

The on going war in Iraq has received international condemnation from many countries as well as concern expressed by the United Nations over the American invasion. The United States’ justification for going to war, namely the threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction has been found to be unproven, resulting in public outrage throughout the world. However, yet again, the members of the National Assembly were given no opportunity to discuss the issue, were not allowed to debate the consequences of the American aggression and were not able to express the opinion of the people that they represent who were overwhelmingly against the invasion in the first place. In contrast the British parliament thoroughly debated the issue before it went to war in Iraq and a lesson can be learnt from its democratic practice with the fact **that 139 MPs of the ruling Labour Party voted against its own government policy which was to go to war in Iraq.**⁸ In the present National Assembly an MNA who dare speaks out against the party line let alone vote against his own party can be confident of facing tough action from the party whips.

An example of proceedings in the British parliament criticizing the absence of WMD in Iraq is given below:

⁶ The government website of the British parliament: <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199091/cmhansrd/1991-03-13/Orals-1.html>

⁷ The government website of the British parliament: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/cgi-bin/ukparl_hl?DB=ukparl&STEMMER=en&WORDS=wmd+&COLOUR=Red&STYLE=s&URL=/pa/cm200304/cmhansrd/cm041021/debtext/41021-25.htm#41021-25_spnew1

⁸ BBC News: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2862749.stm

“Llew Smith (Blaenau Gwent) (Lab): When I participated in last year's debate on defence, I mentioned that there seemed to be a reluctance to debate the whole issue of nuclear weapons. In retrospect, I suppose that I have been proven wrong, because for the past 12 months we have spent many hours in the Chamber debating nuclear weapons. Sadly, the nuclear weapons that we debated were the mythical Iraqi nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

It was obvious from the Secretary of State's opening speech that there is still a great reluctance to debate, or even mention, nuclear weapons. I do not think that he mentioned them on a single occasion in his speech. We should debate that subject. We should debate our own nuclear weapons. We should debate Trident, which has been dubbed the £15 billion mass killer. We should debate the tens of thousands of nuclear weapons deployed by the US and Russia.

We should also debate the 200 nuclear weapons deployed by Israel. We should never forget Mordechai Vanunu, who spent 16 years of his life telling and protesting the truth about Israel's nuclear weapons while all those around him were lying. Although he has been released from one form of imprisonment, he is now faced with another—being unable to leave Israel.

I make no apologies for returning to the question of nuclear weapons today. It was interesting to hear the Secretary of State's admission, on previous occasions in response to my questioning, that he was willing to press the nuclear button. He has said that he would be willing to be involved in what would be the greatest act of murder ever committed in the history of this beautiful planet of ours. However, he remains reluctant, and still refuses, to mention the sort of circumstances in which he would be prepared to use nuclear weapons.

He still refuses to tell the House who the enemy is, against whom those nuclear weapons are directed, and against whom they would be used.

The Government's latest attempt to justify nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction appeared in their response to a question tabled by my right hon. Friend the Member for Llanelli (Denzil Davies). The Minister for Europe stated:

"Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty . . . five states—the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Russia and China—are legally

entitled to possess nuclear weapons.”—[Official Report, 1 September 2004; Vol. 424, c. 689W.] ”⁹

(B) Regional Issues:

(i) Pak-India Relations and the Kashmir Dispute

Pak-India relations are of critical importance to Pakistan’s security, foreign policy, economy, trade etc. yet this issue has also never been discussed in Parliament. Another important aspect of Pakistan’s future is the current ongoing dispute over Kashmir. The Pakistani people are highly concerned about the issue and have a deep emotional attachment to the people of Kashmir and their long struggle for freedom. This is one issue that is discussed by almost every citizen of Pakistan yet their representatives, sitting in the National assembly are again given no opportunity to discuss the plight of the Kashmiri Nation and put forward ideas for the resolution of the dispute. Instead many important decisions have been made in this regard and none were discussed on the floor of the National Assembly but rather fell victim to back door diplomacy. Proposals are being given directly by the President, to the press, to the public, and particularly to his Indian counter parts, without any kind of consultation and participation of the parliament on the matter. It is never on the agenda of Parliamentary debate. The sole reason, to my mind is that our rulers do not want this issue to be decided in Parliament since Parliament may create hurdles in the execution of the “given agenda” and the “settled solution”, where as the Indian Parliament is always heard discussing the issue and giving guidelines to the Government for its solution.

The United Kingdom has been involved in its own territorial disputes with the highly volatile problem of Northern Ireland. This dispute has raised similar sentiments amongst the British nation as the issue of Kashmir has done with the Pakistani people. However Members of the British Parliament have had full opportunities to discuss the dispute and policy regarding the future of Northern Ireland as well as legislation for its

⁹ Official website of the UK Parliament: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/cgi-bin/ukparl_hl?DB=ukparl&STEMMER=en&WORDS=wmd+&COLOUR=Red&STYLE=s&URL=/pa/cm200304/cmhansrd/cm041021/debtext/41021-25.htm#41021-25_spnew1

settlement on the floor of the house and not behind closed doors. An example of this can be seen in the business of the house regarding the 'Draft Northern Ireland Act 2000 (Modification) (No. 2) Order 2004'¹⁰.

Bilateral Dialogues are going on between Pakistan and India. Various proposals and options are being forwarded and discussed between the two countries but our poor parliament has no access to all of this.

(ii) Pak-Afghan Relations

Pakistan's Afghan policy has been the subject of international concern, and was the pre-cursor over the so called war on terrorism. Pakistan was America's 'front-line' ally providing key logistical and strategic support for the bombardment. Later the hunt for Osama bin Laden and his followers reached fever pitch with regular accusations that Pakistan was hiding him and his followers. However despite huge international concern and debate, the National Assembly was given no opportunity to engage in exhaustive debates over the issue. The Pakistani nation was not taken into confidence over decisions made and instead neither the general public nor members of the National Assembly were informed of actions to be taken, only finding out from the media.

