

NATO and Israel: Instruments of America's Wars in the Middle East

By [Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya](#)

Global Research, January 29, 2008
28 January 2008

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)
Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)
In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?,
PALESTINE](#)

NATO's Role in the Middle East War Theater

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the iron fist of America, Britain, France, and Germany. These four Western nations are the pillars of NATO.

In the post-Cold War era, NATO has become an instrument in support of Anglo-American and Franco-German foreign and security objectives. Although intra-NATO differences exist, the interests of the U.S., the E.U. and Israel — which since 2005 has held a de facto membership in NATO — are interlocked within the Atlantic military alliance.

Two areas in the Middle East have been militarized by foreign powers: the Persian Gulf and the Levant.

In this regard, there have been two distinct phases of militarization in the Middle East since the late-1970s, the first being distinctly Anglo-American, going back to the Iraq-Iran War and the later being a unified NATO endeavour involving France and Germany as key players.

Although the militarization process in the Levant started after the Second World War with the establishment of Israel, NATO's distinctive role in this process took shape since the launching of the "Global War on Terror" in 2001.

Paris and Berlin reveal their functions in the "Global War on Terror"

The E.U., led by France and Germany, has actively supported Anglo-American foreign policy since the onslaught of the "Global War on Terror." This has resulted in the ever expanding NATO involvement in the Middle East and Central Asia.

Both NATO and Israel are slated to take on major responsibilities in forthcoming regional conflicts with Iran and Syria, should they occur. This is evident by the positioning of NATO troops and warships in the Middle East, Afghanistan, and on the borders of both Iran and Syria.

The 2002 Arab Peace Initiative: Entrapping the Palestinians in Mecca and via a Gaza-West Bank Split

In regards to Palestine, the chain of events that will be discussed will eventually lead to Annapolis. These events start with the 2002 Arab Initiative that was proposed by Saudi Arabia in Beirut during an Arab League conference in Lebanon. The Annapolis Conference

was only an extravagant answer to the carefully crafted Saudi-proposal, which was really handed over to the Saudis by London and Washington in 2002 as part of their roadmap for the Middle East.

To understand where the path advertised at Annapolis is taking the Palestinians and the Levant one must also understand what has been happening in Palestine since 2001. To get to Annapolis one must recognize what happened between Hamas and Fatah, the calculated deceit behind Saudi Arabia's role in the Mecca Accord, and the long-term objectives of America and its allies in the Middle East and the Mediterranean littoral.

First of all, America and the E.U. realized that Fatah did not represent the popular will of the Palestinian nation and that other Palestinian political parties would eventually take power away from Fatah. This was a problem for Israel, the E.U., and America because they needed the corrupt leaders of Fatah to implement their long-term objectives in the Palestinian Territories, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Middle East.

In 2005, the U.S. State Department, the White House, and Israel started preparing themselves for a Hamas victory in the Palestinian general-elections. Thus, a strategy was created to neutralize not only Hamas but all the legitimate forms of Palestinian resistance to the foreign agendas that the Palestinians have been held hostages to since the "Nakba."

Israel, America, and their allies, which included the E.U., were well aware that Hamas would never be a party to what Washington foresaw for the Palestinians and the Middle East. Simply stated, Hamas would oppose the Project for the "New Middle East" and what would be one of its consequential outcomes in the Levant, the Mediterranean Union. All along, the 2002 Arab Peace Initiative was a gateway for the materialization of both the "New Middle East" and the Mediterranean Union.

While the Saudi's played their part in America's "New Middle East" venture Fatah was manoeuvred, at a loss for better words, into fighting Hamas so that an understanding would be required between Hamas and Fatah. This was also done with the knowledge that Hamas' first reaction as the governing Palestinian party would be to maintain the integrity of Palestinian unity. This is where Saudi Arabia comes into the picture again through its role in arranging the Mecca Accord. Saudi Arabia did not give Hamas any diplomatic recognition before the Mecca Accord.

The Mecca Accord was a setup and a means to entrap Hamas. The Hamas-Fatah truce and the subsequent Palestinian unity government that was established was never meant to last from the day that Hamas was deceived into signing the agreement in Mecca. The Mecca Accord was in advance a preparation to legitimize what would happen next, a Palestinian mini-civil war in Gaza.

It is after the signing of the Mecca Accord that elements within Fatah led by Mohammed Dahlan (supervised by U.S. Lieutenant-General Keith Dayton) were ordered to overthrow the Hamas-led Palestinian government by the U.S. and Israel.

There probably existed two contingency plans, one for Fatah's possible electoral success and the other contingency plan (and more probable of the two) in the case of Fatah's failure. The latter plan was a preparation for two parallel Palestinian governments, one in Gaza led by Prime Minister Haniyah and Hamas and the other in the West Bank controlled by Mahmoud Abbas and Fatah. Mahmoud Abbas and his associates have also called for the

creation of a parallel Palestinian parliament in the West Bank, a rubber stamp all but in name. [1]

The Mecca Accord effectively allowed Fatah to rule the West Bank in two strokes. Since a unity government was formed as a result of the Mecca Accord, a Fatah withdrawal from the government was used to depict the Hamas-led government as illegitimate by Fatah. This was while the renewed fighting in Gaza made new Palestinian elections unworkable. Mahmoud Abbas was also put in a position where he could claim legitimacy for forming his own administration in the West Bank that would have been seen worldwide for what it really was, an illegitimate regime. It is also no coincidence that the man picked to lead Mahmoud Abbas' government, Dr. Salam Fayyad, is a former World Bank employee.

With Hamas effectively neutralized and cut off from power in the West Bank, the stage was set for two things; proposals for an international military force in the Palestinian Territories and the Annapolis Conference. [2]

The Annapolis Peace Summit: Foreshadowing events yet to Come

According to Al Jazeera prior to the Annapolis Conference, agreements drafted by Mahmoud Abbas and Israel called the Agreement of Principles guaranteed that the Palestinians would not have a military force when the West Bank is given some form of self-determination.

The agreements also called for the integration of the economies of the Arab World with Israel and the positioning of an international force, similar to those in Bosnia and Kosovo, to supervise and implement these agreements in the Palestinian Territories. It also becomes clearer with the revelation of this information why there was a need to neutralize Hamas and legitimize Mahmoud Abbas.

This is where France, the E.U., and the creation of a Mediterranean Union re-enter the picture. For years, even before the "Global War on Terror," Paris had been calling for a troop contingent from either the E.U. or NATO to be deployed in Lebanon and the Palestinian Territories. The people of the Middle East must open their eyes to what has been planned for their lands.

February 19, 2004, Dominique de Villepin stated that once the Israelis left the Gaza Strip foreign troops could be sent there and an international conference could legitimize their presence as part of the second phase of the Israeli-Palestinian Roadmap and as part of an initiative for the Greater Middle East or the "New Middle East." [3] This statement was made before Hamas came to the government scene and before Mahmoud Abbas' Agreement of Principles. However, it did follow the 2002 Saudi-proposed Arab Initiative.

It is clear, in this regard, that the events unfolding in the Middle East are part of a military roadmap drawn before the "Global War on Terror."

This brings us to Nicolas Sarkozy's proposals for a Mediterranean Union. The economic integration of the Israeli economy with the economies of the Arab World would further the web of global relationships being tightened by the global agents of the Washington Consensus. The Saudi-proposed Arab Peace Initiative, the Agreement of Principles, and Annapolis are all phases for establishing the economic integration of the Arab World with Israel through the Project for the "New Middle East" and the integration of the entire Mediterranean with the European Union through the Mediterranean Union. The presence of

troops from both NATO and E.U. countries in Lebanon is also a part of this goal.

Lebanon Déjà Vu: Internationalization of the Gaza Strip by NATO?

There is ample evidence that the 2006 Israeli war against Lebanon was planned by Israel, the U.S., and NATO. [4]

After deploying inside Lebanon in 2006 under the banner of UNIFIL, NATO was also slated to enter the Gaza Strip at some time in the near-future. Coinciding with the 2006 war on Lebanon, Israel was due to launch a major campaign against the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip. Israeli officials were saying that in the aftermath of the fighting between the Israeli military and the Palestinians that NATO was designated to move into Gaza. The Gaza Strip was viewed as the next destination for NATO “peacekeeping operations,” by Avigdor Lieberman, the former Israeli Minister for Strategic Affairs. Avigdor Lieberman was also the deputy prime minister of Israel at the time.

Avigdor Lieberman even insisted, in the presence of Condoleezza Rice and U.S. officials, that a military operation against the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip was “inevitable” and “the results of such a action should be the entry of 30,000 NATO forces [meaning troops] to deploy in Gaza” so as to prevent any further [Palestinian] armed build-up. [5] Amir Peretz, while in the post of Israeli defence minister, had also stated in March of 2007 that the Israeli military had authorization for fresh military operations in the Gaza Strip. [6]

The fighting that Israeli officials and military commanders predicted has occurred, but not initially between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The fighting unfolded between the Palestinians in Gaza and then the Israelis started their operations. The Israelis merely outsourced their dirty work to Palestinian collaborators in Gaza, such as Mohammed Dahlan. Even the Israeli calls for the internationalization of the situation in Gaza, like the situation in Lebanon, have been outsourced to Palestinian collaborators. Mahmoud Abbas, the leader of Fatah, has been incriminatingly following the U.S. and Israeli script verbatim.

Israel: The De Facto Arm of NATO

“Israel’s diplomatic and security goal...must be clear: joining NATO and entering the European Union.”

-Avigdor Lieberman, the Israeli Minister for Strategic Affairs



Israel has established a high-level military cooperation agreement with NATO. Avigdor Lieberman has stated that Israel is destined to become an outpost of the E.U. and a formal member of NATO. [7] The former Israeli minister also managed Israeli high-level contacts with NATO and the Iranian war dossier. He has been involved with the U.S. and NATO in regards to coordinated preparations against Syria and Iran.

Since the founding of the Jewish State, Israel has been perceived as a protrusion of the so-called “West” and its interests into the Middle East and the Arab World. Israel is an active member of NATO’s Operation Active Endeavour in the Eastern Mediterranean. Although Israel is not a NATO member, Israel together with Turkey constitute the backbone of NATO strength in the Middle East. Both Turkey and Israel are slated in the future to also take on major military roles in the Mediterranean region.

By the end of 2007 Israel started claiming that it was given the “green light” from the U.S., the E.U., and their mutual military body, NATO, to launch an attack against Iran. This would spark an all embracing war in the Middle East. The Israeli military has been training continuously and Israeli troops have been told by their superiors to prepare for an “all-out war.”

Creating Barriers in the Palestine Territories: Calculated Steps for the Future?

The Gaza Strip has been compared by many in Palestine and Israel to a large detention centre or prison. Movements are restricted, mobility rights are violated, and the whole area is surrounded by barriers and barbed wire. Portions of it are also still occupied by the Israeli military and used as buffer zones.

The West Bank is a vast area compared to the Gaza Strip. The Gaza Strip is also a fraction of the size of the West Bank. It has an approximate 360 square km (139 square mile) total area and shares a 51 km (32 mile) border with the Israelis. The West Bank on the other hand has an official 5,949 square km (2,297 mile) total area. It is far easier to control or seal off the smaller Gaza border for the Israeli military than the West Bank. In regards to the demographics of the Israeli military and Israeli manpower the case is the same. In this sense sealing off and manning Gaza would be the easier of the two areas.

In the West Bank it will be Fatah with the help of foreign troops that will be used to restrain Palestinian fighters in the event of a broader Middle Eastern war. The venture to internationalize the situation in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank with foreign troops from NATO and Arab nations can also be seen as part of the effort to create a military barrier for Israel.

Gabi Ashkenazi, an Israeli general of mixed Bulgarian and Syrian descent, with ground experience in Lebanon as a supervisor of the South Lebanon Army (SLA) has succeeded Daniel Halutz as the head of the Israeli military. Ashkenazi was placed in charge of building the barrier, widely talked about as the “Apartheid Wall,” between the West Bank and Israel. Although not complete, the Apartheid Wall in the event of a regional war, would also obstruct Palestinian fighters from crossing the West Bank and fighting Israeli forces.

Creating Additional Barriers between Lebanon and Israel

The post-2006 UNIFIL that deployed to South Lebanon after the Israeli bombardment of Lebanon is not the same as the pre-2006 UNIFIL. It is a more robust and battle-ready entity and it too can be used as a shield for Israel and against the Lebanese in the case of a regional war launched by Israel.

Another important point is the Israeli military’s firing of about 3 million (or more) American-supplied cluster bombs into South Lebanon during the 2006 war against Lebanon. What came across as extremely sinister was the Israeli rush to saturate South Lebanon with these

cluster bombs when the Israeli 2006 attacks on Lebanon were drawing to an end. South Lebanon's geography gives a partial explanation; it is the region of Lebanon which borders Israel.

The mass ejection of the Israeli cluster bombs into South Lebanon was a calculated move to create another Israeli barrier from potential combatants in a future Middle Eastern war. These cluster bombs have basically become landmines that will prevent a wave of Lebanese fighters from crossing into Israel in the case of a major war against Iran, Syria, the Palestinians, and Lebanon.

Regional War Scenario: Israeli Preparations for a Retaliatory Missile Storm

The Project for a "New Middle East" will come at a high price and that price is war. The militarization of the Gaza Strip is multi-faceted in rationale and is linked to preparations for a broader Middle Eastern conflict. The deployment of foreign troops to the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, like in Lebanon, and the walling up of the West Bank also serve the purpose of keeping the Palestinians at bay should a major war break out in the Middle East between Israel, America, and NATO on one side and Syria, Iran, and their allies on the other.

The rationale for this analysis is based on the fact that a war against Iran and Syria would reduce and weaken the Israeli military: Iranian ballistic missiles would leave Israeli forces exposed and the different Palestinian resistance groups are well aware of this. If a regional war were to break out between Israel and Iran and Syria, the Palestinians could be elevated to an almost equal fighting status on the ground with the Israelis in the Palestinian Territories. The dynamics of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians would be transformed overnight.

Divisions amongst the Lebanese and the Palestinians would obstruct the effectiveness of a combined military endeavour against Israel in the case of a broader regional war. The situation is the same as in Iraq: the more divided the Iraqis are the weaker their war effort would be against the U.S. and its allies occupying Iraq. Aside from Palestine, the Nakba has been repeated in Iraq. There should be no mistake about it, the occupations of Palestine and Iraq are from the same cloth and architects. Bilad Al-Sham, Iraq, and their peoples suffer from the same source.

Does a Link exist between Talks of a Palestinian Nation and War?

"The war we [Israel] are waging in the Middle East is not a war of the State of Israel alone (...) and we [Israel] are situated on the front lines."

- Avigdor Lieberman, the Minister for Strategic Affairs

Following the Hariri assassination, France and Germany have become more active in the diplomatic waltz of the Middle East. Franco-German resources are fully active in alignment with Anglo-American interests on the diplomatic front. Before going to Egypt on a state visit, Chancellor Angela Merkel declared that Germany and the E.U. would restart the Arab-Israeli peace process. [8] Franco-German diplomats and the E.U. have also harmonized their efforts with Saudi Arabia in regards to mollifying the Palestinians. [9]

Many parallels can be drawn between the march to war of 2002 and 2003 in relation to Iraq and the ongoing march to war against Syria and Iran. One of these parallels was the White

House initiative to revive a so-called “Arab-Israeli peace process” and to help establish an independent Palestinian State before the Anglo-American invasion of Iraq.

There is a strong relationship between American wars in the Middle East and overtures of Palestinian statehood to the Arabs. The Oslo Accords were also linked to the 1991 defeat of Iraq in the Gulf War. Is this why George W. Bush Jr. talked more about the threat from Iran than about peace during his presidential tour of the Middle East and his visit to Israel?

One of the rationales for U.S. statements about statehood for the Palestinians, a façade, was to ensure that none of the client governments in the Arab World would be displaced through revolts by Arab populations and replaced. The Palestinian Question and support for the Palestinians is an issue that can win or lose hearts and minds in the Arab World and with many Muslim populations. The notion is that while there is temporary silence on the Palestinian front, new fronts may be opened without creating a massive outburst in the Middle East and elsewhere.

NATO-Israeli War Consultation at NATO Headquarters in Brussels

A consistent pattern is unfolding involving NATO, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the “Global War on Terror.” In late-June 2007, Avigdor Lieberman and Israeli officials had high-level meetings with NATO officials at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. [10] The Deputy Secretary-General of NATO, Alessandro Minuto Rizzo of Italy, and an Israeli delegation led by Avigdor Lieberman discussed the anticipated deployment of NATO units and forces in the Gaza Strip. [11]

The NATO Deputy Secretary-General and the Israeli side also discussed deploying an international force in Gaza to preserve order and prevent the Palestinians from arming themselves. [12] The meetings also pertained to Iran and the matter of air defences for Israel, and the deepening of intelligence cooperation between NATO and Israel. [13] Avigdor Lieberman returned to Israel from his meetings in Western Europe claiming on Israel’s Army Radio that the U.S., the E.U., and NATO had given Israel the “green light” to ignite war in the Middle East by launching an attack on Iran at an undisclosed time. [14]



In 2007 NATO gave Israel the “Green Light” to start a war with Iran at an Undisclosed Time

“Iran is a complicated country and it doesn’t seem that Israel has the power to counter [challenge] it.”

-Javier Solana, European Union Foreign Policy and Security Chief and former NATO Secretary-General (Der Tagesspiegel)

After returning from his trip to Western Europe and conferring with NATO Headquarters the former Israeli Minister of Strategic Affairs, Avigdor Lieberman, said on early-July, 2007 that he received the tacit blessing of the E.U., the U.S., and NATO to initiate an Israeli military strike on Iran. “If we start military operations against Iran alone, then Europe and the U.S. will support us,” Avigdor Lieberman told Israeli Army Radio, in a message geared towards Israeli servicemen, following his European tour and his meetings with E.U. officials, José María Aznar of Spain, and the Deputy Secretary-General of NATO.

Avigdor Lieberman also asserted that because of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq the U.S., Britain, and their European allies were unable to initiate a war with Iran and its allies, but were willing to allow Israel to attack Iran.

Avigdor Lieberman also affirmed that the U.S. and NATO would intervene on the side of Israel once the war with Iran and its allies were started. The message conveyed to Lieberman by NATO and E.U. officials was that Israel should “prevent the threat herself,” which means that Israel must launch the war against Iran and its regional allies. [15]

Israel will be protected by NATO in a war scenario with Iran and Syria

“The best way to provide Israel with that additional security is to upgrade its relationship with the collective [defence] arm of the West: NATO. Whether that upgraded relationship culminates in membership for Israel or simply a much closer strategic and operational [defence] relationship can be debated. After all, a classic security guarantee requires clear and recognized borders to be defended, something Israel does not have today. Configuring an upgraded Israel-NATO relationship will require careful diplomacy and planning.”

-Ronald D. Asmus, Executive Director of the German Marshall Fund’s Transatlantic Center in Brussels (February 21, 2006)

Israel can not challenge Iran militarily. Militarily Tehran is above Israel’s league, despite the illusions of Israeli strength. Tel Aviv will only launch a war against Iran, if the U.S. and NATO are partners in the military operation.

In such a scenario, the U.S., Britain, and NATO will immediately or almost immediately come to the side of Israel, as Avigdor Lieberman has stated.

This is a premeditated arrangement. The leaders of NATO will tell their citizens that Israel was compelled to attack Iran out of fear and because of its “right to exist.” Then they will close ranks with Israel. It should also be stated when a living organism’s “right to exist” comes at the deprivation of the “rights to exist” of everything else around it then it becomes a threat like cancer.

In March of 2006, it was reported in Britain that NATO officials had alluded that they would play a role in an Israeli-U.S. attack against Iran.

Sarah Baxter and Uzi Mahnaimi reported that Major-General Axel Tüttelmann, NATO Commander of Airborne Early Warning and Control Force (AWAC) assured Israeli officials that NATO would be involved in a future campaign against the Iranians. [16]

“[Major-General] Tüttelmann’s comments revealed that the military alliance [NATO] could play a supporting role if America [and Israel] launches air strikes.” The report also revealed that the Major-General was showcasing AWAC’s early warning surveillance plane to the Israelis. [17] The showcasing of NATO surveillance planes suggests the existence of joint Israel-NATO war preparations.

Strategic studies analyst Patrick Cronin of the International Institute for Strategic Studies also told *The Guardian* (U.K.) in 2007 that if Israel insisted on striking Iran, the U.S. would have to take “decisive action,” insinuating that America will enter the Israeli-sparked war on the side of Israel. [18]

Israel Working to Shape Strategic Atmosphere and Environment: But for Whom?

Napoléon Bonaparte once said, “International incidents must not be allowed to shape foreign policy, foreign policy must shape the incidents.” Whatever is said and claimed about this historic figure, he was a military genius and a grand statesman. In his life time the Corsican officer escalated himself up to the rank of a general and became the Emperor of France, King of Italy, Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, and Mediator of the Helvetic (Swiss) Confederation. His campaigns took him from the Pyramids of Mamluk Egypt and the hillsides of the Iberian Peninsula to the plains of Poland and the riverbanks of Moscow. He was a man of intellect who knew very well about the depth of international relations and the politics of incidents.

Were Napoléon Bonaparte still alive, he would not have been surprised at the events unravelling in the global environment, especially in the Middle East. Today, foreign policy is still shaping international incidents. Israel has been a battling entity that has been striving to sculpt and shape its strategic environment.

If the U.S. or Britain were to take the initiative to launch another war, their political leaders would face fierce opposition from public opinion, which could threaten the Anglo-American political establishment and even create national instability. But if Israel were to launch a war the situation would be quite different.

If Israel were to launch a war on the pretexts of defending itself from a growing Iranian menace, the U.S. and NATO would intervene to “protect Israel” from Iranian reprisals without appearing to have started another illicit international war.

Blame would be shouldered on the Israelis for the war rather than on the U.S. administration and its indefectible British ally. Western political leaders would argue that it is their national duty to protect Israel regardless of the Israeli breach of international laws.

Nuclear Armageddon in the Middle East: Israel to target the Arab World and Iran with Nukes?

According to Norman Podhoretz, one of the so-called intellectual forces behind the foreign policies of the Bush Jr. Administration, in the February 2008 issue of *Commentary Magazine*,

“The only alternative that seemed even remotely plausible to me was that he [meaning George W. Bush Jr.] might outsource the job [of starting a war with Iran] to the Israelis.”

Not only has Podhoretz called for getting Tel Aviv to attack Iran for the U.S., he has also argued that a nuclear war in the Middle East between the Israelis and the Iranians is inevitable unless Iran is bombed. This is despite the fact that the Iranian nuclear energy program has been certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as peaceful. Based on the work of Anthony Cordesman, Podhoretz has also brought up the notion that Israel will also have to eliminate its Arab neighbours, such as Egypt and Syria (even if they are Israeli allies and at peace with Israel like Egypt).

In Podhoretz’s own words: “In the grisly scenario Cordesman draws, tens of millions would indeed die, but Israel — despite the decimation of its civilian population and the destruction of its major cities — would survive, even if just barely, as a functioning society. Not so Iran, and not its ‘key Arab [neighbours],’ particularly Egypt and Syria, which Cordesman thinks Israel would also have to target in order ‘to ensure that no other power can capitalize on an Iranian strike.’ Furthermore, Israel might be driven in desperation to go after the oil wells, refineries, and ports in the [Persian] Gulf.”

Osirik/Osiriq Déjà Vu: Israeli Attack against Iran in the Works?

It should be noted that Pervez Musharraf started a tour of Europe in the same window of time as the presidential tours of the American President and Nicolas Sarkozy in the Middle East and the withdrawal of Avigdor Lieberman from the Israeli cabinet. [19] The aim of Musharraf’s tour is to coordinate with the E.U. and NATO in Brussels, as well as to visit France, Britain, and Switzerland. [20] Musharraf’s trip comes at a time when Pakistan is in a divisive political crisis and in the eve of Israeli calls for war with Iran.

The Secretary-General of NATO, Jakob (Jaap) de Hoop Scheffer, also visited the U.A.E. shortly after the tours of George W. Bush Jr. and Nicolas Sarkozy; de Hoop Scheffer told his hosts in Abu Dhabi that NATO would work in the Persian Gulf to contain Iran. [21] The Secretary-General of NATO also called Iran a common threat to both the GCC and to NATO members. Secretary-General de Hoop Scheffer’s trip and statements are in line with Anglo-American and Franco-German plans in the Middle East to confront Iran. While in the U.A.E. the Secretary-General of NATO also inferred that NATO would get involved in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, which as noted has been in the works for years. [22]

Alarming statements that have been insinuating a looming attempt by Tel Aviv to attack Iran have been made repeatedly since 2004 and have been getting stronger. At the 2008 Herzliya Conference, an annual Israeli conference on national security, John Bolton encouraged Tel Aviv to bomb Iran while mentioning the September 2007 Israeli air strike on Syria as a precedent for another attack. [23] In a state of irony, Ehud Barak started making claims in late-January, 2008 that Iran is in the final stages of manufacturing nuclear warheads while the Israeli government was announcing the success of missiles that carry nuclear warheads. [24]

Paris has also suggested that Israel will start a war against Iran; in an interview with *Le Nouvel Observateur*, Nicolas Sarkozy stated that the likelihood of Israel starting a war against Iran are far greater than an American attack on Iran. [25] The U.S. Homeland Secretary, Michael Chertoff, has also confirmed that the U.S. would not launch any attacks against Iran in an interview with *RIA Novosti*. [26]

Iran and Syria have stated that they are ready to protect themselves and would retaliate to any Israeli aggression. [27] All around the Middle East the forces that are resisting foreign control are on alert for some form of Israeli hostility. "If Israel launches a new war against Lebanon, we promise them a war that will change the face of the entire region," the Secretary-General of Hezbollah, Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah has also warned Tel Aviv in anticipation of renewed Israeli aggression in the Middle East during a public ceremony in Beirut. [28]

Israel: An Instrument of U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East

Tel Aviv has been justifying its opponent's claims that it is a tool of colonial projects in Middle East. The majority of Israelis are themselves being manipulated by a complex system that includes media disinformation, fear mongering, and longstanding psychological conditioning. Israeli blood is being used to oppress, kill, appropriate, and to fuel the engines of economic empires. Mercantilism is still very much alive, but in a mutated form.

Israel through its officials and government leaders is being used to maintain tension in the Middle East. Israel is an instrument which justifies Anglo-American and Franco-German intervention. Why else would the U.S. get angry with Israel because Tel Aviv did not endanger its own interests by attacking Syria during the 2006 Israeli against Lebanon and facing the wrath of an expanded regional war with Iran and Syria? [29]

Despite the demands and views of the majority of the Israeli population, Ehud Olmert, a man who was known for his corruption as the mayor of West Jerusalem, is still in the office of prime minister. Just as the democratic will of the American public has been ignored in regards to Iraq, the democratic will of Israelis has been ignored about the removal of Ehud Olmert. Like in many other places, the interests of the population of Israel are meaningless to the upper echelons of power. Israel's leaders do not serve the interests of Israelis, they serve the "Washington Consensus."

Ehud Olmert's coalition may last long enough to start a regional war. Prime Minister Olmert's political career is virtually over and he has nothing to lose from starting another war. Avigdor Lieberman, the man who led the high level consultations with NATO on behalf of Tel Aviv, left the Israeli cabinet during George W. Bush Jr.'s visit to Israel as a part of his recent presidential tour of the Middle East. Lieberman stated that his departure was because of "the peace talks" with the Palestinians, but in reality he took the decision because of the Winograd Commission and as part of a tactic to keep the Labour Party of Israel within Ehud Olmert's coalition government. This is a tactic to possibly give enough life and time to Ehud Olmert's government to launch a regional war by attempting to attack Iran.

Even the enemies of Israel agree that Tel Aviv is a proxy of Anglo-American and foreign interests. Rear-Admiral Ali Shamkhani, the defence minister of Iran in 2004, warned the U.S. government that in the case of an Israeli attack, Iranian military retaliation would be directed against both the U.S. and Israel. It is understood, in this regard, that were Tel Aviv to launch a war, it would need a U.S. green light before commencing the attacks. [30] The White House has also been fully involved in all Israeli missile tests and Israeli war preparations have involved joint Israeli-American coordination through such bodies as the Israeli-U.S. Joint Political Military Group. [31]

In the wake of the 2006 war on Lebanon, the Deputy Secretary-General of Hezbollah Sheikh

Naim Qassam (Kassam) declared in an interview given to Al-Manar Television: “Who started the war? Israel. It turned out that Israel does not respond proportionally, but rather executes pre-planned American decisions. The aggression was planned in advance.” [32] Sheikh Naim Qassam further accused “Israel of functioning as an arm of the United States.” Sheikh Naim Qassam explained that “Everyone has always said that Israel pulls America’s strings, but now it turns out that America rules Israel. Israel has turned into America’s arm.” [33]

NOTES

[1] Khaled Abu Toameh, PLO to form separate W. Bank parliament, *The Jerusalem Post*, [January 14, 2008](#).

[2] Emine Kart, Ankara cool towards Palestine troops, *Today’s Zaman*, [July 3, 2007](#).

[3] Dominique René de Villepin, Déclarations de Dominique de Villepin à propos du Grand Moyen-Orient, interview with Pierre Rousselin, *Le Figaro*, [February 19, 2004](#).

[4] Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, The Premeditated Nature of the War on Lebanon: A Stage of the Broader Middle East Military Roadmap, *Centre for Research on Globalization* (CRG), [September 10, 2007](#).

[5] Israeli action in Gaza ‘inevitable,’ *Al Jazeera*, [January 14, 2007](#).

[6] Tom Spender, Israel ‘planning Gaza invasion,’ *Al Jazeera*, [April 4, 2007](#).

[7] Avigdor Lieberman: Israel should press to join NATO, EU, *Haaretz*, [January 1, 2007](#).

[8] Germany to help renew Mideast peace efforts: Chancellor, *Xinhua News Agency*, [December 10, 2006](#).

[9] Angela Merkel sets off to Middle East, *Associated Press*, [March 31, 2007](#).

[10] Ronny Sofer, Lieberman wants NATO troops in Gaza, *Yedioth Ahronoth*, [June 28, 2007](#).

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] NATO: The US and Europe can not suspend Iran’s nuclear program, *Azeri Press Agency* (APA), July 11, 2007.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Sarah Baxter and Uzi Mahnaimi, NATO may help US strikes on Iran, *The Times* (U.K.), [March 5, 2006](#).

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Julian Borger and Ewen MacAskill, Cheney pushes Bush to act on Iran, *The Guardian* (U.K.), [July 16, 2007](#).

[19] Pakistan President arrives in Belgium for Europe tour, *The Times of India*, [January 2008](#).

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Indel Ersan, NATO chief urges cooperation with Gulf over Iran, ed. Andrew Roche, *Reuters*, January 24, 2008.

[22] Jamal Al-Majaida, NATO chief discusses alliance's role in Gulf, *Khaleej Times*, [January 27, 2008](#).

[23] Yuval Azoulay and Barak Ravid, Bolton: 'Near zero chance' Pres. Bush will strike Iran, *Haaretz*, [January 24, 2008](#); Israeli Transportation Minister, Shaul Mofaz, also indicated at the Herzilya Conference that the years 2008 and 2009 will also see the last diplomatic efforts against Tehran before an implied military option (attack) against the Iranians. The Israeli Transportation Minister also made similar threats before saying that sanctions had till the end of 2007 to work against Iran until the military option would be prepared. This prior threat was made as he led the Israeli delegation of the Israeli-U.S. Joint Political Military Group, which focuses on Iran, Syria, Palestine, and Lebanon. Shaul Mofaz was also the former commander of the Israeli military, a former Israeli defence minister, and hereto is one of the individuals in charge of the Iran file in Tel Aviv.

[24] Iran may be working on nuclear warheads: Israeli Defence Minister, *The Times of India*, [January 26, 2008](#); Israel suspects Iranians already working on nuclear warhead, *Agence France-Presse* (AFP), January 16, 2008; Lally Weymouth, A Conversation With Ehud Barak, *The Washington Post*, January 26, 2008, p.[A17](#).

[25] Sarkozy: France worried by Iran-Israel tension, *Associated Press*, December 12, 2007.

[26] U.S. will not attack Iran, *Russian News and Information Agency* (RIA Novosti), [January 25, 2008](#).

[27] Bush trying to foment discord in Mideast, *Tehran Times*, January 28, 2008, p.[A1+](#); Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, America's "Divide and Rule" Strategies in the Middle East, *Centre for Research on Globalization* (CRG), [January 17, 2008](#); Nir Magal, Syrian VP: We'll retaliate for Israeli aggression, *Yedioth Ahronoth*, [September 8, 2007](#).

[28] Hezbollah chief scoffs at Israel at rare public appearance, *Agence France-Presse* (AFP), January 19, 2008.

[29] Yitzhak Benhorin, Neocons: We expected Israel to attack Syria, *Yedioth Aharonot*, December 16, 2006.

[30] Anthon La Guardia, Iran wars Israel on pre-emptive strike, *The Telegraph* (U.K.), [August 19, 2004](#).

[31] Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, Israel's Nuclear Missile Threat against Iran, *Centre for Research on Globalization* (CRG), January 19, 2008; Hilary Leila Krieger, Mofaz warns sanction on Iran must bite by year's end, *The Jerusalem Post*, [June 7, 2007](#).

[32] Hanan Awarekeh, Kassem: If Israel attacks, we'll show them surprise, *Al-Manar*, July 12, 2007.

[33] *Ibid.*

Related articles from the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG):

[Israel's Nuclear Missile Threat against Iran](#)

[America's "Divide and Rule" Strategies in the Middle East](#)

[The Premeditated Nature of the War on Lebanon: A Stage of the Broader Middle East Military Roadmap](#)

[US, NATO and Israel Deploy Nukes directed against Iran](#)

[Iran: the Threat of a Nuclear War](#)

[More Smoke on the Horizon in the Middle East War Theater](#)

[The March to War: Syria Preparing for US-Israeli Attacks](#)

[Iran's "Power of Deterrence"](#)

[Plans for Redrawing the Middle East: The Project for a "New Middle East"](#)

["Triple Alliance": The US, Turkey, Israel and the War on Lebanon](#)

[Nuclear War against Iran](#)

[Planned US-Israeli Attack on Iran](#)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya](#), Global Research, 2008

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya](#)

About the author:

An award-winning author and geopolitical analyst, Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya is the author of *The Globalization of NATO* (Clarity Press) and a forthcoming book *The War on Libya and the Re-Colonization of Africa*. He has also contributed to several other books ranging from cultural critique to international relations. He is a Sociologist and Research Associate at the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), a contributor at the Strategic

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