

Trump Team Targets Iran

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, October 17, 2017

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 13 January
2017

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

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

This article was first published on January 13, 2017

Saudi Arabia [dominates above all other nations as a supplier of suicide bombers](#), and [its royal family dominates as the world's top financial backer of Al Qaeda and other jihadist groups](#), but incoming President Donald Trump has chosen to lead his national-security team, only people who blame Iran and not Saudi Arabia, as being the main source of international terrorism.

All four of the persons selected by U.S. President-Elect Donald Trump for the top **U.S. national-security posts are committed to replacing the outgoing U.S. President Barack Obama's #1 military target, Russia, by a different #1 military target, Iran.** Iran has long been the #1 military target in the view of **Michael Flynn**, the chosen Trump National Security Advisor; and of James Mattis, the chosen Trump Secretary of Defense; and of **Dan Coats**, the chosen Trump Director of National Intelligence; and of **Mike Pompeo**, the chosen CIA Director.



Coats's appointment to become the DNI in Trump's Administration is a clear indication that Trump intends to **refocus American foreign policy away from Russia as being America's #1 enemy, to Iran as being that.** Like **Lt. General Michael Flynn**, who will be Trump's National Security Advisor; and like Marine General James Mattis, who has been selected to be the head of the Defense Department; and like the next CIA Director, Mike Pompeo; Dan Coats views Shiite Iran, and not 'America's ally' (the rabidly anti-Iranian) Sunni Saudi Arabia, as being the source of 9/11 and other terrorist acts against the U.S. and Europe. (However, [in fact, Al Qaeda is funded mainly by the Sunni-fundamentalist Saudi royal family.](#)) (Al Qaeda is a fundamentalist Sunni armed force, and it condemns Shiites; it is hostile toward Iran, not in any way an extension of Iran.) (ISIS, too, is Sunni-fundamentalist, and kills Shia.) And all four men have said that America should, at least at the start, try to work with Russia against such 'terrorists' (meaning mainly against Iran, which actually produces vastly fewer terrorists than America's Sunni-fundamentalist 'allies' do). Russia has long been allied with Iran, and could provide the U.S. government crucial help to conquer Iran. The idea is to persuade Russia to sell-out Iran, instead of for Trump's foreign policy to *start off* by continuing to treat Russia as being America's number-one enemy ([such as U.S. President Barack Obama did](#) despite [Obama's having famously mocked Romney's «Russia, this is, without question, America's number one geopolitical foe»](#)).

This means that President Trump intends to make a deal with Russia's President Putin, for Russia to separate from and isolate, and so allow America's (and/or Israel's) military to

defeat, Iran. (Invasions, after all, can be extremely profitable, for some people.) Also, for Marine General James Mattis and the entire Marine Corps, who have long craved revenge against the Iranian-backed suicide-bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983, conquering Iran would be a long-delayed sweet victory. (That terrorist act was against America's support for Israel against Palestinians, which was one of the very few anti-Western jihadist acts that were Shiite-fundamentalist instead of Sunni-fundamentalist.)

This foreign policy is based upon false assumptions, especially that terrorists are fundamentalist Shiites instead of fundamentalist Sunnis — such as they actually are. (All of the 9/11 hijackers were fundamentalist Sunnis, and 15 of the 19 were Saudis. Virtually all Islamic terrorists except against Israel, are fundamentalist Sunnis. That's just a fact — but one that the American aristocracy refuse to acknowledge publicly, because America's aristocracy is allied with the Saudis and other Arabic, fundamentalist-Sunni, royal families: America's 'allies' finance [Al Qaeda](#) and [other such groups](#).)

So, this is not a foreign policy that's actually designed to overcome the terrorist threat against the United States (since jihadism doesn't come from Iran but does come from America's Arab 'allies'), but it is a foreign policy that's designed to continue the pretext for America's overspending on the military (very profitable for the U.S. aristocracy). That, more than anything else, is what the U.S. aristocracy (who control the 'defense' firms such as Raytheon etc.) demand from their agents in the U.S. Congress and White House. Even conquering Russia (in order to take its oil and gas etc.) isn't as important to them as keeping the 'defense' (i.e., aggression) budget astronomically high. (Obama's method of meeting the aristocracy's requirement was to boost strategic nuclear forces against Russia and [to claim that he was doing it mainly against Iran and held no hostility against Russia. He lied in order to hide his plan](#) — a plan in cooperation with the Gulf Arab countries and America's vassal-states in Europe — to [conquer Russia](#).)

Here [with my comments in brackets] is from a speech that Senator Coats, the newly appointed DNI, delivered [in the Senate on 17 November 2015](#):

We, the United States, need to show the world that threats to our principal freedoms are entirely unacceptable. Unfortunately, President Obama continues to fail to provide the American people with the leadership we so desperately need...