Again the other countries around the globe discussed the issue extensively and in particular the House of Commons publication, dated 25th March 1997, which was presented to the House, discussed the continued civil war in Afghanistan and the Taliban thoroughly.¹¹

(C) National/Domestic Issues

(i) Defence and Nuclear Policy

Pakistan's national security is one of the most single important issues that the nation has faced, and in particular its nuclear policy. However recent

¹⁰ Official website of the UK Parliament: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/cgi-bin/ukparl_hl?DB=ukparl&STEMMER=en&WORDS=ira+&COLOUR=Red&STYLE=s&URL=/pa/cm200304/cmstand/deleg3/st040909/40909s03.htm#muscat_highlighter_first_match

¹¹ House of commons Library, Afghanistan, 97/41

events concerning the arrest, detention and questioning of Dr. Abdul Qadeer and his team has given grave cause for concern. What is even more alarming has been the permission given to the American secret services to question directly those involved in the nuclear program with absolute disregard for national security interests. Despite public indignation and out cry at the manner in which the whole episode has been dealt with, again the National Assembly was prohibited from discussing the matter on the floor of the House. Rather it would seem that the American secret service is trusted far more greatly by the Government than the elected representatives of our Parliament. Again if one looks to the British Parliament it has always discussed its own nuclear policies as well as those of other countries with great seriousness and detail.¹² Members of our Parliament have no idea as to what has happened to our nuclear capability. Has any thing been left behind or has every thing disappeared? Has any kind of surveillance, control or access been made available to any other country? Have some impediments, conditions and constraints been enforced on our nuclear program? Where do we stand and what is the position of our security? Parliament seems to have nothing to do with any of these matters.

The National Assembly has also not been given the chance to discuss the National Defence Policy. The military budget, future spending on arms and other priorities should also be allowed to be discussed and revised by the National Assembly. If national security is cited as a bar to such openness then how is it that other democracies have no such qualms when they hold such discussions? An example of open and detailed discussions of defence policy carried out by the British parliament is given below and can be seen in the House of Commons publication, dated 13th October 1995 and presented to the House. It provides detailed defence statistics giving precise figures on annual British defence expenditure as well as providing an annual break down of expenditure pinpointing the amount designated for each particular category. The exact numbers of personnel

¹² See "The Nuclear Safeguards Bill [H.L.]", Bill 59 of 1999-2000". This paper looks at the history of international efforts to introduce effective nuclear safeguards and examines why the Additional Protocol is considered necessary. It then provides an overview of the nuclear sector in the UK and concludes with an examination of the main elements of the Bill. (Official website of the UK Parliament: <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2000/rp00-040.pdf>)

in the armed forces are broken down in to various subcategories and the cost of building a nuclear submarine is given there in.¹³

(ii) Internal Terrorism & Conspiracy

Internal terrorism within Pakistan is one of the greatest threats facing the country, a menace in society which is restricting and debilitating the every day lives of citizens for the fear of imminent bomb blasts and shootings. Terrorists in the country still continue to operate freely without any sign of this menace being controlled and wiped out by the authorities. What are the roots of the terrorism, where do these roots emerge from and who are responsible for protecting, maintaining and promoting these roots? Why we have been unable to wipe it out in spite of the fact that the Army has been in power for the last five years, and the Intelligence Agencies are enjoying full, unlimited and unchecked authority to do whatever is required to do. Moreover, our slogan and commitment to the whole world has been to eradicate all forms and manifestations of terrorism from our land. In reality this terrorism has not be eradicated and uprooted till today. Instead of decreasing it goes on increasing. Why? Is this because we are unable to deal with it or simply that we do not want to eliminate it? Some quarters have accused that a handful of hidden influential elements in power are the main players in perpetrating the acts of terrorism, violence and sectarianism to provide a justification to the world for continuing their dictatorial rule, citing internal unrest as a bar to complete civilian takeover of government. Right or wrong what ever is the reality, these questions should have been addressed in National Assembly at length and the Government would have been held accountable for its inability.

The National Assembly should have been given the opportunity to chalk out a proper definition of “internal terrorism”, rather than relying upon American definitions, dual standards and parameters of terrorism. The problem can only be solved if terrorism is properly defined, its causes are deeply investigated and measures to solve the situation are thoroughly identified, analysed and assessed on the floor of the house. An evaluation should also occur as to the quantum of conspiracy involved in perpetuation of sectarianism and terrorism and how many functionaries of the government are interested in keeping it up. Instead the Nation is being

¹³ House of commons Library, Defence Statistics 1995, 95/98

fooled into believing that there are no means of putting an end to internal terrorism which is simply untrue and unbelievable.

The *British parliament* on the other hand has discussed internal terrorism in great detail and legislated on the issue. An example being the ‘*Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Bill*’, which was introduced in the House of Commons on 12th November 2001¹⁴

(iii) Devolution and Flawed Electoral Process

A three tier system of governance was implemented consisting of national, provincial and local representation. However these devolved powers have proved to be complete shams with conflicts and confusions between the three tiers remaining un-resolved. Moreover, there is no justice, honesty, fairness and neutrality in the whole electoral practice, being used as the most effective tool for political revenge, aimed at uprooting the opposition at gross root level in constituencies for future elections. In this way the non-political Local Governments are working day and night for the completion of a political agenda and a future dictatorial plan.

