

War-Drums Against Iran

"It is difficult to make prophecies, in particular about the future," the Danish humorist Storm-Pedersen once said. Indeed, the upcoming war against Iran has been prophesied for a long time. In the spring of 2006, Michael Rivero said that "there can be no doubt that a War against Iran will follow, the question is only about the timing." Then came Israel's new war [1] against the Palestinians and Lebanon, during the whole summer, a warfare full of war crimes and still no success for the Israelis. However, the war-drums are getting very much louder in February 2007. On the 10th, Guardian wrote "Pentagon plans for possible attack on nuclear sites are well advanced ... extra missiles have already been sent out. Meanwhile oil is being stockpiled ... Targets have been selected. For a bombing campaign against nuclear sites, it is quite advanced" [2]. Concerning the timing, the same article mentions "The present military build-up in the Gulf would allow the US to mount an attack by the spring. But the sources said that if there was an attack, it was more likely next year, just before Mr Bush leaves office." That, however, must be doubted, as Rivero puts it: "the military cannot maintain such a state of readiness for an entire year before acting ... The cost of getting those resources there is just too high. Deployed assets are deployed for one reason: to be used." If that is true, the use is imminent, scheduled for this or next month.

Déjà Vu: Weapons of Mass Destruction

We heard it all in 2002-3: It was necessary to invade Iraq because Saddam Hussein was in possession of weapons of mass destruction and would soon attack Israel. Now Iran is said to be about to create nuclear bombs, and its president is quoted for a desire to "wipe off Israel from the map." And Iran is claimed to be involved in supporting the resistance in Iraq.

In reality, Iran has, other than Israel, Pakistan and India, signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. This permits the civil use of nuclear power, which is all what Iran demands. There is no hint that its ambitions go beyond that – except for the paranoia expressed by some other nations. Disregarding if Iran really attempts nuclear weapons as the mentioned three states (nothing really points in this direction), the reaction of Western states expresses a deep hypocrisy. Perhaps having the bomb is a precondition for a change of attitude?

The elected president of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has been discredited for having made the remark that "Israel should be wiped off the map". He never said so. The speech, held on Oct. 25, 2005, was held in Farsi. A word-by-word translation of the critical phrase reveals the plot [3]: "Imam (Khomeini) ghoft (said) een (this) rezhim-e (regime) ishghalgar-e (occupying) qods (Jerusalem) bayad (must) az safheh-ye ruzgar (from page of time) mahv shavad (vanish from)." The President quoted Khomeini: "The Imam said this regime occupying Jerusalem must vanish from the page of time" (which is a fair wish, shared by all opponents of the apartheid regime, without expressing the wish to throw the inhabitants in the sea).

But while we are at it, there is one state, which was 'wiped off the map,' and that even by Israel: in 1948, the United Nation created the Palestinian state. And as the remaining Palestinian area was finally occupied in 1967, the UN prohibited any occupation of that area – today, more than ¼ million settlers live there, with an annual 6% increase. The Palestinian population has been confined to ghettos.

Building-Up the Conflict

Israel demands from its American colony that it leads a pre-emptive attack on Iran, otherwise they may themselves lead an attack on the nuclear research centre by Isfahan; and the Iranians made it clear that an Israeli attack will be regarded also an American. Moreover, the acting president Bush (so called because he has twice stolen the

1 [Israel's New War](#)
2 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/iran/story/0,,2010086,00.html>
3 http://www.aljazeera.com/me.asp?service_ID=13061

presidency) has made it clear that they stand close to their Israeli ally in case of an armed conflict. But the conflict involves many more countries than just the two: Israel and NATO signed a framework agreement toward the end of October 2006 [4,5]. It is the question whether Israel will perform a risky airborne mission or commit a false-flag attack of one of the ~50 American and British military vessels, which have gathered in the Persian Gulf since the autumn [6] and are continuously being enforced – and then, there is also one Israeli submarine. In other words, Israel may not even have to risk an attack on Iran and then let its allies get its young people killed.