President Obama, in a shockingly dismissive tone, doubled down on his so-called strategy to deal with this global threat. What has his strategy to date accomplished? Well, ISIS [the most-fundamentalist of all Sunni sects] has expanded into more than half a dozen countries...

Time after time, the President has shown he simply doesn't get it. In 2012, he boasted Al-Qaeda was on the path to defeat. In 2014, he dismissed the Islamic State as the «JV team», saying that ISIS «is not a direct threat to us nor something that we have to wade into». Last Thursday he said, «I don't think [the Islamic State] is gaining strength» and saying «we have contained them». What will it take for this President to wake up and see what is happening around the world as a result of the ever-expanding threat of ISIS terrorism?..

I called for a diplomatic effort to persuade Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Qatar [all three of which were actually allied with the U.S. in supporting Al Qaeda in Syria to overthrow and replace the Russia-allied Syria's legitimate government, which is headed by the non-sectarian Shiite Bashar al-Assad], and other

regions [all being Sunni] to join with us to resist more forcefully ISIS aggression. Last year I called for much greater security assistance for our potential partners in the fight against ISIS... I said we also needed to find effective ways to support and directly arm the reliable, vetted Sunni tribes and Sunni leaders in Iraq who are essential partners in combatting ISIS extremism that ultimately are Sunni Islam's greatest threat. [This is analogous to asserting that Dominionist fundamentalist Christians are 'Christianity's greatest threat' — the greatest threat to Christianity. One might as well say that Orthodox or fundamentalist Jews are the greatest threat to Judaism. But Coats is himself a Dominionist fundamentalist Christian — a member of the super-secret «The Family» group of Washington insiders who aspire for the U.S. to take over the world for Christians. And he's not saying that such Dominionist fundamentalist Christians are «Christianity's greatest threat».] ...

We need their engagement. They are in the crosshairs of ISIS. Why haven't they stepped up? [The reason why is that the Saudis hire jihadists to attack and overthrow only other governments, not their own; same for the Thanis who control Qatar, and for all the other Arabic royal families: to overthrow only foreign governments, not their own.]... As I said, we also need to find effective ways to support the Sunni tribes and Sunni leaders. [He wants only Sunni Muslims as allies; no Shiites — this means that the leadership in both Iran and Syria need to be overthrown, not worked with.]... I have called for increased specialized military action by our own Armed Forces — intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and special forces — not a massive invasion. [This is exactly Obama's approach.] ... Our bombing campaign — this strategy of bombing against ISIS targets — has been far from adequate. [He wants the Obama approach but more intense.]... Contrast this anemic bombing campaign with the bombing campaign before the first Gulf War, which was several thousand sorties a day.[He wants to get those American bomb-factories humming again at full capacity.] ...

My bill would... recognize the reality that exists here in terms of abuse of the Visa Waiver Program or the possibility of abuse and inserting terrorists into the United States... When introducing this, I remember the response: Oh, that is too tough. Nothing is too tough these days to keep Americans safe. ...

We need a comprehensive, realistic, articulate plan if we are going to destroy ISIS, and NATO action should be part of that plan...

Admiral Stavridis also suggests the possibility of forming some type of a coalition with Russia. We are seeing a strong Russian response today — last evening — once it was determined and proven the Russian airliner was brought down by a bomb and by ISIS. [He deceives there: Russia has consistently opposed jihadists and fundamentalist Islam itself; only the U.S. and its allies have supported jihadism, when it serves to defeat Russia or any government that's friendly toward Russia. Coats knows this.] ISIS has taken credit for it, and ISIS will receive the wrath of the Russian military as a result [again repeating that lie about Russia], in direct contrast to what we have done for attempts on our own people. I am not a big fan of Putin. I am not a big fan of the current Russia government. I spoke out strongly about Russia's invasion of the Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea, and have strongly advocated for Russia's diplomatic isolation. In fact, I so strongly advocated for it that Russia put me on a list of seven people who are banned from entering Russia for life. Well, I have been to Russia, and I don't need to go back. So it is no big deal. Apparently it was a big deal to them. But now we are facing an emergency situation. Russian forces are deployed in Syria. Russian efforts need to be coordinated with NATO efforts, if we go the NATO route. We are already coordinating in terms of some of our flights. As we learned in 1941, national emergencies can create strange bedfellows...

In conclusion, let me say this. In 2014, the leader of ISIS, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi,

said:

Our last message is to the Americans: Soon we will be in direct confrontation, and the sons of Islam have prepared for such a day. So watch, for we are with you, watching.

This is the enemy we are dealing with. This is not some vague threat; this is a direct threat. We have seen how they carry out their direct threats, and we stand in the crosshairs.

There is no evidence whatsoever that either the Iranian regime, or any other Shia Muslims, participated in, or knowingly assisted, the 9/11 attacks. The 9/11 attackers were 100 % Sunni and almost entirely Saudi — and the [9/11 Commission Report](#) devoted only two of its 585 pages (240-241) to the topic, «Assistance from Hezbollah and Iran to al Qaeda» and was unable to find anything against Iran other than the Iranian regime's attempts pre-9/11 to have cordial relations with both Al Qaeda and the Saudis. (The U.S. government never sought cordial relations with Iran, except when America's coup-imposed stooge, the brutal Shah, infamous for torturing all opponents, headed Iran.) Those attempts at rapprochement with the Saudis and their agents, bore no fruit. To the contrary, the Saudis, during Obama's regime in the U.S., increased their hostility against Iran. After 9/11, Iran sided with the U.S. even against Al Qaeda, but the U.S. government has even [blamed Iran for 9/11](#), while covering-up [the massive evidence that the Saudis had actually financed the 9/11 attacks](#). (The U.S., under Obama, even [sided with Hitler against Russia and Russians — and even against Jews](#). Obama was every bit as depraved a [liar as was George W. Bush](#), but depended upon votes from the opposite Party of suckers of the U.S. aristocracy.)

Regarding **Mike Flynn**, his international-affairs viewpoint is well summarized by the anti-Russian, but even more anti-Iranian, conservative commentator, Michael J. Totten, writing in the neoconservative World Affairs journal, headlining [«How Trump's General Mike Flynn Sees the World»](#), and it's remarkably similar to the views that were propounded there by Dan Coats. This is more an anti-Iranian neoconservatism, than an anti-Russian neoconservatism (which was backing Hillary Clinton). Flynn is [openly anti-Muslim](#), but that's only because he erroneously equates what is actually fundamentalist-Sunni Islam, with Islam itself; and then he misattributes Shia Islam — and especially Iran — with that (alleged 'Muslim' threat), and he assumes that the jihadists who endanger Americans, the actually fundamentalist Sunnis who are financed actually by the U.S. aristocracy's allies the Saudis and other fundamentalist-Sunni royal Arabic families, will somehow be able to become destroyed by an alliance between the U.S. government and those actual funders of jihadists (plus perhaps Russia, if Putin will agree to join Trump's war against IRAN — not against the Saud family etc.). It's stupid, but apparently it's sincere — not intended merely to advance Flynn's career serving [the U.S. oligarchy](#) (who are even more obsessed to conquer Russia, like Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton were hoping to achieve, than they are to conquer Russia). (Thus the U.S. aristocracy hate Trump's guts even though he himself is a member of America's aristocracy.)

Marine General James Mattis, whom Trump has chosen to head the 'Defense' Department, is similarly focused against Iran and Shia Islam (including Hezbollah) as the main source of jihadism, and as being America's number-one enemy. Consequently, on 4 December 2016, Mark Perry at *Politico* headlined [«James Mattis' 33-Year Grudge Against Iran»](#), and he attributed Mattis's obsessive hatred of Iran to the 23 October 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, by an Iranian, during the Lebanese civil war — an event

that had turned the Marine Corps (the entire institution) rabid against Iran. Perry wrote that «It was also this Iran obsession that led Obama to force Mattis' retirement back in January 2013». Referring to Obama's *National Military Strategy*, Perry wrote: «The gravest threat to America, according to the document, is not 'Iran, Iran, Iran' [as Mattis insisted], but 'Russia, Russia, Russia'». Obama [would not keep any general who failed to share his hatred of Russia](#).

At the far-right Heritage Foundation, on 13 May 2015, Mattis delivered [a lecture](#) in which he stated that jihadists are mainly Iranian or Shia (actually they're almost 100% fundamentalist Sunnis, not Shia, and that's one of several historical falsehoods in Mattis's lecture). The only other major source of it that he even identified there was «the Muslim brothers in Cairo for a year» — by which he referred to the [temporary Muslim Brotherhood rule of Egypt, from 30 June 2013 to 3 July 2013](#). He didn't mention there, for example, as being the main Sunni source of jihad, Al Qaeda, or ISIS — he gave as the main Sunni example of what he referred to as America's number-one enemy, or «political Islam», the one example in which it was democratically elected into power (which jihadist groups never are). He treated that «political Islam» which he identified as America's top enemy, as being a threat that comes from the masses of Muslims (the Sunni public for example who voted Mohamed Morsi into Egypt's Presidency) and not at all from the the Sunni elite (the royal families who own the Arabic nations that are allied with the U.S. aristocracy). He mentioned Sunni leaders only as being allies of America. Mattis is targeting only Iran's aristocracy and public, and their supporters abroad.

As regards the next CIA Director, House Republican Mike Pompeo, Ryan Costello of the National Iranian American Council, bannered on 23 November 2016, [«Trump CIA Pick Hyped Facts On Iran, Downplayed Costs Of War»](#), and he wrote: «Pompeo has been a fierce ideological opponent of the Iran nuclear accord and gone out of his way to work to roll back the multilateral agreement. Perhaps most disconcertingly, Pompeo has downplayed the costs of bombing Iran», and «fought tooth and nail to prevent the deal from being struck». Pompeo's record is clear that he wants the U.S. to invade Iran. Furthermore, «Pompeo's last tweet prior to his selection as Trump's future CIA Director stated 'I look forward to rolling back this disastrous deal with the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism'». This common neoconservative allegation — that Iran, instead of [the Saudi royal family](#), is 'the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism' — contradicts the massive and compelling evidence, but now the U.S. CIA will be tasked to go full-bore 'documenting' this vicious, and bloody dangerous, lie.

Even Donald Trump's opponent, the hater of Russia [Hillary Clinton, said in her private communications](#):

We need to use our diplomatic and more traditional intelligence assets to bring pressure on the governments of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which are providing clandestine financial and logistic support to ISIL and other radical Sunni groups in the region.

and,

[Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide.](#)

She never mentioned that those «donors» — as [Glenn Greenwald noted on 25 August 2016](#) — happened to have «[donated between \\$10 million and \\$25 million](#) to the Clinton Foundation, with donations coming as late as 2014, as she prepared her presidential run. A group called 'Friends of Saudi Arabia,' [co-founded 'by a Saudi Prince,'](#) gave an additional amount between \$1 million and \$5 million». Those same people who funded the Clintons and Bushes [had funded also Osama bin Laden](#). And, the Saud family own Saudi Arabia: [the Saud family and the government of Saudi Arabia are the same entity](#). Like bin Laden's former bagman said, «[Without the money of the — of the Saudi you will have nothing](#)». The Saud family are enemies of the American people, but to both Democratic and Republican Administrations, the Saud family, the Saudi government, are America's 'allies'.

Consequently, Donald Trump, like his predecessor, Obama, [blames Iran](#), not Saudi Arabia — not the royal Sauds, who own Saudi Arabia — for Islamic terrorism. Trump, apparently, shares President Obama's 100% backing of immunity for the dictatorial Saudi royal family's financing the 9/11 attacks and for their continuing to finance Al Qaeda and other jihadist groups. Obama had said that if the leaders of Saudi Arabia wouldn't be immune for perpetrating 9/11, then American Presidents could similarly be prosecuted by other nations, perhaps (for example) like for [Obama's bloody coup](#) overthrowing Ukraine's democratically elected and Moscow-friendly President in 2014. America's mainstream newsmedia [supported him on that immunity for all international leaders](#), and even Britain's liberal Guardian also [reported favorably on Obama's support for sovereign immunity](#) (which puts The West now against — for example — the Nuremberg Tribunals, as merely victors' 'justice' in the eyes of The West's aristocracies today). (Hitler would be pleased.) Obama's [blaming Iran for such jihadists](#), will thus almost certainly be continued by President Donald Trump, and there will be no '[draining of the swamp](#)' accountability, such as Trump had campaigned on.

Even the American public [approve of President Obama's Presidency](#); so, they're not bothered by his having [constantly lied to them](#). The 9/11 victim-families are thus chillingly ignored by both the American public, and the American [aristocracy \(who actually control the government\)](#). Trump need not worry, so long as his words feed the standard (aristocracy-created) myths, which both Trump and Obama do very effectively.

Maybe the only good thing that one can reasonably say about Donald Trump as U.S. President is that, unlike his electoral opponent Hillary Clinton, he's not [heavily committed to forcing World War III](#). In fact, unlike her ([and President Obama](#)), he's not (at least not yet) at all committed to conquering Russia. But still, America's [aristocracy rules](#); only now they're aiming to conquer Iran, instead of to conquer Russia. They've chosen a less dangerous, more vulnerable, target, for the time being.

But as regards destroying jihadists, that's still not their top foreign-policy, national 'security', objective. Conquest is. It's still a neoconservative regime, just a less dangerous variety of that.

The American people have already been conquered by the American aristocracy. It has been done by lies, and by the public's tolerance of being lied-to.

So, the people in Iran have sound reason now to be very worried.

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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