The present electoral system is also in need of a massive upheaval and is the main culprit in assisting the sham elections. Electoral lists are full of bogus voters and the manner in which elections are conducted are so blatantly biased that the general public has lost all faith in the democratic process. The dictatorial establishment which rules this country and decides in advance on who will be elected from which constituency, is at present too big of a power for Parliament to tackle. Unless Parliament plays an independent, serious and a potent role in order to save the political future of the country, each person desiring to contest the elections and be elected for the assemblies, will always be playing as a puppet in the hands of the powerful establishment. Unless those individuals who are in the habit of distributing Parliamentary seats as gifts and donations, are checked and stopped, there will be no future of democracy in this country. Parliament cannot act as a parliament, unless it gets rid of this begging culture. If the National Assembly cannot do this job, then what is the use of remaining a part of it?

¹⁴ Official website of the UK Parliament: <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200102/cmbills/049/2002049.pdf>

An example of an open and detailed discussion on electoral and voting systems, carried out by the British parliament is given below:

The House of Commons publication, dated 13th February 1997 presented to the house discusses alternative voting systems. First-past-the-post system, proportional representation, alternative vote, second ballot, supplementary ballot, additional members systems (AMS), single transferable vote, and party lists systems are discussed in detail.¹⁵

World Parliaments keep on discussing ways of improving their present electoral systems in place and are continually considering alternatives to improve democracy conditions in their countries. Our Parliament is not meant to discuss the issues of prime concern and significance, **even if it happens to discuss, it is not allowed to decide the matter on the floor.** It has to go to some other house for final disposal.

(iv) Poverty, Illiteracy, Unemployment and Health & Social Conditions:

The Pakistani people elected the members of the National Assembly with the hope that they would legislate in order to eradicate poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, inflation and many other tragedies they face on a daily basis. Moreover, that they will be able to improve the health and social conditions of the country. It was the duty of the ruling Government to bring these issues onto the floor of the National Assembly so that solutions to these domestic tragedies could be found out, but nothing of the sort was done. Instead the government is kept busy in political manoeuvring so no time is left for addressing these issues. The remainder of Parliament is kept busy in welcoming, appreciating and clapping for what is being done, leaving no other option for the opposition except shouting and boycotting.

¹⁵ House of commons Library, Voting Systems, The Alternatives, 97/26

4. Conclusion

After the passing of the “Dual-Uniform Bill” and another “broken promise”, my personal assessment of the current situation is that our country will be forced towards the introduction of a “Presidential Form of Government.” Even if this does not take place, the present parliamentary system and democracy has come to its end. Parliament has disabled itself by cutting off its own hands with an ever lasting dictatorship being approved, legislated and constitutionalised, unconstitutionally through this bill.

Therefore in light of all of these facts I tender my resignation in protest and request all of the one hundred and fifty opposition MNA’s to do likewise. It is time to put words into actions and take a conclusive stand.

I thus resign in protest from my N.A. 127 seat.
My thanks and prayers for all who deserve them.

Dr. Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri

Appendix (A)¹⁶

A List of US Military Interventions in Various Countries.

- 1- **China, 1945-51**
- 2- **France, 1947** .¹⁷ .¹⁸
- 3- **Marshall Islands, 1946-58**
- 4- **Italy, 1947-1970s** .¹⁹
- 5- **Greece, 1947-49**
- 6- **Philippines, 1945-53**
- 7- **Korea, 1945-53** .²⁰
- 8- **Albania, 1949-53**
- 9- **Eastern Europe, 1948-56** .²¹
- 10- **Germany, 1950s**
- 11- **Guatemala, 1953-1990** .²²
- 12- **Costa Rica, Mid-1950s, 1970-71**
- 13- **Haiti, 1959**
- 14- **Western Europe, 1950s-1960s**
- 15- **British Guiana/Guyana, 1953-64**

¹⁶ Appendix details extracted from "Rogue State" By William Blum (New Updated Edition published by Spearhead, South Africa, 2002) p.104, p.126

¹⁷ . Alfred W McCoy, The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade (Lawrence Hill Books, NY, 1991), p.54--63; Sallie Pisani, The CIA and the Marshall Plan (University Press of Kansas, 1991), p.99-105

¹⁸ . New York Times, May 5, 1947, p. 1

¹⁹ . The Guardian (London), November 29, 1983

²⁰ . Washington Post, September 30, 1999, p.1; October 14, p.14; December 29, p.19

²¹ . Stewart Steven, Operation Splinter Factor (London 1974).

²² . Washington Post, November 14, 1999, also see Amnesty International Annual Report for Guatemala 1997,

1998,1999 on AI's website

- 16- Soviet Union, 1940s-1960s**
- 17- Vietnam, 1945-73**
- 18- Cambodia, 1955-73**
- 19- Laos, 1957-73**
- 20- Thailand, 1965-73**
- 21- Ecuador, 1960-63 .²³**
- 22- The Congo/Zaire, 1960-65, 1977-78**
- 23- France/Algeria, 1960s .²⁴**
- 24- Brazil, 1961-64**
- 25- Peru, 1965**
- 26- Dominican Republic, 1963-65 .²⁵**
- 27- Cuba, 1959 to present**
- 28- Ghana, 1966 .²⁶**
- 29- Uruguay, 1969-72 .²⁷**
- 30- Chile, 1964-73 .²⁸**

²³. Ralph McGehee, *Deadly Deceits: My 25 years in the CIA* (New York, 1983), p.64-69; New York Times,

November 27, 1966, pA; Washington Post, November 20, 1966, p.22; December 7, 1966

²⁴. Washington Post, May 21,1997, column by Nora Boustany

²⁵. Washington Post, May 21,1997, column by Nora Boustany

²⁶. CIA internal memorandum of February 25, 1966, declassified March 7, 1977, received by author as a result of an FOIA request

