

Israel, Iran and the US: Who Will be Blamed for Nuclear War?

By [Jorge Hirsch](#)

Global Research, July 24, 2006
24 July 2006

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#)

The war on Lebanon [may well escalate](#) to [the point where the US](#) will [use nuclear weapons against Iran](#), in what would be the first use of nuclear weapons in war since Nagasaki. And the world may well blame the Jewish State [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#).

Israel's bombing campaign which is causing [immense suffering](#), is in blatant violation of the [Geneva conventions](#), and deserves the strongest of condemnations. It is especially important for the Jewish community today to distance itself from [Israel's immoral government policies](#) and [US's support for them](#). Many Jews are doing this [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), unfortunately, many are not. ["Thousands of American Jews clogged the streets"](#) in New York and elsewhere in the US [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), [\[5\]](#), [\[6\]](#), [\[7\]](#), [\[8\]](#) in [support of Israel's actions](#), reports the Jerusalem Post. Both Houses of the US Congress have just passed solidly backed bipartisan resolutions supporting Israel's actions in Lebanon [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), to "solidify long-term backing of Jewish voters" according to [the Washington](#) Post.

The irony is, Israel's war crimes are going to be dwarfed in comparison to the crime against humanity that would take place if the [US uses nuclear weapons against Iran](#). Israel, by its disproportionate reaction and by accusing Iran (without proof) of being behind Hezbollah's actions [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), will be seen as having played a key role if the conflict escalates to engulf Iran and the United States. Yet the motivation for those that want this to happen [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#) is *not* to [ensure Israel's hegemony](#) in the [Middle East](#), rather it is to ensure [US hegemony in the world](#).

Israel's Interests

It goes without saying that Israel would benefit from the destruction of Hezbollah. Yet it is hard to see how the [indiscriminate attack against Lebanon](#) that is taking place will achieve anything other than [strengthening the already strong support for Hezbollah](#) in Lebanon and elsewhere in the Arab world. Shmuel Rosner argues in a Haaretz OpEd that Israel is ["America's deadly messenger"](#), being used to promote Bush's ["democracy agenda"](#). It certainly appears that Israel's current actions are irrational and self-destructive. Unless [their real aim](#) is to [draw Syria and Iran into the conflict](#), following [directions from Washington](#). At the very least it is clear that Israel would not be doing this in the absence of a guarantee from the US that it will intervene if the conflict widens, which in any event [Bush has already publicly announced](#).

If [Iran enters the conflict](#) and shoots a single missile against Israel, [the US will step in](#) and destroy the military infrastructure of Iran by aerial bombardment. As suggested by [Seymour Hersh](#) and others [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), this is likely to involve the US use of [nuclear "bunker](#)

[busters](#)".

It has been predicted that if the US or Israel attack Iran, Iran will [unleash Hezbollah who will carry out devastating attacks](#) against Israel. "[Hizbollah was also seen as a means of tying our hands on the Iranian nuclear threat,](#)" says an Israeli official. Well, we are in the dress rehearsal, and we are seeing that despite all the hype, [Hezbollah is a paper tiger](#). Green light for the [Iran attack](#).

Iran's Interests

What is really unusual about the current flare-up in the Middle East is the barrage of strident denunciations against Iran, from the [Bush administration](#), politicians [from across](#) the political spectrum [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), [\[5\]](#), [\[6\]](#), and the mainstream media [\[1\]](#), [\[2\]](#), [\[3\]](#), [\[4\]](#), that uniformly accuse Iran (without presenting evidence) of being behind the Hezbollah actions. This has never happened before when there was [conflict in Lebanon where Hezbollah was involved](#), why now?

One argument is [Ahmadinejad's stated animosity](#) against Israel. However, that has been [Iran's stated position since 1979](#).

The other argument is that [Iran is trying to "divert attention"](#) from the [nuclear issue](#). That defies the most elementary logic. If Iran was really intent in getting nuclear weapons and destroying Israel, it would try to keep things as quiet as possible until it gets those nuclear weapons, [several years into the future](#).

The reality is that, whether one ascribes to Iran evil or benign intentions, Iran draws no benefit whatsoever from the current turmoil in Lebanon. Neither does Syria. Consequently the rhetoric from the US and Israel suggests a [deliberate attempt to draw Syria and Iran into the conflict](#).

US Interests

A US [attack on Iran](#) has been [predicted](#) by [analysts](#) for several years. The US policy vis-a-vis Iran is clearly directed towards confrontation rather than accommodation. There are many reasons for the US to attack Iran, including the control of energy resources, suppression of a regional power opposite to US and Israeli interests, etc. However I have [argued for many months that](#) the key reason for the US to seek a military confrontation with Iran is that it will ["force" the US](#) to cross the nuclear threshold and [use low yield nuclear weapons](#) against Iranian installations. And this is seen as essential to further [US geopolitical goals](#).

