## MY VIEWS

## OF KHOMEINI

What has happened in Iran, and what is happening there today, is no surprise to me. Several years have passed since the revolution, but matters still go from bad to worse. I cannot foretell the future, but I can interpret what I see. And I do not exclude some sudden and startling development. I do not exclude the possibility of the extreme Left grabbing power from Khomeini. I do not exclude the possibility of the Iranian armed forces making a move to end the rule of the Ayatollah. When everything has been lost, when darkness prevails and terror rules, then anything becomes possible.

When the revolution occurred, Khomeini claimed it was an Islamic revolution. I thought: "No, this is not an Islamic revolution. It is a Khomeinian revolution, built upon revenge, blood, and terror."

Khomeini was given a great opportunity to realize the dreams of his people. He could have built a great country. Iran could have become a miraculously strong power, respected by the whole world. Unfortunately, the chance was missed and Khomeini has taken his country down with him into the abyss. When he took over the country, Iran exported 7,0 million barrels of oil a day-worth about $\$ \Gamma \cdot$ million or $\$ V \Gamma$ billion in a full year. Did Khomeini need more treasure than this with which to build up his country?

The main objective of a revolution should be to look after the welfare of the people. But this did not happen after the revolution in Iran, for many reasons. Khomeini wished to build up popular support; so he called his revolution an Islamic revolution. This was a lie, as was proved when he turned to bloody revenge to settle his personal disputes. Khomeinfs style is not the style of Islam. It is also a fact that those who threw out the shah and brought Khomeini into power are Communists of the extreme Left. Khomeini welcomed their support at first; at that time he would have welcomed support from the devil himself.

When I saw he was being used by the extreme Left, and when I saw the methods he was using to rule the country, I forecast that one day Khomeini would be forced to drink from the same cup from which he forced the shah to drink. It is naive to believe the situation in Iran is directed solely by Khomeini. The truth is that the country is in the hands of those who brought him home from exile-those who blew up his party headquarters, killing dozens of his closest associates. Matters will go from bad to worse. Sooner or later those who are bringing about the chaos in Iran will overthrow Khomeini and take over the country. When Khomeini returned to Iran he was received with adulation by millions of people. But behind it all was the hand of the extreme Left. They had laid their plans at least a year before they brought him home.

The Communists began their campaign by fomenting discontent against the shah. They organized most of the demonstrations and the attacks on property. The shah's security forces were compelled to intervene, and this was then used as an excuse for the next day's rioting. The Communists
thereby destabilized the situation and took the initiative away from the shah. They went so far as to organize a huge demonstration of very young children, who were marched to the shah's palace in the hope that the shah would shoot them. The Communists calculated this would cause even more outrage against the shah and create chaos. That is what they wanted. The mistake Khomeini made was to rely on this same group of people who had created the volatile situation for the shah. He should have set them aside, but he did not. He forgot that those who brought him to power could just as easily throw him out.

The Communists are very strong. The proof of it came when Khomeini did finally try to escape from their grasp, and when they responded by giving him a terrible warning. They "blew up his party headquarters and left the bodies of his most important supporters and allies inside. This was done solely to demonstrate to Khomeini that they were in control and to show the outside world that Khomeini does not in fact rule Iran. That this has happened is Khomeinfs own fault. He failed to control the situation from the first. Had he done so, the crisis over the American embassy hostages would not have happened.

There was in fact a very close relationship between the embassy hostages crisis and the struggle for power in Iran. Those who created the hostage crisis were a group of leftist students. For one whole year Khomeini was powerless to intervene. The leftists laughed at him. The Communists were clever enough to inflate Khomeinfs importance by pretending their orders came directly from him. By using this pretext they were able to prevent government ministers and even the president from intervening.

Khomeini himself knew they were mocking him and that they would not adhere to any real orders he issued. The true masters of the situation were the Communist leadership. Anyone who understands the basis of politics will realize that neither Khomeini nor the president nor the prime minister rules Iran today. Those who rule that country are the people who control the mob.

I therefore challenge the claim that Iran has become an Islamic republic. I have studied Islam's role in politics and government and I recently read a book on the subject by Dr. Mahmoud Metawli. In it he demonstrates that there is in fact no Islamic political system. Our rules for life are based on the holy Koran; what we take from it is implemented without political discussion. A second element in the life of a Muslim is our interpretation of the practices of the Prophet Muhammad. This commits us to two things in politics: the ruler must consult with his people about his government, but decisions about government must remain with the ruler. There is nothing in the Koran that calls for presidential or parliamentary rule. So where does Khomeini get his idea that his is an Islamic system? There is nothing constitutional about what he has done. In any country in the world, there cannot be anyone higher in the political sense than the president or head of state-except the people.