²⁷. Cable News Network en Espanol, July 23, 1998; El Diario-La Prensa (New York) July 24, 1998; Clarin (Buenos Aires) July 22, 1998, p45

- 31- Greece, 1967-74**
 - 32- South Africa, 1960s-1980s .²⁹**
 - 33- Bolivia, 1964-75**
 - 34- Australia, 1972-75**
 - 35- Portugal, 1974-76 .³⁰**
 - 36- East Timor, 1975-99 .³¹**
 - 37- South Korea, 1980 .³²**
-

²⁸. Numbers of victims: New York Times, January 3, 2000, FBI: New York Times, February 10, 1999, p.6;

Kissinger: US government document declassified in 1999, The Observer (London), February 28, 1999, p.3

²⁹. New York Times, July 23 1986, p.1; Baltimore Sun, November 12, 1995, p.10; Covert Action Information

Bulletin (Washington, DC), #12, April 1981, p.24-27; William Minter, Apartheid's Contras (London, 1994),

chapter 6

³⁰. Washington Post, October 9, 1974, p.36; New York Times, September 25, 1975, p.1; Evans and Novak in

Washington Post, October 26, 1974, p.19 (NATO information); Facts on File, March 1, 1975, p.131 (NATO

exercises).

³¹. The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism, Volume I (Boston, 1979), p.129-204.

Daniel Moynihan with Suzanne Weaver, A Dangerous Place (Boston, 1978), p.247.

Allan Nairn, "US Complicity in Timor", The Nation, September 27, 1999, p.5-6; "U.S. trained butchers of Timor", The Observer (London), September 19, 1999. New York Times, October 31, 1995, p.3.

- 38- Fiji, 1987 .³³**
39- Bulgaria, 1990-91 .³⁴
40- Albania, 1991-92

³². New York Times, May 23,1980, p.1.

The Milwaukee Journal, August 12, 1980

New York Times, February 2,1981, p.8, February 3, p.6.

³³. Speech at the Pacific Islands Luncheon, Kahala Hilton Hotel, Hawaii, February 10, 1982, cited in a September

1989 paper, "Possible Foreign Involvement in the Fiji Military Coup", p.2, by Owen Wilkes, editor of Peacelink

and Wellington Pacific Report, both of New Zealand.

Ibid, p.6-7.

The Nation, August 15/22,1987, p.117-20; San Francisco Chronicle, June 17, 1987; The National Reporter

(Washington, DC), Fall 1987, p.33-38; Covert \ Action Information Bulletin (Washington, DC), #29, Fall 1987,

p.7-10.

The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia), May 16, 1987, p.1.

³⁴. Washington Post, November 23, 1999.

National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, DC, Annual Report, 1990 (October 1, 1989-September

30,1990), p.23-4.

Ibid., 1991, p.41-43

A list of US Political Interventions in Various Countries

- 41- Philippines, 1950s .³⁵**
- 42- Italy, 1948-1970s**
- 43- Lebanon, 1950s .³⁶**
- 44- Vietnam, 1955 .³⁷**
- 45- British Guiana/Guyana, 1953-64 .³⁸**
- 46- Japan, 1958-1970s**
- 47- Nepal, 1959**

By the CIA's own admission, it carried out an unspecified "covert action" on behalf of B.P. Koirala to help his Nepali Congress Party win the national parliamentary election. The NCP won a majority of seats in the new legislature and Koirala became prime minister. It was Nepal's first national election ever, and the CIA was there to initiate them into the wonderful workings of democracy.³⁹

³⁵. Miami Herald, October 17, 1997, p. 22A

³⁶. Joseph Burkholder Smith (former CIA officer), portrait of a cold warrior (New York, 1976), chapter 7, 15,16,17;

Raymond Bonner, Waltzing with a dictator: the Marcoses and the Making of American Policy (New York, 1987),

p. 39- 42; New York Times editorial, October 16, 1953, p.26

³⁷. Smith, p. 210-11

³⁸. Dwight Eisenhower, The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1956 (New York, 1963), p.372

³⁹. Duane Clarridge with Digby Diehl, A Spy For AU Seasons: My Life in the CIA (New York, 1997), p.64-6.

Clarridge went on to become a high official in the CIA.

- 48- Laos, 1960** ⁴⁰
- 49- Brazil, 1962** ⁴¹
- 50- Dominican Republic, 1962** ^{42,43}
- 51- Guatemala, 1963** ⁴⁴
- 52- Bolivia, 1966** ⁴⁵
- 53- Chile, 1964-70** ⁴⁶
- 54- Portugal, 1974-5**

In the years following the coup in 1974 by military officers who talked like socialists, the CIA revved up its propaganda machine while funneling many millions of dollars to support

⁴⁰. New York Times, April 25, 1966, p.20

⁴¹. Philip Agee, Inside the Company: CIA Diary (New York, 1975), p.321 AJ Langguth, Hidden Terrors (New York, 1978) p.92

⁴². John Banlow Manin, Overtaken by Events: The Dominican Crisis From the fall of Trujillo to the Civil War (Doubleday, NY, 1966) p.226-8

⁴³. Ibid., p.347-8

⁴⁴. Georgie Anne Geyer, Miami Herald, December 24, 1966; Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, Bitter Fruit:

The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala (New York, 1982), p.236-44; New York Herald Tribune,

April 7, 1963, article by Ben Quint, section 2, p.1

⁴⁵. Washington Post, May 17, 1975; New York Times, May 17-18, 1975

⁴⁶. Covert Action in Chile, 1963-1973, a Staff Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (US Senate), December 18, 1975