“It is difficult to make prophecies, in particular about the future,” the Danish humorist Storm-Pedersen once said. Indeed, the upcoming war against Iran has been prophesied for a long time. In the spring of 2006, Michael Rivero said that “there can be no doubt that a War against Iran will follow, the question is only about the timing.” Then came Israel’s new war [7] against the Palestinians and Lebanon, during the whole summer, a warfare full of war crimes and still no success for the Israelis. However, the war-drums are getting very much louder in February 2007. On the 10th, Guardian wrote “Pentagon plans for possible attack on nuclear sites are well advanced ... extra missiles have already been sent out. Meanwhile oil is being stockpiled ... Targets have been selected. For a bombing campaign against nuclear sites, it is quite advanced” [8]. Concerning the timing, the same article mentions “The present military build-up in the Gulf would allow the US to mount an attack by the spring. But the sources said that if there was an attack, it was more likely next year, just before Mr Bush leaves office.” That, however, must be doubted, as Rivero puts it: “the military cannot maintain such a state of readiness for an entire year before acting ... The cost of getting those resources there is just too high. Deployed assets are deployed for one reason: to be used.” If that is true, the use is imminent, scheduled for this or next month.

Around Christmas, Reuters reported, “Iraq’s president protested the arrest by U.S. forces in Iraq of two Iranian diplomats U.S. officials say were seized during raids against Iranians suspected of planning attacks on Iraqi security forces.” In January, an Iranian consulate in Iraq was sacked by the American occupation troops [9] and they continued to declare that they could shoot on any Iranian if they saw reason to do so [10].

The provocation continues, as does the propaganda warfare in Europe, America and (of course) Israel. Only Russia and China does not join ranks. Russia has begun delivery of Tor-M1 air defense missile systems to Iran, so when the despotic attack on the country begins, it shall not be as simple as the offensive to Baghdad in 2003. Besides, both Iraq and Afghanistan has shown that you cannot win a war entirely by supremacy in the air. A year ago, Ahmadinejad said to Bush: “You can start a war against us, but it won’t be you who finishes it.”

Consequences of the New War

Both Israel and USA have talked openly about using nuclear weapons. Too long time has passed since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, now there is a possibility to use the old rusty ammunition – and there is little protest encountered, here on the threshold to what historians may later term ‘the third World-War.’ The *Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator* [RNEP] is a nuclear weapon that would burrow a few meters into rock or concrete before exploding. Fallout from the use of nuclear weapons against the Isfahan nuclear facility in Iran would spread for thousands of miles across Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. It would kill 3 million people within 2 weeks of the explosion and expose 35 million to cancer causing radiation [11].

February 11, 2007

-
- 4 <http://www.uruknet.biz/?p=m27688&hd=0&size=1&l=e>
 - 5 [Stop the War – We are at the Wrong Front](#)
 - 6 <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=20061024&articleId=3593>
 - 7 [Israel’s New War](#)
 - 8 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/iran/story/0,,2010086,00.html>
 - 9 http://onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/article_1639.shtml
 - 10 <http://www.ynetnews.com/Ext/Comp/ArticleLayout/CdaArticlePrintPreview/1,2506,L-3359545,00.html>
 - 11 http://www.ucsus.org/global_security/nuclear_weapons/the-robust-nuclear-earth-penetrator-rnep.html

American U-turn in late 2007

The content was no surprise in its content, but the fact that it was disclosed approaches a miracle: in early December, an American intelligence report said that Tehran is less determined to develop nuclear arms than previously thought - Iran halted its nuclear weapons development program in the fall of 2003 and the program remains on hold [12]. Quite stupid is the comment from the White House: "It suggests that Iran is susceptible to diplomatic pressure." Only since 2006 have the war-drums, here taken as 'diplomatic pressure,' been running on high speed. The report should have been known by their pResident, the White House (his secondary residence) further claimed, thereby admitting that he lied as usual when he threatened a nuclear war when warning about the possible 3rd World War, Iran's alleged persistence for nuclear arms might precipitate.

