

IRAN AND IRAQ: SOME LATER THOUGHTS

Written by

Tuesday, 18 April 2006 02:26 - Last Updated Tuesday, 18 April 2006 02:26

IRAN AND IRAQ: SOME LATER THOUGHTS

F.H. Knelman, Ph.D.

The entire U.S. position on Iran is based on a big lie, not unlike the lies about Iraq. For many weeks the U.S. has campaigned both within and outside the UN for strict sanctions against Iran, based on their judgement that Iran was on the verge of manufacturing nuclear weapons.

IRAN AND IRAQ: SOME LATER THOUGHTS

F.H. Knelman, Ph.D.

The entire U.S. position on Iran is based on a big lie, not unlike the lies about Iraq. For many weeks the U.S. has campaigned both within and outside the UN for strict sanctions against Iran, based on their judgement that Iran was on the verge of manufacturing nuclear weapons. We have suggested earlier that their judgement of the immediacy of that issue was false. Moreover, they had to know it was false and so once again, as in Iraq, policy is based on lies. The one man who is truly an expert on the technical aspect of this issue is Nobel Laureate and head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, (IAEA), ElBaradel. After meeting with two of Iran's top nuclear officials on April 14th, he said, "I don't think the issue of enrichment right now, as emotional as it is, is urgent. So we have ample time to negotiate a settlement by which, as I said, Iran's need for nuclear power is assured and the concern of the international community is also put to rest", (CNN.com, April 14, 2006).

The generally agreed upon time period that it will take to produce a bomb-grade uranium enrichment is some ten years. In the light of this it was a sickening sight to witness the Canadian Foreign Minister, Peter McKay, cozying up to the Wicked Witch of the West, Condoleezza Rice. She has taken a lead role in threatening Iran and calling on the international community to join her threats (CNN.com, April 14, 2006). We can surmise that Canada officially agreed with Rice. Peter McKay might even have apologized for not being a member of the so-called "coalition" in Iraq. My one lingering concern is that ElBaradel was a little late in his pronouncement above, which permitted the tensions to rise.

On the Rumsfeld controversy, it is obvious that no sitting general would dare criticize the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, for six retired generals to criticize Rumsfeld has a high validity. He, above all, is directly responsible for the death of some 2,500 Americans and up to 100,000 Iraqi civilians. The fact that the U.S. attack on Iraq was based on lies and violated the Geneva Convention and the United Nations Charter, and even the Rome Statute on torture is the real context of Rumsfeld's status. For this author, these latter aspects are more important than the Rumsfeld debate which concerns the number of troops the U.S. should have placed in Iraq and anticipating the consequence of the invasion, which was wrong in the first place. And regarding the possible use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran's civil nuclear facilities, Rumsfeld himself stated that the Pentagon prepares for every possible contingency. And U.N. Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, told Spain's ABC daily that the situation was already "too heated" to withstand any further aggravation "and "I still think the best solution is a negotiated one and I don't see what would be solved by a military campaign", (CNN.com, 16 April, 2006). We can predict with some confidence that the response to the U.S. position will lead to further terrorist attacks by Islamic fundamentalists and terrorists, proving yet once again how

IRAN AND IRAQ: SOME LATER THOUGHTS

Written by

Tuesday, 18 April 2006 02:26 - Last Updated Tuesday, 18 April 2006 02:26

unproductive U.S. policy really is when based on neoCon fundamentalism.