"moderate" candidates, in particular Mario Soares and his (so-called) Socialist Party. At the same time, the Agency enlisted social-democratic parties of Western Europe to provide further funds and support to Soares. It worked. The Socialist Party became the dominant power.⁴⁷

55- Australia, 1974-75

56- Jamaica, 1976

A CIA campaign to defeat social democrat Michael Manley's bid for reelection featured disinformation, arms shipments, labor unrest, economic destabilization, financial support for the opposition and attempts upon Manley's life. Despite it all, he was victorious.⁴⁸

57- Panama, 1984, 1989⁴⁹

58- Nicaragua, 1984, 1990^{50,51,52}

59- Haiti, 1987-1988⁵³

⁴⁷. New York Times, September 25, 1975, pl, January 7, 1976, p11 The Guardian (London), February 7, 1996 (review of book about Soares'links to CIA)

⁴⁸. Ernest Volkman and John Cummings, "Murder as Usual", Penthouse (New York), December 1977, p.112 ff.; David Com, *Blond Ghost: Ted Shackley and the CIA's Crusades* (Simon & Schuster, NY, 1994), p.330; Roben Gates (former CIA Director), *From the Shadows* (New York, 1996), p.175

⁴⁹. 1984: Los Angeles Times, March 21, 1992, p.2; 1989: U.S. News & World Report, May I, 1989, p.40; Los Angeles Times, April 23, 1989, p.1

⁵⁰. New York Times, October 21, 1984, p.12, October 31, p.1

⁵¹. Covert Action Information Bulletin (Washington, DC) No. 22, Fall 1984, p.27,

⁵². William I. Robinson, *A Faustian Bargain: U.S. Intervention in the Nicaraguan Elections and American Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era* (Westview Press, Colorado, 1992) passim; Jacqueline Sharkey, "Anatomy of an Election: How U.S. Money Affected the Outcome in Nicaragua," *Common Cause Magazine* (Washington, DC) May, June 1990

⁵³. The Guardian (London), September 22, 1986; Los Angeles Times, October 31, 1993, p.1; New York Times, November 1, 1993, p.8

- 60- Bulgaria, 1990-1991 & Albania, 1991-1992**
- 61- Russia, 1996**⁵⁴
- 62- Mongolia, 1996**^{55,56,57,58}
- 63- Bosnia, 1998**⁵⁹

US Interventions in the Muslim World

- 64- Iran, 1953**
- 65- Middle East, 1956-58**
- 66- Indonesia, 1957-58**
- 67- Iraq, 1958-63**^{60,61,62,63,64,65,66}
- 68- Indonesia, 1965**

⁵⁴. Time, July 15, 1996, p.29-37; Fred Weir, veteran American correspondent in Moscow, analysis dated July 17, 1996, fweir.ncade@rex.iasnet.ru Clinton quote: Washington Star, March 27, 1996, p.1, from a State Department cable that

⁵⁵. Washington Post, April 6, 1997.

⁵⁶. New York Times, July 3, 1996, p.6

⁵⁷. Wall Street Journal, July3,1996,p.10

⁵⁸. Intelligence Newsletter (Paris), June 18, 1998.

⁵⁹. Los Angeles Times, September 12, 1998, p.6; 'March 6, 1999, p.6; The Guardian (London), May 31,1997, p.16

⁶⁰. New York Times, April 29, 1959, p.1

⁶¹. See John Gerassi, The Coming of the New International (New York, 1971), p.245-56,

⁶². Claudia Wright, New Statesman Magazine (London), July I, 1983, p.20.

⁶³. Los Angeles Times, April 14, 1991,

⁶⁴. Le Monde (France), February 5, 1963, p.5

⁶⁵. State Department statement: Christian Science Monitor, February 13, 1963, p.3

⁶⁶. The Guardian (London), January I, 1994, p.5

- 69- Iraq, 1972-75** ⁶⁷
- 70- South Yemen, 1979-84** ⁶⁸
- 71- Libya, 1981-89**
- 72- Afghanistan, 1979-92**
- 73- Somalia, 1993** ⁶⁹
- 74- Iraq, 1990s** ⁷⁰
- 75- Indonesia, 1955** ^{71,72,73,74,75}

⁶⁷. Staff Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence, US House of Representatives, 1975, "the Pike Report".

⁶⁸. Bob Woodward, VEIL: The Secret Wars of the CIA 1981-1987 (New York, 1987), p.78-9, 124-5,215; New York Times, April 8, 1982, p.3.

Fred Halliday, "Russians help to beat leftwing guerrillas", The Guardian (London), May 3,1984, p.7; New York

Times, March 19, 1980, p.1.

⁶⁹. Mark Bowden, Black Hawk Down (1999), Stephen Shalom, "Gravy Train: Feeding the Pentagon by Feeding

Somalia", November 1993, at www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/shalomsomalia.html; oil companies: Los Angeles

Times, January 18, 1993, p.1

⁷⁰. Post-war bombing: Washington Post, August 30, 1999, p.3,

⁷¹. David Wise and Thomas Ross, The Invisible Government (New York, 1965), p.337; Wilbur Crane Eveland,

Ropes of Sand: America's Failure in the Middle East (W.W. Norton & Co, New York, 1980), p.24-50; New

York Times, March 31, 1997, p.11

⁷² "Pentagon's Planning Guidance for the Fiscal Years 1994-1999", New York Times, March 8, 1992, p.14

⁷³ New York Times, February 3, 1992, p.8

⁷⁴ Washington Post, December 27, 2001, p.C2

⁷⁵ October 17, 1963, UN Resolution number 1884

Appendix (B)⁷⁶

The list of 148 UN Security Council resolutions vetoed by the US alone or with it having the support of Israel or UK is given below:

Date/Issue	Resolution Number	Yes-No Vote
<u>1978</u>		
1. Dec.15	33/75	119-2 (US, Israel)
Urges the Security Council, especially its permanent members, to take all necessary measures for insuring UN decisions on the maintenance of international peace and security.		
2. Dec.19	33/136	119-1 (US)
Calls upon developed countries to increase quantity and quality of development assistance to under developed countries.		
<u>1979</u>		
3. Jan.24	33/183M	114-3 (US, France, UK)
To end all military and nuclear collaboration with apartheid South Africa.		
4. Jan.29	33/196	111-1 (US)
Protectionism of developing countries exports		
5. Nov.23	34/46	136-1 (US)

⁷⁶ Appendix details extracted from "Rogue State" By William Blum (New Updated Edition published by Spearhead, South Africa, 2002) p.185

Alternate approaches within the UN system for improving the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

6. Dec.11 34/83J 120-3 (US, UK, France)
Negotiations on disarmament and cessation of nuclear arms race
7. Dec.12 34/93D 132-3 (US, UK, France)
Strengthening arms embargo against South Africa
8. Dec.12 34/931 134-3 (US, UK, France)
Assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movement
9. Dec.14 34/100 104-2 (US, Israel)
Against support for intervention in the internal or external affairs of states
10. Dec.17 34/158 121-2 (US, Israel)
Prepare and carry out the UN conference on women
11. Dec.19 34/199 112-1 (US)
Safeguarding rights of developing countries in multinational trade negotiations

1980

12. Dec.5 35/57 134-1 (US)

Establishment of a new international economic order to promote the growth of under developed countries and international economic cooperation

13. Dec.11 35/119 134-3 (Us, UK, France)
Implementation of the declaration on granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples
14. Dec.11 35/136 132-3 (US, Israel, Canada)
Endorse program of action for second half of UN decade for women
15. Dec.12 35/145A 111-2 (US, UK)
Cessation of all nuclear test explosions
16. Dec.12 35/154 110-2 (US, Albania)
Declaration of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states
17. Dec.15 35/174 120-1 (US)
Emphasizing that the development of nations and individuals is a human right
18. Dec.16 35/206J 137-3 (US, UK, France)
Assistance to oppressed people of South African and their national liberation movement

1981

19. Oct.28 36/12 145-1 (US)
Anti-racism; condemns apartheid in South Africa and Namibia

20. Oct.28 36/13 124-1 (US)
 Condemns collaboration of certain states and transnational corporations with the South African Govt.
21. Nov.9 36/18 123-1 (US)
 To promote cooperative movements in developing countries (agricultural, savings and credits, housing, consumer protection, social services etc.)
22. Nov.9 36/19 126-1 (US)
 The right of every state to choose its economic and social system in accord with the will of its people, without outside interference in whatever form its takes
23. Dec.1 36/68 133-3 (US, UK, Guatemala)
 Condemns activities of foreign economic interests in colonial territories
24. Dec.9 36/84 118-2 (US, UK)
 Cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons
25. Dec.9 36/92J 78-3 (US, Canada, Brazil)
 World-wide action for collecting signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, curb the arms race and promote disarmament
26. Dec.9 36/96B 109-1 (US)
 Urges negotiations on prohibition of chemical and biological weapons
27. Dec.14 36/133 135-1 (US)
 Declares that education, work, healthcare, proper

nourishment, national development etc. are human rights

28. Dec.16 36/149B 147-2 (US, Israel)
Calls for the establishment of a new and more just world information and communications order
29. Dec.17 36/172C 136-1 (US)
Condemns aggression by South Africa against Angola and other African states
30. Dec.17 36/172H 129-2 (US, UK)
To organize an international conference of trade unions on sanctions against South Africa
31. Dec.17 36/172 126-2 (US, UK)
To encourage various international action against South Africa
32. Dec.17 36/172N 139-1 (US)
Support of sanctions and other measures against South Africa
33. Dec.17 36/1720 138-1 (US)
Cessation of further foreign investment and loans for South Africa
34. Dec.18 36/234B 1982 [only solitary US votes]
UN accounting changes for 1980-81
35. Oct.28 37/7 127-1 (US)
World Charter for protection of the ecology
36. Nov.15 37/11 136-1 (US)
Setting up UN conference on succession of states in respect to state property, achieves and debts.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|--------|------------|
| 37. | Dec.3 | 37/47 | 124-1 (US) |
| | Appeal for universal ratification of the convention on the suppression and punishment of apartheid | | |
| 38. | Dec.9 | 37/69E | 141-1 (US) |
| | Promoting international mobilization against apartheid | | |
| 39. | Dec.9 | 37/390 | 138-1 (US) |
| | Drafting of international convention against apartheid in sports | | |
| 40. | Dec.9 | 37/69H | 134-1 (US) |
| | Cessation of further foreign investments and loans for South Africa | | |
| 41. | Dec.9 | 37/73 | 111-1 (US) |
| | Need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty | | |
| 42. | Dec.9 | 37/78A | 114-1 (US) |
| | Request to US and USSR to transmit a status report on their nuclear arms negotiations [USSR abstained] | | |
| 43. | Dec.9 | 37/83 | 138-1 (US) |
| | Prevention of arms race in outer space | | |
| 44. | Dec.10 | 37/94B | 131-1 (US) |
| | Support of UNESCO's efforts to promote a new world information and communications order | | |
| 45. | Dec.13 | 37/98A | 95-1 (US) |
| | Necessity of a convention on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons | | |
| 46. | Dec.16 | 37/103 | 113-1 (US) |

Development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new economic order

47. Dec.17 37/131 129-1 (US)
Measures concerning the UN Joint Staff Pension Board including prevention of exclusion of certain UN employees
48. Dec.17 37/137 146-1 (US)
Protection against products harmful to health and the environment
49. Dec.18 37/199 131-1 (US)
Declares that education, work, healthcare, proper nourishment, national development etc are human rights
50. Dec.20 37/204 141-1 (US)
Motion for a review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States
51. Dec.21 37/237-XI 132-1 (US)
Adequacy of the conference facilities of the economic commission for Africa at Addis Ababa
52. Dec.21 37/251 146-1 (US)
Development of the energy resources of developing countries
53. Dec.21 37/252 124-1 (US)
Restructuring international economic relations toward establishing a new international economic order

1983

54. Nov.22 38/19 110-1 (US)
International convention on the crime of apartheid
55. Nov.22 38/25 131-1 (US)

The right of every state to choose its economic and social system in accord with the will of its people, without outside interference in whatever form it takes.