Was this a planned disclosure or quite inconvenient leak? Was it perhaps leaked by military circles in order to avoid further catastrophes after the unlucky wars in Afghanistan (in which Taliban now controls more than half of the area) and Iraq, in which the coalition of the no longer willing is slowly pulling out, soon leaving the Americans alone)? Was it perhaps a strategical movement to induce some false security in Iran in advance of the attack? So far, there should be no false security in Tehran. Israel has reacted disappointed to the development [13] and renewed its threat, if necessary to go alone [14]. To this threat you must remember that their colonial governor in America, even this Mr. Bush, has already committed the United States to 'defend' Israel in the event of wars, including wars that Israel starts (so far all the wars in which Israel was involved).

I recommend the warships in the Persian Gulf to increase their awareness to a certain Israeli Dolphin U-boat, also cruising there. A false-flag action, claiming the lives of hundreds or thousands of marines, may be imminent!

December 8, 2007

What if Iran really had Nuclear Arms?

Assume that Iran really had nuclear arms, what, then, could they use them for? An attack on the Jewish state would probably claim more Arab victims, whereas an Israeli attack on Iran with nuclear weapons, as openly discussed, is more selective.

May 23, 2009

Netanyahu's Crusade

As Israel itself has come under increasing criticism also from countries which traditionally have been more cautious to express negative remarks, it has taken three steps: 1) The Jewish lobby in all countries has been activated against all such reaction; 2) The Nazi Holocaust has been given maximal attention; and 3) the war-drums against Iran have been activated (when at all possible) even more. It is anyhow a big surprise to me that it has not been activated already. With the absolute refusal to restore Palestine (the neglected settlement freeze is only the tip of the iceberg in the continued ethnic cleansing), it can be expected that the Israelis need the war even more, to abstract from their own misdeeds.

Ahmedinejad is not my idol, but he has again lately been misquoted as in the 'wiped off the map' affair four years (which erroneous interpretations are still endlessly repeated by dishonest journalists). Ahmadinejad calls the "pretext" for founding the state of Israel "a lie," but he doesn't spell out precisely what he means by "pretext." In the context, the word seems to refer to the Holocaust, but arguably his reference to "a lie which relies on ... a mythical claim" could be about Biblical claims to the land of Palestine that Zionist organizations cite [15]. Of course, no mainstream media, devoted to propaganda, would print it, but I did not see the Iranian President trying to straighten the matters out. Instead he contributed further to the anger with this remark: "There are many .. similar historical events. Why is this one in particular so important to you? ... During World War II, 60

12 <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/930707.html>

13 <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1195546799748&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

14 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/iran/story/0,,2224052,00.html>

15 <http://atheonews.blogspot.com/2009/09/what-did-ahmadinejad-really-say.html>

million people were killed. Why are we just focusing on this special group alone?" [16]. Another desecration of the 'Holy Holocaust,' the excuse for Israel's ethnic cleansing in Palestine [17].

Then comes the question, if Ahmadinejad did something wrong at all. His new American colleague has finally understood that Iran has the right to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes. That includes a weak enrichment (3-5%). It is difficult to prove that more is aimed at (before it is too late?). However, let us not forget that the claim that they are doing so comes from a state that themselves secretly produced hundreds of nuclear bombs and refuses International inspection of their nuclear power station (at Dimona) through the IAEA. That state is itself the leading troublemaker in the world, a fact which its agents in press and policy have so far managed to conceal. Perhaps the public will someday wake up – by the explosion of an Israeli nuclear bomb.

It is unlikely that the Israelis themselves will carry out the military action against Iran. More probable is that they, possibly with the aid of their Dolphin submarines (in Germany purchased and half presented, in San Diego, USA, with nuclear missiles armed), will orchestrate a false-flag action in the Persian Gulf, whereupon the dear allies, to which we belong, will do the dirty job – easier to start than to end.

September 28, 2009

16 <http://politicaltheatrics.org/2009/09/24/ahmadinejadwhy-focus-on-the-holocaust/>
17 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Ethnic-Cleansing-Palestine.pdf>