[The United States used nuclear weapons against Japan](#) not because it had to. It did so to demonstrate to the world that it was in possession of a new weapon that packed the destructive power of thousands of bombing missions into a single one. [To tell the rest of the world, beware](#).

Since then, it has spent [over 5 trillion dollars](#) in building up its nuclear arsenal, but nuclear weapons have become ["unusable"](#) after 60 years of non-use. [America has achieved nuclear primacy](#) but it is useless, until it shows that nuclear weapons are usable again.

Low yield [B61-11 nuclear](#) bunker busters have already been deployed, just in case

[“surprising military developments”](#) give rise to [“military necessity”](#). Once Iran is drawn into a conflict and shoots a single missile against Israel or US forces in the region, the US administration will argue that the next Iranian missile could carry [chemical](#) or [biological](#) warheads and cause untold casualties among Americans, Iraqis or Israelis. A low yield nuclear bunker buster will be touted as the most “humane” way to prevent further loss of life.

What could happen

In 1941, a [vast military effort](#) was started by the United States to create nuclear weapons, culminating in the Trinity test and subsequent bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. The effort was shrouded in secrecy and any [moral qualms](#) were set aside. [When it succeeded](#), it was argued that [many American and Japanese lives had been saved](#) by nuking Japan into surrender.

Any speculation during the period 1941-1945 that the United States had 100,000 people devoted to create a secret weapon million-fold more powerful than any known weapon would have been dismissed as the ultimate “conspiracy theory”.

Similarly, [much evidence indicates](#) that a deliberate project, shrouded in secrecy, exists today that will culminate in the nuking of Iran, to [“save lives”](#). Many are [privy to parts](#) of the plan, as [Seymour Hersh](#) revealed, only [a few](#) know the plan in its entirety. Low-yield [nuclear bunker busters](#) would be used, [untested](#) but as [reliable](#) as the untested [“Little Boy”](#) that leveled Hiroshima. Americans will buy the “military necessity” argument because it will be true: American troops in Iraq will be sitting ducks facing Iranian missiles, with or without WMD warheads.

After the US uses nuclear weapons again, it will have established the usability of its nuclear arsenal against non-nuclear countries. It will be possible to [wage war “on the cheap”](#), saving many American lives in future conflicts. “Support the troops” is the one thing all Americans, no matter how diverse their views are, agree on.

*It should not be allowed to happen. [The President has sole authority to order the use of nuclear weapons](#) against Iran. We know from previous actions of this administration what [Bush](#), [Cheney](#) and [Rumsfeld](#) are capable of. There have been [radical changes in US nuclear weapons policies](#) and in [preemption “doctrine”](#), and the Bush announcement that [the nuclear option is “on the table”](#). In response, *there needs to be a strong groundswell call to [restrict](#) the absolute presidential authority of this President to order the use of nuclear weapons against Iran.* By the general public, by [“antinuclear”](#) organizations, by scientific, political and professional organizations. To push Congress into action before it is too late. Without a “nuclear option”, the US will be more interested in negotiation than in confrontation with Iran.*

[Cui Bono?](#)

In the short term, Israel certainly will benefit from the destruction of Iran’s military capabilities.

But Israel will not enjoy peace as a result, because the nuking of Iran will create enormous animosity against Israel in the Muslim world and beyond. To the extent that the world buys

the US fable that the nuking of Iran was required by “military necessity” and not premeditated, Israel (and Jews worldwide) will bear a heavier than deserved brunt for having contributed to “precipitate” these events.

The US will reap enormous benefits. Flexing its nuclear muscle, it will establish its absolute hegemony in the Middle East and Central Asia and beyond, and gradually squeeze China and Russia into nuclear disarmament and complete submission.

In the end of course we will all lose. Because the nuclear genie, unleashed from its bottle in the war against Iran, will never retreat. And just like the US could develop nuclear weapons in only 4 years with completely new technology 60 years ago, many more countries and groups will be highly motivated to do it in the coming years.

Think about the current disproportionate response of Israel, applied in a conflict where the contenders have nuclear weapons. [10 to 1 retaliation](#), starting with a mere 600 casualties, wipes out the entire [Earth’s population](#) in eight easy steps. Who will be willing to stop the escalation? The country that lost 60,000 citizens in the last hit? The one that lost 600,000? 6 million?

As the nuclear holocaust unfolds, some will remember the Lebanon conflict and subsequent Iran war and blame it on Israel. Others will properly blame Americans, for having allowed their Executive to [erase the 60-year old taboo against the use of nuclear weapons](#), first [in doctrine](#) and then [in practice](#), despite having the most powerful conventional military force in the world. Others of course will blame “Muslim extremism”.

And then the blaming will wither away as a three-billion-year old experiment, life on planet Earth, comes to an end.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Jorge Hirsch](#), Global Research, 2006

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jorge Hirsch](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca