

The Iran War is on the Front Burner

By [Muriel Mirak-Weissbach](#)

Global Research, September 28, 2007

28 September 2007

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

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

Note: Readers are welcome to cross-post this article with a view to spreading the word and warning people of the dangers of a broader Middle East war. Please indicate the source and copyright note.

The war that Dick Cheney has been planning against Iran, has moved from the back burner to the front, and those who do not see this are either blind or complicit.

Military deployments are in place, as laid out in detail in a Sept. 16 feature by [Michel Chossudovsky in Global Research](#), while the statements of intent to wage war, issued by President Bush and Vice President Cheney, have been hyped in British and American news outlets.

The fact that war is high on the agenda, was denounced by the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Dr. Mohammad ElBaradei, who made a dramatic exit from an ongoing meeting of the IAEA board of governors on Sept. 11, in protest against the manifest intent of the U.S. and U.K. delegations, as well as the rotating EU presidency representative, to proceed with military aggression.

ElBaradei, who was so furious that he initially refused to talk to the press, clearly stated, in his Sept. 10 report to the UN body, that the course chosen by the IAEA, to proceed with diplomacy and inspections, was succeeding in providing the necessary clarifications of outstanding questions about Iran's nuclear energy program.

The IAEA chief's report reflected a recent agreement struck between the agency and Iran, regarding a framework for resolving all remaining issues, and, step by step, closing the file. ElBaradei stressed, "This is the first time that Iran has agreed on a plan to address all outstanding issues, with a defined timeline." He called for a "double time-out," meaning the suspension of Iranian enrichment activity along with a suspension of sanctions against the Islamic Republic.

Iran's ambassador to the IAEA, Ali Asghar Soltanieh, on Sept. 12, welcomed ElBaradei's latest report as a "major step forward," and criticized certain states (meaning the U.S. and the U.K) for "questioning the merits of the Iran-IAEA modality agreement." That agreement had effectively pulled the rug out from under those warmongers who argued that since Iran's program was military, it had to be stopped by military means. Since the IAEA meeting, ElBaradei has gone to the press almost daily, to reassert his conviction that, there is no reason to attack Iran on the nuclear issue; At the same time ElBaradei underscored that, despite the Iran-IAEA agreement, the intention for a US sponsored attack is being envisaged. On Sept. 17, he told the press:

“We need always to remember that use of force could only be resorted to when ... every other option has been exhausted. I don’t think we are at all there.... There is a UN charter and there are rules for the international use of force. I hope everybody would have gotten the lesson after the Iraq situation when we see a drama unfolding every day.”

ElBaradei noted that thousands of “innocent civilians [in Iraq] have lost their lives on the suspicion that a country had nuclear weapons.” He recalled that he had tried to continue inspections in Iraq, but had been prevented by the U.S. war. Now, he said, he was conducting negotiations with Iran, which were bearing fruit:

“I think what we need now to do is to encourage Iran to work with the agency to clarify the outstanding issues” in the over four-year-old IAEA investigation. He gave a clear time frame for results to be produced: “by November-December we will be able to know whether Iran is acting in good faith or not, and if not, then obviously we will have a different situation.... But people need to bear with us. People need to understand we are dealing with an issue that has a lot to do with peace and security and regional instability in the Middle East, and I would ask everybody to hold their horses until we go through the process.”

ElBaradei also addressed the climate of hysteria being created by the warmongers, and the complicit role of the media, which deliberately ignores the reality on the ground. “I have made it very clear that I don’t see today a clear and present danger in regard to the Iran nuclear program,” he said.

Then he characterized the talk of war as “a lot of hype” which reminded him of a statement by George Orwell to the effect that “in a time of hype, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act.” ElBaradei commented: “If that is the case, I will continue, I can promise you, to be a revolutionary by giving the truth in an objective and impartial manner.”

War Mongers of the World Unite

Due to the fact that the war party did not succeed in Vienna, to corral the IAEA members into endorsing punitive measures against Iran, the Bush-Cheney Administration announced that it would hold a meeting on Sept. 21, to discuss “broadening UN sanctions against Iran for its refusal to suspend nuclear activity,” as State Department spokesman Sean McCormack put it. The meeting is to bring together the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, plus Germany, the so-called 5+1. At the same time, the drumbeat for war became louder. Over the Sept. 15-16 weekend, the British press worked overtime to promote the cause of war in Southwest Asia. From the {Sunday Observer}, to the {Telegraph} and Sunday {Times}, the message delivered was unequivocal: “Bush Setting Up for War With Iran,” announced the {Telegraph}, while the {Observer} headlined, “Time Is Running Out To Avoid War With Iran.” The {Telegraph} retailed the line that the Pentagon had a list of 2,000 targets in Iran, adding that Cheney was committed to deploying nuclear bunker-buster bombs against presumed Iranian nuclear sites. The press also referenced the provocative Israeli strikes over Syria, as part of the regional war process.

Then, on Sept. 16, a bombshell was dropped from Paris. French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner (notorious for his endorsement of military interventions on “humanitarian grounds”), issued a blunt statement that France must be prepared for a war with Iran.

Although Prime Minister François Fillon later tried to water down the remarks, the message was clear. And no one could forget President Nicholas Sarkozy's recent visit with the Bushes at Kennebunkport. Following his return to Paris, Sarkozy, according to source reports, started sending notes to various European capitals, that the message he had received from Bush was that war with Iran was inevitable.

The French intelligence leak-sheet, {Le Canard enchaîné}, lent credence to Kouchner's remarks, reporting that the war against Iran is ready to go. It quotes a former CIA official who said that Israeli officers were lobbying the Pentagon and White House for a military intervention. In addition, {Le Canard} reported that Antonov jets had been leased in Ukraine and Belarus to transport US military hardware from military bases in Iraq, Central Asia, and Djibouti to the Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean. The same source also signaled the arrival of stealth bombers to Qatari bases, reinforcing the armada there.

Kouchner's remarks provoked a storm of justified criticism from those quarters seeking to avoid war, including Russia and China. As reported by AFP, as well as Russian wires on Sept. 18, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Alexander Losyukov lodged his protest in an interview with Vremya Novosti:

"The bombings of Iran would be a bad move that would end with catastrophic consequences... We are convinced that there is no military solution to the Iranian problem. It's impossible. Besides, it is quite clear that there is no military solution to the Iraq problem either. But in the case of Iran everything could be even more complicated."

He concluded by characterizing any U.S. military action as "a big diplomatic and political error." Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov also spoke out against all forms of military aggression, and the Chinese foreign ministry issued a statement saying the diplomatic course should be pursued. As reported by ITAR-TASS, Lavrov said that Moscow was alarmed by reports of possible military action. He made these remarks, pointedly, at a joint press conference with visiting French Foreign Minister Kouchner:

"The multiplying reports that some contemplate the introduction of military sanctions against Iran cause Russia's alarm. It is hard to imagine what this can be fraught with for the region... Russia remains committed to the agreement that the UN Security Council will not go beyond the bounds of supporting the IAEA... Not a single problem has a military solution, and the same applies to Iran's nuclear program."

Regarding renewed talk of sanctions, he said, "Once we have agreed to take collective action, and this agreement materializes as consensus work within the UN Security Council, what objectives does the introduction of unilateral sanctions serve?" We should never forget, Lavrov added, that "part of the agreement, within the framework of the group of six international mediators, that provides for wider dialogue with Iran, including on issues of regional security."

Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Liu Jianchao lashed out at Kouchner's views the same day:

“We should avoid threatening others with military actions,... We are opposed to military actions in dealing with international affairs... We believe that negotiations would be the best option meeting the interests of international community.”

But, in cheerful disregard for such informed warnings, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, en route to the Middle East for a round of cosmetic peace diplomacy, aimed at pacifying Arabs in preparation for the Iran war, lashed out at those seeking a diplomatic solution. She targeted the IAEA and ElBaradei in no uncertain terms:.

“We believe the diplomatic track can work but it has to work both with a set of incentives and a set of teeth... The IAEA is not in the business of diplomacy. The IAEA is a technical agency that has a board of governors of which the United States is a member...It is not up to anybody to diminish or to begin to cut back on the obligations that the Iranians have been ordered to take.”

Although she carefully tiptoed around Kouchner’s statements regarding the war with Iran option, Rice stated: “The key here is that we are committed to a diplomatic track but the President has not taken any of his options off the table.”

Back to the Drawing Board

The real script being prepared to justify a new war in the eyes of public opinion, however, is in the making, namely that Iran is responsible for rising casualties among U.S. troops in Iraq. According to this new Hollywood-style fiction, Iran has been sending in weapons, especially the deadly IEDs, to kill American GIs, and train Shi’ite militias to fight American forces in Iraq. Anyone with a brain in his head, or, a functioning Internet connection with access to international news wires from the region, knows that these are lies. of the same caliber as those churned out by Tony Blair in the months leading up to the war on Iraq that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq had sophisticated WMD, which could strike down the West in 45 minutes. Dick Cheney (the man who organized the stove piping of disinformation before the Iraq fiasco) is foremost among those propagating this line. On Sept. 14, Cheney delivered a speech in Grand Rapids, Mich., reiterating his harangue against Islamic terrorists, who, he claimed, seek to “establish a radical empire covering a region from Spain ... to Indonesia.” According to Cheney, this justifies which the war on terrorism anywhere, everywhere, and forever:

“Coalition forces [in Iraq] have ... conducted operations against extremists supported by Iran—a country whose paramilitary organization traffics in lethal material.”

The same day, the indefatigable VP addressed the Central Command, Special Operations Command and the 6th Air Mobility Wing at the MacDill Air Force Base in Florida. Cheney, reading from the same prepared text, said, “Governments that support of harbor terrorists are complicit in the murder of the innocent, and must be held to account.” Eager to clarify just whom he had in mind, Cheney again mentioned that it was Iran which was harboring the terrorists.

The “paramilitary organization” in question, to which Cheney and Bush have referred to on several occasions, is the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps, whose Al Quds (Jerusalem) unit they accuse of being involved of terrorist acts inside Iraq. Recent reports suggest that

the Bush-Cheney Administration was about to officially designate the IRGC as a terrorist organization, and that this decision would be followed by the imposition of sanctions including the freezing of IRGC assets in the US. Given that the IRGC probably does not have millions stashed away in accounts at JP Morgan Chase, or elsewhere in the U.S., such a designation would serve to justify moving militarily against its alleged positions, inside Iran or Iraq.

This, in fact, is the new scenario on the drawing boards. Gen. Kevin Bergner was sent by Cheney to Iraq, precisely to cook up some “evidence” that the Iranians were providing weapons and training anti-U.S. forces inside Iraq. Gen. David Petraeus and U.S. Ambassador to Iraq Ryan Crocker both supported this charge, in their testimony before Congress on Sept. 11.

Dovetailing with this new scenario, is the notion that Iran has been supporting the Shi’ite militia leader Moqtadar al-Sadr, in an internecine Shi’ite battle with the mainstream group, the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCIRI), which is part of the ruling coalition in Baghdad. Although rivalries among Shi’ite groups do exist, the version presented by the Cheney crew is just short of preposterous. First, it must be stressed that the government of Shi’ite Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, with SCIRI support, has been aggressively attacked by Washington as incompetent, and calls have been made for it to be replaced. Cheney’s candidate to replace Maliki is Ayad Allawi, a man of dubious connections, to say the least, but who would toe Cheney’s line.

Secondly, regarding inter-Shi’ite conflicts, it must be noted that al-Sadr announced a unilateral ceasefire—a cessation of {all} armed activities, including against the occupying forces—for six months. Iranian sources told me this was an explicit sign of support by Sadr for the beleaguered government of Maliki. Finally, and most important, Maliki has been consulting with the supreme religious authority of all Shi’ites, the Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani, in an effort to stabilize his government. Maliki went to Najaf on Sept. 5 to meet with Sistani, and, following the talks, told the press: I discussed with him the case of the government. I asked his help in forming a government and nominating new ministers, or if there is the possibility to form a new government based on technocrats. He did not indicate what the cleric’s response had been, Reuters reported.

Sistani’s role is crucial. His principled stance on the Iraq crisis, from the beginning of the invasion, has been that he would support a democratically elected parliament and government, in hopes that such a government would proceed to end the occupation. On several occasions, Sistani has met with different Shi’ite, and other leaders, in an attempt to forge national reconciliation. For this, he has been rewarded with a series of assassinations of his top aides, the sixth such murder executed just weeks ago.

The talks between Sistani and Maliki were prompted also by a serious crisis that had ensued, following clashes in the Shi’ite holy city of Karbala on Aug. 28, which had been characterized as fighting between rival Shi’ite groups. Maliki said he was considering giving these cities a special status.

“I am considering that holy shrines and sacred cities be peaceful places and disarmed of weapons and under the protection of the Iraqi army,”

Iranian sources told me that the clashes had been instigated by outside forces, not by any of

the rival Shi'ite groups, as the press had claimed. Then, on Sept. 13, the Tehran Times came out with a report indicating that the force behind the massacres in Karbala was none other than the Mujaheddin el-Khalq (MKO/MEK), the Iranian terrorist organization which, after having been protected in Iraq by Saddam Hussein, is now protected by the U.S. occupying forces there.

The Tehran Times political desk reported that three months prior to the massacre, "closed-circuit cameras captured a 23-year-old woman and 13-year-old youth who were gathering information about the various entrances to the Imam Hussein (AS) shrine. After their arrest, it became clear that they had been sent by the Mujaheddin Khalq Organization (MKO) to locate ways to sneak into the shrine for terrorist operations."

The paper described how the attack was planned. Members of Moqtada Sadr's al-Mahdi militia, trying to enter the shrine, were prevented by security forces. Then, clashes began which led to 52 dead and 300 injured. "At first glance, it seemed to be a clash between rival Shia groups seeking to monopolize power and another indication of the extreme insecurity in Iraq, especially in Shia areas," the paper commented. But, this is not the case. According to witnesses, large amounts of weapons were distributed to people near the Sadr group's position, giving the impression that that group had been handing out arms. Among the weapons were some made in Iran—to leave a clear lead. The Iraqi Interior Ministry has conducted investigations into the event, concluding that the MKO was behind the incident.

This incident, attributed by the Cheneyacs to "Iranian-backed Shi'ite factions inside Iraq," is being pushed into the stove pipe of disinformation, to motivate a military attack against Iran.

Within the US military, preparations for confrontation with Iran are proceeding apace. In addition to the detailed information provided by Global Research, noted above, there is the news, released by the Wall Street Journal on Sept. 10, that the U.S. is preparing to build a military base near the Iraq-Iran border, allegedly to intercept the flow of weapons into the country. Maj. Gen. Rick Lynch, commander of the Army's 3rd Infantry Division, was quoted saying the base would include fortified checkpoints as well as X-ray machines and explosives-detecting sensors. The base is to be placed just four miles from the Iranian border—a blatant provocation. The {Sunday Telegraph} on Sept. 16 reported that Gen. David Petraeus was going to visit London to brief Prime Minister Gordon Brown and others of such plans. Petraeus was expected, according to this account, to press the British to cancel their plans to withdraw 5,000 troops from Iraq, and instead, to deploy them along the border with Iran.

Iran's Version of the Olive Branch

In response to these preparations for yet another war, the Iranian leadership has been seeking ways to avoid a conflict which it knows would be catastrophic. In addition to Iran's overtures to the IAEA, Tehran has dispatched its diplomats to meet with key countries, including Russia and China.

Inside Iran, on Sept. 7, former President Hashemi Rafsanjani, now head of the Expediency Council, was elected head of the Assembly of Experts. Iranian sources have stressed that Rafsanjani, a moderate, has the full support of the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Al Khamenei.

At the same time, there has been a leadership change in the IRGC. Ali Khamenei, who is also

Chief Commander of the Armed Forces, named Brig. Gen. Mohammad Ali Jafari as the new commander. In his first press conference in his new position, Ali Jafari announced the military's readiness to face threats. "Relying on people's support that is organized within military framework, great intelligence superiority, and its missile capabilities, the IRGC is fully ready to defeat any possible aggressive move."

Thus, as the political leadership closes ranks, the Military prepares for the worst.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Muriel Mirak-Weissbach](#), Global Research, 2007

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Muriel Mirak-Weissbach](#)

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