

# Obama's "Coalition of the Willing" Against Iran?

Continuity rather than Change in US Foreign Policy

By [Ali Fathollah-Nejad](#)

Global Research, November 20, 2008

19 November 2008

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

*A Mere Atmospheric Change in Obama's Foreign Policy: U.S. London-Based Pundits See Rather Continuity Than Change*

*LONDON - After Barack Obama's victory in the U.S. presidential elections last week, discussions about what direction an Obama/Biden Administration is likely to follow are gaining momentum.*

Invited by the London Middle East Institute (LMEI) on 11 November to speak about the foreign policy of the next U.S. administration, the London-based American analyst Jonathan Paris anticipated an Obama foreign policy much in line with the one of the current Bush administration.

The main areas of concern, he asserted, would be Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran. Focusing extensively on the latter, Paris said that sanctions will be kept up with even the aim of aggravating those. Meanwhile, one should not "beg" Russia to join the efforts by the P5+1 - i.e. the five permanent UN Security Council members and Germany - to increase pressure on Iran. Rather would it suffice to wait for Russia to join an anti-Iran "coalition of the willing." Moscow has so far been reluctant to Washington's insistence to impose further sanctions on Tehran. According to Paris, who like Norman Podhoretz is an adjunct fellow at the neoconservative U.S. think-tank Hudson Institute, Washington's overall goal would be to "win over" Russia so to avoid any opposition to its preferred policies.

Drawing on Obama's campaign announcement to enter into direct negotiations with Iran, Paris stressed that this would test the Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei's willingness to come along. Although proponents of a thus-designed "overture" vis-à-vis Tehran expect the Iranian leadership to repudiate, other experts point out that such an outcome is far from obvious with the Iranians being seriously interested in normalizing ties with the United States. Paris reiterated that Israel could only attack Iran with U.S. support.

Paris, a Middle East fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations in New York from 1995 to 2000, stated that other spotlights would be Pakistan - which he described as constituting the "prize" -, "the most pivotal state in the Middle East," Egypt, with President Hosni Mubarak's succession pending, and Iraq where "corruption" of the Baghdad government would be the core problem without mentioning Obama's promise to withdraw occupation forces there. While tackling the so-called "rogue states," of course China would be a central focal point for Washington's foreign policies, Paris added.

## Multilateralism “Yes,” Multipolarity “Not So Fast”!

Paris, who is also a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London, classified a future president Obama opting for “cooptation” rather than confrontation, a characteristic attributed to the Bush Administration. While he approved multilateralism, he cautioned against multipolarity whose dawn he commented with occurring “not so fast.”

He described the decision-making process of the forthcoming administration to be “bottom-up,” implying that Obama will be very much acting upon advice given to him. Paris conceded that only “atmospheric change” would come during an Obama presidency.

A few days earlier on 5 November, Mark Fitzpatrick, at a panel on “nuclear futures after the U.S. elections” at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London, stated that establishing a weapons-of-mass-destruction free zone in the Middle East could not be found among the top-ten list of an Obama administration. Fitzpatrick, an American senior fellow for non-proliferation at the IISS, said that the main obstacle to launching a regional conference to such an end would be the lack of “mutual recognition” between Israel and Iran. However, he did not mention Iran’s “grand bargain” offer of spring 2003 to the U.S. which *inter alia* included a *de facto* recognition of the state of Israel. Washington at that time ignored this remarkable Iranian overture that included Tehran’s willingness to settle all controversial issues in U.S.-Iran relations.[1]

Fitzpatrick presaged that a future president Obama would command U.S. marines in the Persian Gulf to start communicating with the Iranian navy in order to avoid any confrontation provoked by misperceptions. In terms of nuclear disarmament, he proposed that in the first 100 days of the new administration, the U.S. could de-alert the status of its nuclear arsenal, but preferably doing so only when Russia acts likewise.

In sum, both London-based U.S. analysts did not signal any change of an Obama administration’s foreign policy stance especially when compared to the Bush administration’s second term. Their remarks implied that the U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS) of 2002 and 2005 which formed the basis of President George W. Bush’s foreign policy agenda and which included the Bush/Wolfowitz preventive strike doctrine would not be revised. According to veteran U.S. Middle East expert William R. Polk the removal of the George W. Bush’s NSS, which “threatens Iran with destruction,” would be an absolute prerequisite for any serious change in Washington’s world policy.[2] The American pundits rather upheld the belief that there will be continuity in Washington’s strategic outlines and actual policies with Obama and that the only change that could be expected will occur in terms of rhetoric.

### Notes

[1] See Gareth Porter (2006) [“Burnt Offering. How a 2003 secret overture from Tehran might have led to a deal on Iran’s nuclear capacity—if the Bush administration hadn’t rebuffed it,”](#) *The American Prospect*, Vol. 17, No. 6 (June), pp. 20—25.

[2] See Ali Fathollah-Nejad (2008) [“Iran Falling into the “Net” of a “Worldwide Policy”:](#) *On the U.S. Foreign Policy Doctrine and Its Present Dangers - Exclusive Interview with William R. Polk,”* *Global Research*, 16 October.

*Ali Fathollah-Nejad (M.Sc. cum laude, M.A., B.Sc., B.A.) was educated in bi-national study programs in France (Sciences-Po Lille), Germany (U Münster) and the Netherlands (U Twente) covering the fields of political science, sociology, law, history, and economics. His current main areas of research are U.S. and EU policies vis-à-vis Iran and the new geography of power in the 21st century.*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Ali Fathollah-Nejad](#), Global Research, 2008

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Ali Fathollah-Nejad](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)