56. Dec.5 38/39E 149-1 (US)
Disseminating material and organizing conferences in the campaign against apartheid
57. Dec.5 38/39I 140-1 (US)
Urges the security council to consider sanctions against South Africa as a protest against apartheid
58. Dec.5 38/39K 145-1 (US)
Authorizes the international convention against apartheid in Sports to continue its consultations
59. Dec.15 38/70 147-1 (US)
Outer space should be used for peaceful purposes; prevention of an arms race in outer space
60. Dec.16 38/124 132-1 (US)
Declares that education, work, healthcare, proper nourishment, national development etc. are human rights
61. Dec.19 38/128 110-1 (US)
Development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new world economic order
62. Dec.19 38/150 137-1 (US)
Transport and communications decade in Africa
63. Dec.20 38/182 116-1 (US)
Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction

64. Dec.20 38/183M 133-1 (US)
Requests nuclear-arms states to submit to General Assembly annual reports on measures taken for prevention of nuclear war and reversing the arms race
65. Dec.20 38/187A 98-1 (US)
Urges intensification of negotiations to achieve an accord on a prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons
66. Dec.20 38/188G 113-1 (US)
Requests a study on the naval arms race
67. Dec.20 38/188H 132-1 (US)
Independent commission on disarmament and security issues
68. Dec.20 38/202 126-1 (US)
Strengthening the capacity of the UN to respond to natural and other disasters

1984

[selected resolutions]

69. Nov.23 39/21 145-1 (US)
Report of the committee on the elimination of Racial Discrimination
70. Dec.5 39/411 119-2 (US, UK)
Reaffirming the right of St. Helena to independence
71. Dec.5 39/42 121-2 (US, UK)
Condemns support of South Africa in its Namibian and other policies
72. Dec.12 39/62 125-1 (US)
Prohibition of development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction
73. Dec.12 39/65B 84-1 (US)

Prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons

74. Dec.13 39/720 146-2 (US, UK)
International action to eliminate apartheid
75. Dec.13 39/73 138-2 (US,
Turkey)
Law of the sea
76. Dec.17 39/148N 123-1 (US)
Nuclear-test ban, cessation of nuclear-arms race, nuclear
disarmament
77. Dec.17 39/151F 141-1 (US)
Request to continue UN study on military research and
development
78. Dec.17 39/161B 143-1 (US)
Commemorating the 25th anniversary of the declaration on the
granting of independence to Colonial countries and peoples
79. Dec.18 39/232 118-2 (US,
Israel)
Support of the UN industrial development organization
80. Dec.18 39/233 120-1 (US)
Industrial development decade for Africa
81. Dec.18 39/243 123-2 (US,
Israel)
Staff and Administrative questions regarding the Economic
Commission for Western Asia

1985

82. Dec.13 40/114 134-1 (US)
Indivisibility and interdependence of economic, social,

cultural, civil and political rights

83. Dec.13 40/124 130-1 (US)
Alternative approaches within the UN system for improving
the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms
84. Dec.13 40/148 121-2 (US,
Israel)
Measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist
activities
85. Dec.17 40/445 133-1 (US)
International cooperation in the inter related areas of money,
finance, debt, resource flow, trade and development

1986

86. Oct.27 41/11 124-1 (US)
Zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic
87. Dec.3 41/68A 148-1 (US)
New world information order, led by UNESCO to eliminate
existing imbalances in the information and communications
fields
88. Dec.4 41/90 126-1 (US)
Review of the implementation of the declaration of the
strengthening of international security
89. Dec.4 41/91 117-1 (US)
Need for result-oriented political dialogue to improve the
international situation
90. Dec.4 41/92 102-2 (US,
France)
Establishment of a comprehensive system of international
peace and security

91. Dec.4 41/128 146-1 (US)
Declaration on the right to development
92. Dec.4 41/151 148-1 (US)
Measures to improve the situation and ensure the human rights and dignity of all migrant workers
93. Dec.8 41/450 146-1 (US)
Protection against products harmful to health and the environment

1987

94. Nov.12 42/18 94-2 (US, Israel)
Need for compliance in the international court of justice concerning military and paramilitary activities against Nicaragua
95. Dec.7 42/101 150-0-1 (US sole abstainer)
A call for a “Convention on the Rights of the Child”
96. Dec.7 42/159 153-2 (US, Israel)
Measures to prevent international terrorism, study the underlying political and economic causes of terrorism, convene a conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of people for national liberation
97. Dec.8 42/162B 140-1 (US)
Financing the training of journalists and strengthening communication services in the underdeveloped world
98. Dec.11 42/176 94-2 (US, Israel)
Ending trade embargo against Nicaragua

- | | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|
| 99. | Dec.11 | 42/198 | 154-1 (US) |
| | Furthering international cooperation regarding the external debt problems | | |
| 100. | Dec.11 | 42/441 | 131-1 (US) |
| | Preparation of summary records for a UN conference on Trade and Development | | |
| | Necessity of ending the US embargo against Cuba | | |
| 101. | 1992 | 59-2 (US, Israel) | |
| 102. | 1993 | 88-4 (US, Israel, Albania, Paraguay) | |
| 103. | 1994 | 101-2 (US, Israel) | |
| 104. | 1995 | 117-3 (US, Israel, Uzbekistan) | |
| 105. | 1996 | 138-3 (US, Israel, Uzbekistan) | |
| 106. | 1997 | 143-3 (US, Israel, Uzbekistan) | |
| 107. | 1998 | 157-2 (US, Israel) | |
| 108. | 1999 | 155-2 (US, Israel) | |

The remaining 40 resolutions vetoed, related to the Muslim world:

Date/Issue	Resolution Number	Yes-No Vote
-------------------	--------------------------	--------------------

1978

- | | | | |
|------|---|---------|------------------------------|
| 109. | Dec.18 | 33/110 | 110-2 (US, Israel) |
| | Living conditions of the Palestinian people | | |
| 110. | Dec.18 | 33/113C | 97-3 (US, Israel, Guatemala) |
| | Condemnation of Israeli human rights record in occupied | | |

territories

1979

111. Nov.23 34/52E 121-3 (US, Israel, Australia)
Return of inhabitants expelled by Israel
112. Dec.12 34/90A 111-2 (US, Israel)
Demand that Israel desist from certain human rights violations
113. Dec.14 34/113 120-2 (US, Israel)
Request for report on the living conditions of Palestinians in occupied Arab countries
114. Dec.14 34/133 112-3 (US, Israel, Canada)
Assistance to Palestinian people
115. Dec.14 34/136 118-2 (US, Israel)
Sovereignty over national resources in occupied Arab territories
116. Dec.17 34/160 122-2 (US, Israel)
Include Palestinian women in agenda of UN conference on women

1980

117. Nov.3 35/13E 96-3 (US, Israel, Canada)
Requests Israel to return displaced persons
118. Dec.5 35/75 118-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli policy regarding the living conditions of Palestinian people

119. Dec.11 35/122C 118-2 (US, Israel)
Israeli human rights practices in occupied territories [same day, similar resolutions 35/122E 119-2 vote and 35/122F 117-2]
120. Dec.15 35/169C 120-3 (US, Israel, Australia)

Rights of Palestinians

1981

121. Oct.28 36/15 114-2 (US, Israel)
Demand that Israel cease excavations of certain sites in E. Jerusalem
122. Nov.13 36/27 109-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli for its bombing of an Iraqi nuclear installation
123. Dec.4 36/73 109-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli policy regarding living conditions of the Palestinian people
124. Dec.9 36/87B 107-2 (US, Israel)
Establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East
125. Dec.9 36/98 101-2 (US, Israel)
Demands Israelis renounce possession of nuclear weapons
126. Dec.10 36/120A 121-2 (US, Israel)
Rights of the Palestinian people
127. Dec.10 36/120B 119-3 (US, Israel, Canada)
Palestinians rights

128. Dec.10 36/120E 139-2 (US, Israel)
Status of Jerusalem
129. Dec.16 36/146A 141-2 (US, Israel)
Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip
130. Dec.16 36/146B 121-3 (US, Israel,
Canada)
Rights of displaced Palestinians to return to their homes
131. Dec.16 36/146C 117-2 (US, Israel)
Revenues derived from Palestinian refugees properties
132. Dec.16 36/1460 119-2 (US, Israel)
Establishment of university of Jerusalem for Palestinian
refugees
133. Dec.16 36/147C 111-2 (US, Israel)
Israeli violations of human rights in occupied territories
134. Dec.16 36/147F 114-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli closing of universities in occupied
territories
135. Dec.16 36/150 139-2 (US, Israel)
Opposes Israeli's decision to build a canal linking the
Mediterranean Sea to the Dead Sea
136. Dec.17 36/173 115-2 (US, Israel)
Permanent sovereignty over national resources in occupied
Palestine and other Arab territories
137. Dec.17 36/226B 121-2 (US, Israel)
Non-applicability of Israeli law over the Golan Heights

1984 [selected resolutions]

138. Nov.8 39/19 134-2 (US, Israel)
Cooperation between the UN and the League of Arab States
139. Nov.16 39/14 106-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli attack against Iraqi nuclear installation
140. Dec.5 39/42 121-2 (US, UK)
Condemns support of South Africa in its Namibian and other policies
141. Dec.11 39/49A 127-2 (US, Israel)
Rights of the Palestinian people
142. Dec.11 39/49D 121-3 (US, Israel, Canada)
Convening a Middle East peace conference
143. Dec.14 39/95A 120-2 (US, Israel)
Israeli human rights violations in occupied territories
144. Dec.14 39/95H 143-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns assassination attempts against Palestinian mayors and calls for apprehension and prosecution of the perpetrators
145. Dec.17 39/147 94-2 (US, Israel)
Condemns Israeli refusal to place its nuclear facilities under international atomic energy agency safeguards
146. Dec.18 39/224 146-2 (US, Israel)
Economic and social assistance to the Palestinian people

1987

147. Oct.15 42/5 153-2 (US, Israel)
Cooperation between the UN and the League of Arab States
148. Dec.2 42/69J 145-2 (US, Israel)
Calls upon Israel to abandon plans to remove and resettle
Palestinian refugees of the West Bank away from their homes
and property

The latest veto by the US was on the 5th of October 2004, which would have demanded Israel to halt all military operations in northern Gaza and withdraw from the area.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Daily Dawn, 7th October 2004. <http://dawn.com/2004/10/07/top15.htm>