During the pilgrimage season, the people of Iran have been taught to shout religious slogans that equate Khomeini with God. "God is great!" they cry, "Khomeini is great!" How can we accept as head of state a sheikh who wears a turban and makes a god of himself, who claims he is not liable to mistakes, and whose decisions are above question? Today, under many royal
systems of government, the king reigns but does not rule. Under a presidential system, the constitution provides for the president to be questioned. In Egypt, for example, I as President can be impeached. All these systems of government recognize that rulers are human. But Khomeini puts himself above all that. Is it possible to call this the rule of Islam?

Iran has fallen into complete chaos. Look, for example, at what happened to the Republic's first president, Bani Sadr. He was brought to office by Khomeini, then removed by him. In the first instance, $\Lambda \cdot$ percent of the population of Teheran were brought out to demonstrate in his favor. In the second instance the same $\wedge$ • percent turned out to demand his head. It is best that governments are not run by religious leaders. This is not to say a religious man should not rule, provided he has the necessary experience. What I reject is a ruler who comes to power solely because he is a sheikh with a turban. What is so horrible about Khomeini is that he fights with the sword of bitterness and ruthless revenge. The practices of Islam do not teach us to bring about a blood bath.

Khomeini could have ruled over a society as wealthy as any in the world. But he built up a system that was ignorant and corrupt. He went to war with Iraq, which destroyed his oil refineries. He has taken away his people's sense of values. He inherited large industries, but where are they today?

All this contributes to internal discontent. I hope that those who still believe Khomeini has brought about an Islamic revolution can now see this. If for only one hour there were the rule of reason in Iran, someone would stand up and say: "Look, people, we are one of the richest countries of the
world. How could this have happened to us? How can we have four and onehalf million people unemployed while during the shah's time we had to import labor from abroad? Why do we have to import petroleum products from abroad, when once we exported six and one-half million barrels of oil each day?"

Unfortunately, Khomeini has removed the rule of reason. I remember the same thing happening when I came to office in $19 \vee \cdot$; my own people were living on their emotions. I immediately called for the rule of reason and was faced with fierce resistance from those who had ruled Egypt through slogans. But I learned that the Left loses all its weapons when the rule of reason prevails. This is why they reject logic and organize emotional demonstrations based on slogans.

Do I think what has happened in Iran could be repeated in other Islamic countries? No, I do not. Personally, I think it is impossible. We live in an interrelated world, linked by speedy communications. Anyone who has followed Khomeini's revolution feels sorry for what will happen to the people of Iran. They do not wish to see it repeated in their own country. From the first, Khomeini uttered a huge lie, which he may have believed himself. He thought he had achieved a miracle when he took over the country from the shah. When millions came out to greet him, he believed himself a god. So he announced that his mission was not confined to Iran but would also be exported abroad. He involved the Iranian people in this mirage. But he neglected his country. So is it possible that any other nation could admire the experience of the Iranian people under Khomeini? Or think to copy it?

I sometimes wonder how it came about that the leaders of other Islamic countries remained silent through the chaos that was happening under the banner of religion in Iran. I am reminded of what happened last year in Mecca when terrorists seized the Prophet's tomb. The United States was the first to announce the news that this had happened. The Saudi authorities said nothing. Immediately, Khomeini seized the opportunity to say the United States was behind the deed. This was a serious accusation, but no one reproached him for it. In the end, I was compelled to do so myself, in spite of the silence of my Arab brothers. I also reproached my Saudi brothers because they did not reveal the whole truth of what had happened and failed to make it clear that the United States was not involved in the conspiracy in any way. The result was that some people believed Khomeini's accusations. Demonstrations erupted against the American embassy in Pakistan and in other Arab and Islamic countries.

I want every Islamic country to announce its rejection of Khomeini's abuses, his terrorism, his vengefulness, and the destruction that he seeks to export. I think the League of Islamic and Arab States could play an important part in this. I am not asking them to interfere in Iran's internal affairs but to recognize that we Muslims should abide by the teachings of our religion. When Khomeini stands up and says his oppression and terror are an Islamic revolution, we should oppose him and tell him that he does not represent Islam.

