

The illogic of Zionist warmongering against Iran

By Yuram Abdullah Weiler

2014-02-27

“The approach we outline offers the best chance to avoid military conflict with Iran. In fact, diplomacy that is not backed by the threat of clear consequences poses the greatest threat to negotiations — and increases prospects for war...”

— AIPAC leaders Michael Kassen and Lee Rosenberg¹

Despite appearances of a recent thawing of relations with Iran, full spectrum subjugation is still at the top of the U.S. agenda in the Middle East, and the Zionist entity plays a key role as Washington’s regional surrogate. The script calls for an unchallenged, nuclear-armed, western-aligned, “democratic” regional power to carry out dutifully U.S.-approved policy in the region while maintaining a modicum of plausible deniability for its patrons on the Potomac should their imperial plans go awry.

To maintain its role, the Zionist entity has spent a great deal of time and money courting U.S. politicians and over the years has become quite adept at lobbying, so much so that it has become difficult to see whether Washington is executing its own policies or those desired by Tel Aviv. Iran is a case in point. A brief examination of recent history reveals a number of convergences of interest between Washington and Tehran which could have led to warmer bilateral relations but did not. Among them were freeing American hostages in Lebanon, coordinating the supply of arms to besieged Bosnians, cooperating in the effort against al-Qa’ida and the Taliban in Afghanistan,² and supplying U.S. forces in Afghanistan with anti-venom for snake bite victims.³

Commenting on the snakebite anti-venom, and in stark contrast with the envenomous rhetoric from Zionist-affiliated politicians, lead researcher Hadi Zareh at Razi Vaccine and Serum Research Institute, the Iranian manufacturer of the life-saving antidote, stated, “We make this to save lives, and it doesn't matter if the person is Iranian or Afghan or American.”⁴ Contrast this with the vitriol written by American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) lobbyists Kassen and Rosenberg in a recent New York Times op-ed. Accusing Iran’s President, Dr. Hassan Rouhani, of brazenness for stating that Iran had not agreed to dismantle any centrifuges,⁵ the Zionist pair wrote, “The United States Congress should proclaim that Iran will pay a steep price for its recklessness.”⁶ However, a cursory examination of the Zionist entity’s own history reveals wanton recklessness, for which it receives from the U.S. billions of dollars annually.

The strategic value of the Zionist entity as a bulwark against Soviet expansionism during the Cold War can be seen without great difficulty, particularly against the background of irrational U.S. preoccupation with and overblown assessments of the communist “threat.” This obsession with communism helps to explain why U.S. officials downplayed the unprovoked Zionist attack on the American intelligence ship U.S.S. Liberty on June 8, 1967, killing 34 and wounding 174 crewmembers on board. The incident is quite revealing for it shows that the U.S. was willing to overlook a deliberate attack upon its military forces to avoid offending a “strategic asset,” and that the Zionist entity was prepared to use any means, even lethal force against its American benefactor, to achieve its objectives. “If it had been an Arab attack on an American vessel it

would have been an entirely different matter,” wrote columnist Alan Hart, “In that event there would have been saturation coverage with demands for retaliation.”⁷

It was the mission of the U.S.S. Liberty that precipitated the attack. Tel Aviv’s goal of a “Greater Israel” required the capture of the Sinai from Egypt and the Golan Heights from Syria, but Washington, fearful of Soviet retaliation, had agreed only to allow seizure of the Sinai, and had stationed the U.S.S. Liberty to ensure the Zionists would not attack Syria. This concession by U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, however, did not satisfy then Zionist war minister Moshe Dayan, who, knowing the ship would be monitoring his military communications, ordered the attack, which included napalm, on what was then America’s most advanced intelligence vessel, so as to eliminate this obstacle to his plans to grab the Golan Heights. Incidentally, Dayan had leaked his assault plans to the U.S. naval attaché in Tel Aviv, who, in turn, alerted his superiors in Washington. Apparently, Johnson caved in to the Zionists and allegedly sent a secure communication to the Liberty to leave the area, but the message was never received.⁸

In 1981, we again see the arrogant intransigence of this presumed U.S. ally. By that time, U.S. strategic focus had shifted to the Persian Gulf and the protection of its “vital interests,” namely crude oil, as a result of the victory of the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979 and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in reaction to Iran’s revolution. Having “lost” Iran, the U.S. at this point had three main goals: first, keeping the Soviets out of the Persian Gulf; second, keeping the sea lanes open for oil shipped by its Persian Gulf allies; and third, containing the Islamic Revolution in Iran. To achieve the last goal, the U.S. had enlisted the help of Iraq’s dictator Saddam to attack Iran, providing him with a broad range of military support⁹ that included chemical weapons of mass destruction, some 100,000 of which were used against Iran.¹⁰

When the Zionist regime launched an air strike on Iraq’s Osirak reactor on June 7, 1981 without Washington’s blessing, there was serious talk among Reagan’s White House staff, mainly led by then Vice President George H.W. Bush and Chief of Staff James Baker, about the need to take punitive measures against the Zionists for their unauthorized surprise raid on the U.S. pseudo-ally. As a result, then U.S. representative to the U.N. Jeanne Kirkpatrick voted on June 19, 1981 in favor of a Security Council resolution condemning the attack by the Israeli entity.¹¹ Calling the incident a “premeditated Israeli air attack on Iraqi nuclear installations,” the text of Security Council Resolution 487 noted that while Iraq had accepted IAEA safeguards on its nuclear activities, the Zionist regime had “not adhered to the non-proliferation Treaty,” and urged Tel Aviv “to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.”¹² To date, as is well known, the Israeli entity has repeatedly thumbed its nose at the Board of Governors of the IAEA, with the tacit approval of its enablers in Washington.

Unbridled by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the “coalition” defeat of Saddam in the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the Israeli entity moved quickly to consolidate its regional hegemony after the Cold War.¹³ In 1995 when forces of reconciliation between Washington and Tehran arose, they were swiftly curtailed by the efforts of the “Israel Lobby.” Iranian President Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani had extended an invitation to American oil companies to return to Iran, resulting in a \$1 billion contract with Conoco,¹⁴ only to have the deal killed by U.S. President Clinton, who yielded to pressures mounted by AIPAC and other Zionist lobbying organizations. “We invited an American firm and entered into a deal for \$1 billion,” former President Rafsanjani said,

adding, “This was a message to the United States, which was not correctly understood.”¹⁵ By 1996, a senior staffer at AIPAC had drafted the Libya Sanctions Act which instituted secondary sanctions on investments in Iran’s energy sector and served as a basis for an ever-increasing U.S. sanction regimen against Iran that remains in force,¹⁶ except for some miniscule relief measures granted as a result of the Geneva agreement on Iran’s nuclear program.

Moreover, some U.S. lawmakers, headed by Republican Senate leader Mitch McConnell under pressure from the Zionist lobby, are seeking to revive stalled legislation to authorize additional economic sanctions on Iran. Leading the drive are New Jersey Democrat Robert Menendez, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Illinois Republican Senator Mark Kirk,¹⁷ who happens to be the number one recipient of contributions from Zionist political action committees,¹⁸ with Menendez coming in second in 2012,¹⁹ and McConnell not far behind. Interestingly enough, U.S. President Obama himself is in fourth place for cumulative Zionist PAC campaign funding while hawkish Arizona Republican Senator John McCain is in fifth.²⁰

The illogic of this Zionist warmongering approach follows from its self-defeating nature. First, the Israeli entity does not have the requisite ordnance to inflict significant damage upon Iran’s hardened nuclear sites. Second, instead of crippling the Iranian economy as desired, the ever-tougher sanctions have had the opposite effect of making the Islamic Republic more self-sufficient. Third, and despite the squawking by chicken hawks to the contrary, any unilateral military action against Iran would not only backfire, but, as a consequence of international outrage, would also lead to further condemnation and isolation of the Zionist entity, and a more rapid collapse of their already tenuous economic sanctions regimen.²¹

Endnotes

¹ Michael Kassen and Lee Rosenberg, “Don’t Let Up on Iran,” *New York Times*, February 21, 2014, accessed February 26, 2014, http://mobile.nytimes.com/2014/02/22/opinion/dont-let-up-on-iran.html?_r=0&referrer=.

² Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, *Going to Tehran: Why the United States Must Come to Terms with the Islamic Republic of Iran* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2013), 283.

³ Jason D. Heiner, MD; Vikhyat S. Bebarta, MD; Shawn M. Varney, MD; Jason D. Bothwell, MD; and Aaron J. Cronin, PA-C, “Clinical Effects and Antivenom Use for Snake Bite Victims Treated at Three US Hospitals in Afghanistan,” *Wilderness & Environmental Medicine* (2013): 2, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1197&context=usarmyresearch>.

⁴ Michael M. Phillips And Farnaz Fassihi, “Snake Tale: How Venom Binds U.S., Iran,” *Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 2012, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424127887323830404578145561189737342>.

⁵ Staff, “Iranian Leaders Draw Red Lines Against Concessions on Plutonium Production Reactor, Uranium Enrichment, & Ballistic Missile Development,” *The Tower Magazine*, February 14, 2014, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.thetower.org/iranian-leaders-draw-red-lines-concessions-plutonium-production-reactor-uranium-enrichment-ballistic-missile-development/>.

⁶ Michael Kassen and Lee Rosenberg, *ibid.*

⁷ Alan Hart, “Israel’s Attack on USS Liberty – The Full Story,” *Veterans Today*, June 7, 2012, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.veteranstoday.com/2012/06/07/alan-hart-israels-attack-on-the-uss-liberty-the-full-story/>.

⁸ Alan Hart, *ibid.*

⁹ Alan Friedman, *Spider’s Web: the secret history of how the White House illegally armed Iraq* (New York: Bantam, 1993), xvi.

¹⁰ Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, *ibid.*, 23.

¹¹ Alan Friedman, *ibid.*, 3-5.

¹² United Nations Security Council Resolution 487, June 19, 1981, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/d744b47860e5c97e85256c40005d01d6/6c57312cc8bd93ca852560df00653995>.

¹³ Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, *ibid.*, 308.

¹⁴ Ervand Abrahamian, *A History of Modern Iran* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 185.

¹⁵ Elaine Sciolino, "Iranian Leader Says U.S. Move on Oil Deal Wrecked Chance to Improve Ties," *New York Times*, May 16, 1995, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/05/16/world/iranian-leader-says-us-move-on-oil-deal-wrecked-chance-to-improve-ties.html>.

¹⁶ Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, *ibid.*, 310.

¹⁷ Patricia Zengerle and Richard Cowan, "U.S. lawmakers seek to revive stalled Iran sanctions bill," *Reuters*, February 25, 2014, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/25/us-usa-iran-sanctions-idUSBREA1O1WP20140225?feedType=RSS&feedName=everything&virtualBrandChannel=11563>.

¹⁸ M.J. Rosenburg, "Mark Kirk Is AIPAC's Million Dollar Baby," *The World Post*, February 3, 2010, accessed February 26, 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mj-rosenberg/mark-kirk-is-aipacs-milli_b_448192.html.

¹⁹ "Pro-Israel: Money to Congress, 2012" *OpenSecrets.org*, March 25, 2013, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/summary.php?ind=Q05&recipdetail=M&sortorder=U&cycle=2012>.

²⁰ "Pro-Israel: Money to Congress, Summary" *OpenSecrets.org*, March 25, 2013, accessed February 26, 2014, <http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/summary.php?ind=Q05&cycle=All&recipdetail=M&sortorder=U>.

²¹ Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, *ibid.*, 311.