



english (original) | français | español | italiano

Add a translation >>

IRAN: STOP US/ISRAEL ATTACK ON IRAN!

US/Israel plan nuclear attack on Iran to control oil and defend the dollar

02 Mar 2006 02:45 GMT



US and Israeli governments plan a military attack against Iran, possibly using nuclear bombs [1] [2] [3] [4] [5], possibly this month (March 2006) for reasons including: stopping the planned opening of an international oil-petrochemical-gas stock exchange for oil trade in euros [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]; control of Khuzestan province [1] [2] [3] where most Iranian oil lies, on the border with Iraq (US war plan OPLAN 1002-04); to distract attention from USA domestic political problems; and for Christian fundamentalist reasons - Bush says he was just following God's orders when he ordered the attacks

on Afghanistan and Iraq.

The official excuse for the attack is the possible nuclear weapons program in Iran: ex-CIA agents Paul Pillar and Ellen Lajposon as well as retired United Nations weapons inspector Hans Blix state that if Iran were really trying to build atom bombs, then the most effective way to stop this would be a guarantee from the US and Israel not to attack Iran.

Key facts:

Iran has not (yet) violated the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), though the National Intelligence Community in the USA estimates that Iran could build nuclear bombs in about 10 years' time, and it seems that nuclear proliferator (US ally) Pakistan gave some help to Iran to do this [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
USA, France and the UK grossly violate Article VI of the NPT, which requires disarmament
Germany violates Articles I and II of the NPT by nuclear sharing
Israel has about 75-200 nuclear bombs and has neither signed nor ratified the NPT, but it is a member of the IAEA - the agency making inspections for the NPT
in June 2005, the USA blackmailed IAEA chief El Baradei to either "get tough" on Iran or lose his job

info: iranbodycount | wikipedia | Iranian blogs | Workers' Left Unity Iran
action: campaigniran | defendiran | stopwaroniran | medialens.org | StopWar.org.uk | Global Days of Action 18-20 March

Three years after the US attack on Iraq, controlled by the dictator Saddam Hussein 53 years after the US+UK coup d'etat in Iran against the democratically elected prime minister Mossadegh and 18 years after the shooting down by the USS Vincennes of Iran Air Flight 655, killing the 290 people on board (274 passengers, 16 crew), the USA and Israeli regimes plan a military attack against the theocratic democracy in Iran.

According to various analysts, [1] [2] [3], the attack may use "mini-nukes" (small nuclear bombs), in order to destroy deep underground facilities. Because of the official reason for the attack (the possible Iranian program to build nuclear bombs), the US/Israeli attack on Iran is expected to be a single, fast, massive simultaneous attack on nuclear energy (civilian or suspected military) and military facilities in sixteen different towns in Iran [1] [2] including e.g. Bushehr (165,000 inhabitants), Arak (511,000), the mountain town of Natanz (40,000), Isfahan (2,000,000) and Tehran (12,000,000) - for a total population in the listed towns (including Tehran metropolitan area) of 23 million.

Even though it's realistic that some sectors of the Iranian government may be hoping to build nuclear bombs in violation of the Iranian head of state's fatwa (religious order) banning the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons, there are several reasons why this alleged bomb-building program is not a credible reason for the planned attack:

- practical:** Iranian engineers and scientists would have great difficulty building nuclear warheads, since Iran has been party to the NPT since 1970. It is credible that there has been some transfer of technical knowledge from Pakistan and P.R.China to Iran. However, in November 2004, Iranian authorities voluntarily accepted to follow an Additional Safeguard Agreement, under which during the last few years, the IAEA has carried out frequent and intrusive inspections of Iranian facilities. According to the Iranian authorities, 1200 person-days of inspections were carried out from November 2003 to November 2005, while the total number of person-days of inspections carried out by the IAEA each year is about 10,000 for 140 states;
- motivational:** the threat of attack by the USA/Israel is a strong motivating factor for Iranian politicians and voters to build atom bombs. Ex-CIA agents Paul Pillar and Ellen Lajposon and the previous IAEA chief Hans Blix have said that if Iran were really trying to build nuclear weapons, then the most effective way of stopping this would be for USA and Israel to provide guarantees that they will not attack Iran - which the USA seems to have done for North Korea;
- ineffectiveness:** Many analysts e.g. at the Centre for Nonproliferation Studies say that since the most likely effect of the attacks would be to increase motivation to build nuclear bombs without destroying the existing uranium supplies (underground) nor being able to totally destroy the technological knowledge among Iranians, the attack would only delay a nuclear bomb building program by a few years.

A more credible reason for the attack is control of Khuzestan province [1] [2] [3] where most Iranian oil lies, on the border with Iraq. British troops and US marines have already been accused of carrying out provocations in Khuzestan and studying ethnic tensions there in order to more efficiently provoke local conflict and "justify" military intervention. Iranian authorities have claimed that a letter calling for Arabs from Khuzestan to be moved to another part of Iran was a fake intended to provoke ethnic conflict (which it did), and that recent bombings in Khuzestan were provoked by British agents, and that two recent military plane crashes occurred due to radio-jamming. The British Ahwazi Friendship Society, which states that it does not support separatism and opposes any invasion of Iran by foreign forces and condemns all forms of terrorism and has no links to any armed group, disagrees with at least some of these claims. The US war plan for invading Khuzestan apparently has a codename OPLAN 1002-04.

According to William Clark, Elias Akleh, Krassimir Petrov and Chris Cook, a more realistic reason for the planned attack is the opening (originally planned for 20 March 2006) of an International Oil Bourse (or Iran Petroleum Exchange) on the island of Kish, at which oil trading in euros (the so-called petro-euro) will become possible. At present, international oil trade happens in US dollars. European, Chinese, Japanese, West Asian and other companies and institutions wishing to buy or sell oil are presently forced to trade using large quantities of dollars, and in practice to keep large reserves in dollars.

After the opening, initially announced for 20 March 2006 though probably greatly delayed, of the Iranian oil exchange, which is expected to use euros, it would become possible to buy oil directly in euros. The risk for the USA would be loss of control over a large part of the world economy due to selling of the dollar, possibly leading to either an economic depression or hyperinflation in the USA. In late 2000, Saddam Hussein changed oil related transactions from the dollar to the euro. Also, he changed \$US 10 billion in the Iraqi reserve fund at the United Nations to euros. These are considered to be important factors in the US decision to invade Iraq. On 23 March 2006, the Federal Reserve (central bank in the USA) will stop publishing the "M3" statistic, which (more or less) represents the amount of US cash dollars circulating around the world.

Other likely factors in the threat to attack Iran are Christian fundamentalist reasons, both for retaining support from the Christian fundamentalist electorate in the US - and for what seems to be Bush's personal belief that God has as much (if not more) right to make US foreign policy decisions as the US electorate: Bush says he was just following God's orders when he ordered the attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq.

The mainstream media propaganda is focussed on the possible Iranian program for developing nuclear weapons, even though:

there is not (yet) any evidence that Iran has violated the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) even after 1200 person-days of intrusive inspections from Nov 2003 to Nov 2005, though the National Intelligence Community in the USA (CIA, etc.) estimates that Iran could build nuclear bombs in about 10 years' time, and organisations more pro-war than the CIA claim shorter delays
USA, France and the UK grossly violate Article VI of the NPT, which requires disarmament
Germany violates Articles I and II of the NPT by nuclear sharing
Israel has about 75-200 nuclear bombs and has neither signed nor ratified the NPT, but it is a member of the IAEA - the agency making inspections for the NPT.

LANGUAGES:

- deutsch
- Ελληνικά
- english
- español
- français
- italiano
- nederlands
- português

ALERT

SEARCH:

- images
- audio
- video

INDY-NEWS UPDATES

Subscribe to news regular news updates:

PARTICIPATE

post your news
instantly upload your audio, video, photo or text directly from your browser

- links
- about
- contact
- support us
- get involved
- syndication
- volunteer
- upcoming events
- imc video projects
- imc video channel

ARCHIVE

- more features
- newswire archive

IMC'S

www.indymedia.org

Projects

- print
- radio
- satellite tv
- video

Africa

- amazonia
- canarias
- estremo / madiag
- nigeria
- south africa

Canada

- hamilton
- maritimes
- montreal
- ontario
- ottawa
- quebec
- thunder bay
- vancouver
- victoria
- windsor
- winnipeg

[East Asia](#)
[burma](#)
[jakarta](#)
[japan](#)
[manila](#)
[qc](#)

[Europe](#)

[alicant](#)
[andorra](#)
[antwerpen](#)
[armenia](#)
[athens](#)
[austria](#)
[barcelona](#)
[belarus](#)
[belgium](#)
[belgrade](#)
[bristol](#)
[bulgaria](#)
[croatia](#)
[cyprus](#)
[estrecho / madiag](#)
[euskal herria](#)
[galiza](#)
[germany](#)
[grenoble](#)
[hungary](#)
[ireland](#)
[istanbul](#)
[italy](#)
[la plana](#)
[liege](#)
[lille](#)
[madrid](#)
[malta](#)
[marseille](#)
[nantes](#)
[netherlands](#)
[nice](#)
[norway](#)
[oost-vlaanderen](#)
[paris/ile-de-france](#)
[poland](#)
[portugal](#)
[romania](#)
[russia](#)
[scotland](#)
[sverige](#)
[switzerland](#)
[thessaloniki](#)
[toulouse](#)
[ukraine](#)
[united kingdom](#)
[valencia](#)
[west vlaanderen](#)

[Latin America](#)

[argentina](#)
[bolivia](#)
[brasil](#)
[chiapas](#)
[chile](#)
[chile sur](#)
[colombia](#)
[ecuador](#)
[mexico](#)
[peru](#)
[puerto rico](#)
[qoliasuvu](#)
[rosario](#)
[santiago](#)
[tijuana](#)
[uruguay](#)
[valparaiso](#)

[Oceania](#)

[adelaide](#)
[aotearoa](#)
[brisbane](#)
[burma](#)
[darwin](#)
[jakarta](#)
[manila](#)
[melbourne](#)
[oceania](#)
[perth](#)
[qc](#)
[sydney](#)

[South Asia](#)

[india](#)
[mumbai](#)

[United States](#)

[arizona](#)
[arkansas](#)
[atlanta](#)
[austin](#)
[baltimore](#)
[big muddy](#)
[binghamton](#)
[boston](#)
[buffalo](#)
[charlottesville](#)
[chicago](#)
[cleveland](#)
[colorado](#)
[danbury, ct](#)
[dc](#)
[hawaii](#)
[houston](#)
[hudson mohawk](#)
[idaho](#)
[ithaca](#)
[kansas city](#)
[la](#)
[madison](#)
[maine](#)
[miami](#)
[michigan](#)
[milwaukee](#)
[minneapolis/st paul](#)
[new hampshire](#)
[new jersey](#)
[new mexico](#)

On 4 November 2004, at the [59th General Assembly of the United Nations](#) 147 countries (including **Iran**) voted **in favour** of creating a committee for the [negotiation of a treaty against producing fissile material](#) which could be used for producing nuclear weapons; 2 countries abstained (UK, Israel); only one country voted against (**USA**); (see also other related votes); the world's largest democracy, [India, struggled for many decades in favour of nuclear disarmament](#) and did not ratify the NPT. However, in 1998, India [became an overt nuclear weapons state \(Pokhran II\)](#). During the next few days (first week of March 2006), Bush will visit India in recognition of India's status as a nuclear weapons state (but will also be ["welcomed" by activists for his status as a mass murderer and war criminal](#)).

Mainstream media attention has also focussed on comments by the recently elected president of Iran, [Mahmoud Ahmadinejad](#). Ahmadinejad spoke [against the existence of Israel as a state](#) and expressed [doubts about the Holocaust](#), leading to strong media and parliamentary criticism in Europe. Ahmadinejad made statements relating to the "wiping out" of the state of Israel in a similar way, according to him, that the USSR, the regime of [Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlawi](#) and Saddam Hussein's regimes were "wiped out". The accuracy of the [translation of his words from Farsi to English](#) remains disputed. The article [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahmoud_Ahmadinejad_and_Israel](#) discusses this in more detail. See also [the explanation on 20 Feb 2006](#) by Iranian foreign minister Manouchehr Mottaki.

Ahmadinejad's election and somewhat weakened power as president demonstrate the complex balance of political forces in post-1979 Iran:

the [2005 presidential election](#) was the first which had to go to a second round of voting (runoff)
[four of Ahmadinejad's proposed ministers were rejected](#) by parliament - the first time that a cabinet was rejected
[the appointment of Khatami](#) to the State Expediency Council's Strategic Research Center in October was criticised and perceived as a weakening of Ahmadinejad's power

more info: [iranbodycount](#) | [wikipedia](#) | [Iranian blogs](#) | [Workers' Left Unity Iran](#)

Do something! Stop the attacks before they start! [campaigniran](#) | [defendiran](#) | [stopwaroniran](#) | [medialens.org](#) | [StopWar.org.uk](#) | [Global Days of Action 18-20 March](#)

[add a comment on this article](#)

this blows my mind.....

blankall 02.Mar.2006 06:38

I think I just lost all respect for this site.....

Your quoting blogs as news now? Joint nuclear strike by Israel and the US on Iran. Are there any facts to back this up? Do you have any idea how dangerous it is to incite hate like this? Dozens died over a cartoon, what kind of results are you trying to get by publishing this?

PROTEST US-ISRAELI NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY, NO US-ISRAEL ATTACK ON IRAN

RIGHT OF RETURN FOR PALESTINIANS. 02.Mar.2006 11:21

isrealis plan US attack on Iran....

[http://www.indymedia.org/en/2006/03/834426.shtml](#)

SUNDAY March 5th AIPAC PROTEST IN DC: vigil Sunday morning and evening 11:00 am to 1:00 pm during speech by UN Ambassador John Bolton on Iran; 6:00 - 8:00 pm during the dinner meeting, just in case Dick Cheney shows up Sunday instead of Monday.

Monday, March 6th, 6:00-8:00 PM DC PROTEST American Israel Public Affairs Committee(AIPAC)Gala Banquet
PROTEST US-ISRAELI NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY, NO US-ISRAEL ATTACK ON IRAN, RIGHT OF RETURN FOR PALESTINIANS. For the right to return to their original homes, lands, cities, towns and villages. non-violent civil disobedience is planned. DC Convention Center, south side of Mount Vernon Place between 7th and 9th Streets NW. ENDORSE! civil disobedience,
[aipacprotest@earthlink.net](#)

[http://stopthewarnow.net/protests/aipacprotest-03-06.html](#)

planning at weekly Tuesday DAWN meeting.

DC Antiwar Network [http://dawn-dc.net](#)

[http://www.indymedia.org/en/2006/03/834426.shtml](#)

please read the sources and judge their validity

fact-seeker 02.Mar.2006 11:58

> Your quoting blogs as news now? Joint nuclear strike by Israel and the US on Iran.

i guess you didn't actually click on the links and read them. Just to help you, here are some of the links already in the article regarding the possibly nuclear nature of the attack:

Nuclear War against Iran by Michel Chossudovsky January 3, 2006 GlobalResearch.ca

[http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=%20CH20060103&articleId=1714](#)

November 12, 2005

A 'Legal' US Nuclear Attack Against Iran
The real reason for the IAEA Iran resolution
by Jorge Hirsch

[http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8007](#)

Doctrine of Joint Nuclear Operations,
by Joint Chiefs of Staff [US armed forces]
15 March 2005

[http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/jp3_12fc2.pdf](#)

The Real Reason for Nuking Iran
Why a nuclear attack is on the neocon agenda
by Jorge Hirsch

November 1, 2005

[http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=7861](#)

> Are there any facts to back this up?

None of the above authors are "bloggers".

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Chossudovsky](#)

wikipedia cite:

Michel Chossudovsky is a Canadian economist. He is a professor of economics at the University of Ottawa.

[new orleans](#)
[north carolina](#)
[north texas](#)
[nyc](#)
[oklahoma](#)
[omaha](#)
[philadelphia](#)
[pittsburgh](#)
[portland](#)
[richmond](#)
[rochester](#)
[roque valley](#)
[saint louis](#)
[san diego](#)
[san francisco](#)
[san francisco bay area](#)
[santa barbara](#)
[santa cruz, ca](#)
[seattle](#)
[tallahassee-red hills](#)
[tampa bay](#)
[tennessee](#)
[united states](#)
[urbana-champaign](#)
[utah](#)
[vermont](#)
[virginia beach](#)
[western mass](#)
[worcester](#)

West Asia
[armenia](#)
[beirut](#)
[israel](#)
[palestine](#)
[ukraine](#)

Topics
[biotech](#)

Process
[discussion](#)
[fbi/legal updates](#)
[indymedia faq](#)
[mailing lists](#)
[process & imc docs](#)
[tech](#)
[volunteer](#)

IMC technology by [Mir](#) and [IMC Geeks](#)
[admin](#)

Chossudovsky has taught as visiting professor at academic institutions in Western Europe, Latin America and Southeast Asia, has acted as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has worked as a consultant for international organizations including the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the African Development Bank, the United Nations African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (AIEDEP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the World Health Organisation (WHO), the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). In 1999, Chossudovsky joined the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research as an adviser.

Jorge Hirsch is a San Diego University physics professor:

☞ <http://physics.ucsd.edu/~jorge/jh.html>

The Joint Chiefs of Staff of the US armed forces are not exactly whom I would call "casual bloggers".

Don't panic! Mini-nukes are safe for civilians!

non-civilian 02.Mar.2006 13:40



artist's impression of mini-nuke safe for civilians in Iran

According to a 2003 Senate decision, the new generation of tactical nuclear weapons or "low yield" "mini-nukes", with an explosive capacity of up to 6 times a Hiroshima bomb, are now considered "safe for civilians" because the explosion is underground.

ditto

a reader 02.Mar.2006 14:06

I agree - not one of the best IMC features. The reliance on so many sources and links only dilute the intent of the article (and please - no more wikipedia links every other sentence!).

IMC articles are best when clear and direct. Links and references should be secondary to the article and offer clear support/background. This article requires a reader to hop across a dozen sites to put together a cohesive story. Please just be concise - it's not hard!

??!!

kdj 02.Mar.2006 14:49

What nonsense. Well, I don't say it's impossible, that the States or Israel would attack Iran, but this feature is more like a conspiracy theory than information. And anyway - Israel wouldn't attack Iran just because to "protect the dollar", in the first case it would attack it because Iran is led by an antisemitic islamo-fascist government, who doesn't have any problem with killing innocent people for the fucking jihad. And yes, there IS a difference between eliminatory antisemitism and US-imperialism!

On the other hand - in Isreal you pay with Shekel, not with Dollar. You're just reproducing antisemitic stereotypes of the bad, bad "eastcoast-jews", who are just about money.

This is no anticapitalist article but pure populism.

Shame on you, Indymedia!

PS.: Why don't you make a feature about anti-islamistic resistance in Iran? Like the strikes in Therean, that were taking place last weeks? Support the progressive resistance, not fascist like ahmedinejad!

Uber Alles Others

eyes wide shut for Zion 02.Mar.2006 15:35



Cheerleaders for War

Before criticizing the article, visit the website of the utterly shameless spying and bribery organization called AIPAC.

But thus shall ye deal with them;
ye shall destroy their altars,
and break down their images,
and cut down their groves,
and burn their graven images with fire.

For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God:
the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be
a special people unto himself,
above all people that are upon the face of the earth
-- Deuteronomy 7:5-6

☞ <http://www.skepticsannotatedbible.com/dt/7.html>

Iranian - and Indymedia - credibility

David Toronto 02.Mar.2006 16:36

Iranian credibility is low because the UN's atomic watchdog has found that:

- Iran signed the non-proliferation treaty in order to get access to information, material etc. about nuclear energy, and agreed to various restrictions (including inspections) to ensure compliance.
- Iran has been found to have been lying about its compliance since approx. 1989. It has acquired Pakistani nuclear weapons technology, been engaged in various subterfuges to acquire technology from the west, has built multiple sites (often in civilian areas) for the different processes needed for manufacture of nuclear weapons and weapons grade uranium (a very different process than for peaceful uses), declined many western (and now Russian) offers to provide enriched non-weapons grade uranium which could only be used for peaceful purposes (in return for disposing of Iran's hidden facilities) etc. etc.
- Iran combines this behaviour with an extremist, fundamentalist theocratic government, which has both in terms of propoganda, and in terms of funding, supported the spread of other extremist Islamic theocracies throughout the middle east, including through the support of hate filled groups like Hamas and Hezbollah who believe (as does the Iranian government) that only Moslems have a right to be the majority in middle eastern nation states.

The failure of the article writer to provide any of this context, I suppose is his or her right. However, it makes me regard the article as - at best - highly slanted propaganda of an extremist trying to advance a sick agenda, and at worst as the raving of a person detached from reality.

The choice of IMC to have it on the site, is a sign of why these sites remain marginal.

The US attacks everywhere everyday - Fools

the hidden one 03.Mar.2006 03:22

the comments saying US pigs will not attack Iran are silly - The Question is When - We predicted the Iran Iraq War and that both supppowers would support both sides; we predicted the fascist zionist attack on Iraqi nuclear power; we predicted 911 in 1987; we predicted that the world would head toward global chaos if Bush and his American sheep attacked Saddam...

What a dumb arguement - Iran signed the NPT in 1970 under the USA Stoooge the Shah - since 1979 Iran has in no way been obligated to follow it...

Everything That You need to Know About the World:

Death to the Capitol of Capital (710 words)

1. A few million evil rich people have set up an economic system that supports about a billion people well while it dooms the other 5 billion and the whole ecology of a planet to misery, lies and death.
2. Billions of people are rising up in the Arab and Moslem worlds; in Latin America and in other regions.
3. Everyone is learning fast, but most leaders and even radical governments hold the people back from moving too quickly to war. These leaders wait for the people to learn, to organize and prepare. The leaders and many activists hope that a crisis of capitalism or of the environment will bring down (or fully discredit) the rich - or weaken them enough that war will not be necessary.
4. These "go-slow" leaders are probably wrong. The USA/capitalist elite are much stronger and more ruthless than imaginable - they could kill off half of the planet in a week and hardly blink. And they will unless we strike them and the infrastructure of their system very hard right before the first signs of collapse. Few writers understand time and without time, timing is more difficult to grasp or execute - yet still most important.
5. In the West (USA-EU Empire(s)) the times of education and debate about the What we are fighting for have ended. Words are deaf and our ears can't hear anything useful above the crash of so many things and dreams and hopes. The time of recruiting warriors and their support groups is almost over. The final planning for how to fight is finishing up. All that is left to do from within the West is Guerillaism - a desperate struggle to stop the rich and their hundreds of millions of supporters from chocking off and crushing the people of the South who are determined to rise up and to be free. A fight to the death commences against the Hella USA! - a military and surveillance domination machine more fearsome than all previous evils combined. The Rules of War (and the lessons) are much different than the game of activism and safe civil disobedience.
6. Nation States no longer exist (under the WTO regime, among most indigenou leaders' views or in our understanding of how the final struggle will unfold). An important effort for activists everywhere is to help people see the need to reject materialism and consumer fads because they are not sustainable and lead to wars and expectations of ever more consumption. The future is either one global Wall Mart or one where basic goods are sold in small open markets. Through communiqés in the West and demonstration projects in liberated zones, activists can explain how building community, regional cooperation and eco-social security are much more important - and fun! - than greed.
7. In the poor countries the masses will line up firmly behind THE REVOLUTION, but not in the wealthy countries. In the USA the vast majority of people will line up behind fascist programs: domestic and international as they do now and have always done - only this time it will be much worse for all of us... Much worse
8. Wherever THE REVOLUTON wins, wherever people fighting the USA hold the land in solidarity, a great rejuvenation of the human spirit will explode all fears away. Never again need we fear totalitarianism from the Left - or ultimately from fundamentalist Islam either. Once free and empowered the people everywhere will express themselves sincerely and petty arguments will no longer hold them back or confuse. People power will for once be real and invincible for many of us sense that this is the Final Big War - the rich against the poor - and so we will all make the best of a hard won and difficult victory. Overcrowding, the ecological crisis and the impossibility of governing people will make decentralization a fact.
9. A general warning: If you live near an ocean, you must plan to relocate inland to areas at least 50 feet above sea level - 100 feet in stormy areas. Plan to move to areas that are not near coastal mega-cities or in the path of their relocation areas. Littorals are also high priority targets for the imperialist invader forces.

LINKS - What's wrong with activist - The Middle Class Disease - Key Questions - How A revolution -

Chavez A Friend of All Things: Perspectives on Re-Thinking Revolutionary Meaning

the value of goyim life

AIPAC and Abramoff in America 03.Mar.2006 03:51

quote:

highly slanted propaganda of an extremist trying to advance a sick agenda

Are you talking about AIPAC, AIPAC propaganda, AIPAC spying, Richard Perle's Clean Break, Oded Yinon's "A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties", or the September 2001 PNAC document titled "Rebuilding Americas Defences: Strategy and Resources for a New American Century" that called for a "Catastrophic and catalyzing event" as a pretext for exterminating Arabs for Israel, or are you talking about the approximately 180,000 Iraqi men, women and

children - give or take a few thousand - that we've irradiated, incinerated, bombed, starved, tortured or bashed to death since March 2003?

Is THAT the sick agenda to which you refer?

Or is that agenda kosher with you?

comon you have to admit this is a bit ridiculous....

blankall 03.Mar.2006 08:36

If you believe this, I've got a guy who has some great theories about WMDs.

Seriously, we should be trying to promote responsible journalism and public education. This kind of ridiculous slander coming from either side helps nobody.

a response...

blankall 03.Mar.2006 09:08

"Are you talking about AIPAC, AIPAC propaganda, AIPAC spying, Richard Perle's Clean Break, Oded Yinon's "A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties", or the September 2001 PNAC document titled "Rebuilding Americas Defences: Strategy and Resources for a New American Century" that called for a "Catastrophic and catalyzing event" as a pretext for exterminating Arabs for Israel, or are you talking about the approximately 180,000 Iraqi men, women and children - give or take a few thousand - that we've irradiated, incinerated, bombed, starved, tortured or bashed to death since March 2003?"

1) please provide a link to this AIPAC document that calls for the eradication of all arabs. Also please provide credible evidence for all other accusations concerning this lobby group.

2)Do you even know what an arab is? First of all Iranians are not predominately arab (they are mostly Persian) so bringing this up in this discussion makes no sense. Furthermore, Persians are traditional enemies of the arabs.

3)Second of all why would Israel want to irradiate all arabs. Israel is allied with several arab groups. Please look up the Bedouins and the Druze. Furthermore, Israel has close economic ties with many arab countries. Not only that, there are Israel's citizens are 20% arabs. Your attempted characterization of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict as some global race war helps nobody.

4)180k deaths is a gross overestimate. Personally I believe the whole war was a mistake and there have been a lot of deaths in Iraq, but that number is grossly exaggerated. Not only that, Americans have not "irradiated, incinerated, bombed, starved, tortured or bashed to death", most of these casualties. The majority of casualties have arisen due to sectarian violence (I concede that this might not have happened without US involvement, but look up Kurdish deaths after the original desert storm before you make condemning statements like this). Also, please provide a link for your statements.

5) even if there were 180k deaths it would not be enough to bring about genocide. Arab birth rates far exceed this number. George W. Bush and his jewish puppeteers are going to have to pick up their pace I guess. What better way to this than by attacking the Persian, who happen to be traditional enemies of the arabs.

"Is THAT the sick agenda to which you refer?"

Or is that agenda kosher with you? "

I don't understand this comment about being Kosher. Are you attacking the poster, because you think he is Jewish? IF so, are you accusing him of wanting or being privy to arab genocide because he/she is jewish? Also, please explain the title of your comment "the value of goyim life". Are you suggesting that Jews have no value for non-jewish life.

Irresponsible

Redbeard 03.Mar.2006 18:15

I think sounding the alarm of impending nuclear war on Iran is irresponsible. In the article itself it becomes more clear that the U.S. and I suppose Israel are warmongering and no doubt they have considered a nuclear strike. But titling it like that makes the indymedia network look very wingnutty and conspiratorial not to mention shrill.

tracing information to the primary source(s)

epistemologist 03.Mar.2006 18:45

> The reliance on so many sources and links only dilute the intent of the article

I don't understand why. The reader has no obligation to click on any of the links - there are only two places where links are specifically mentioned in the text. The intent of the article is to inform. Those readers who believe the text simply because it is published as an indymedia feature are welcome to believe it without going to the sources. The more sceptical readers, who experience cognitive dissonance between their present beliefs and the claimed facts listed in the article, are able, thanks to the links, to see some examples of how the claimed facts can be traced to their sources and why the article was written this way.

> (and please - no more wikipedia links every other sentence!)

Consensus decision-making is a key element of both indymedia and wikipedia. Consensus decisions on "facts", made among many people from diverse groups, are more likely to approach the truth than majoritarian decisions or authoritarian decisions. If you want to read an article by "authoritative" expert and believe it without having to double-check it, then you live in fairy land. Sorry.

Frequent wikipedia links increase the chance that we, "the world's second superpower", of human rights and environmental activists partly (but not only) connected through the internet, can get nearer to the truth than official propaganda media like NYTimes, Le Monde, BBC - even if we have to link to some of their articles in order to document the behaviour of authoritarian organisations.

> IMC articles are best when clear and direct. Links and references should be secondary
> to the article and offer clear support/background. This article requires a reader to
> hop across a dozen sites to put together a cohesive story. Please just be concise - it's not hard!

The reader has no obligation at all to "hop" across any external sites.

Being both concise AND correct on a subject about which the propaganda is so strong is extremely difficult. Correctness is more important to indymedia than conciseness. If you wish to write a "press release" style article with very few links, then please do so and propose it to your local IMC.

The local IMCs geographically closest to Iran were invited to participate in decision-making on the text. One person from one of them responded and supported the text, with requests for a few changes, which were made. Several antiwar groups were also invited to participate and had no complaints.

distinguish anti-Zionism from anti-semitism

anti-racist 03.Mar.2006 19:26

> What nonsense. Well, I don't say it's impossible, that the States or Israel would attack Iran,

> but this feature is more like a conspiracy theory than information.

The US political-economic system is overtly aimed at maximising profit and maximising US geopolitical control. This is not a conspiracy theory. The particular facts in the present situation are consistent with the general pattern of previous behaviour by the US over the past 100 years.

> And yes, there IS a difference between eliminatory antisemitism and US-imperialism!

So far, there is no evidence that Iran has any serious plans to attack Israel - it seems like Ahmadinejad's remarks are just populist rhetoric to get support from his electorate against the clerics who want a more pro-western, pro-market approach.

However, if you have some reasonably serious evidence in your claim that Iran has plans to attack Israel, then please update the appropriate wikipedia page, and provide proper citations to online references - preferably reasonably factual references, not just opinion pieces:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran-Israel_relations

You would be wise to distinguish anti-Zionism from anti-semitism.

> On the other hand - in Isreal you pay with Shekel, not with Dollar. You're just reproducing
> antisemitic stereotypes of the bad, bad "eastcoast-jews", who are just about money.
> This is no anticapitalist article but pure populism.
> Shame on you, Indymedia!

Collapse of the dollar would be problematic for Israel as well as the US - the Israeli economy and politics are closely linked to the US.

> PS.: Why don't you make a feature about anti-islamistic resistance in Iran? Like the strikes in
> Therean, that were taking place last weeks? Support the progressive resistance, not fascist like
> ahmedinejad!

If you look at the "info" links given, and click on Workers' Left Unity Iran you'll find the page:

<http://www.iran-bulletin.org/Labour/15febenglish.htm>

You'll find that the progressive resistance supporting the bus strikers is also vehemently against any form of sanctions or military attack on Iran. The bus strike is real, it is not a plot by the CIA, but is also not a reason to allow the US/Israel to start a nuclear attack (or even a non-nuclear attack) against Iran, nor sanctions. Opposing the attack is not supporting Ahmadinejad.

675 wingnutty conspiratorial US physicists

reality check 03.Mar.2006 19:42

> I think sounding the alarm of impending nuclear war on Iran is irresponsible.
> In the article itself it becomes more clear that the U.S. and I suppose Isreal
> are warmongering and no doubt they have considered a nuclear strike. But titling
> it like that makes the indymedia network look very wingnutty and conspiratorial not to mention shrill.

<http://physics.ucsd.edu/petition/us.php#taq1>

675 US physicists have signed the petition as of Mar, 03 2006 11:38 AM PST

Petition by physicists on nuclear weapons policy, September 2005

As physicists we feel a special responsibility with respect to nuclear weapons; our profession brought them into existence 60 years ago. We wish to express our opposition to a shocking new US policy currently under consideration regarding the use of nuclear weapons. We ask our professional organizations to take a stand on this issue, the Congress of the United States to conduct full public hearings on this subject, and the media and public at large to discuss this new policy and make their voices heard.

This new policy was outlined in the document Nuclear Posture Review delivered to Congress in December 2001, part of which has been made public, and is further defined in the unclassified draft document Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations dated March 15, 2005, which is in the final stages of being adopted and declared official policy by the US government, according to reports in the Washington Post and the New York Times (9/11/05). It foresees pre-emptive nuclear strikes against non-nuclear adversaries, for purposes which include the following (Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations, Page III-2):

- * For rapid and favorable war termination on US terms.
- * To ensure success of US and multinational operations.
- * To demonstrate US intent and capability to use nuclear weapons to deter adversary use of WMD.
- * Against an adversary intending to use WMD against US, multinational, or alliance forces.

The Nuclear Posture Review document states that:

- * US nuclear forces will now be used to dissuade adversaries from undertaking military programs or operations that could threaten U.S. interests or those of allies and friends.
- * Nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack

This dangerous policy change ignores the fact that nuclear weapons are on a completely different scale than other WMD's and conventional weapons. Using a nuclear weapon pre-emptively and against a non-nuclear adversary crosses a line, blurring the sharp distinction that exists between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, and heightens the probability of future use of nuclear weapons by others. The underlying principle of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is that in exchange for other countries forgoing the development of nuclear weapons, the nuclear weapon states will pursue nuclear disarmament. Instead, this new U.S. policy conveys a clear message to the 182 non-nuclear weapon states that the United States is moving strongly away from disarmament, and is in fact prepared to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear adversaries. It provides a strong incentive for countries to abandon the NPT and pursue nuclear weapons themselves and dramatically increases the risk of nuclear proliferation, and ultimately the risk that regional conflicts will explode into all-out nuclear war, with the potential to destroy our civilization.

We urge members of Congress, professional organizations and the media to raise public awareness and promote discussion on these issues, and we express our repudiation of these dangerous policies in the strongest possible terms.

what in the world?

avm 03.Mar.2006 21:21

I'm just wondering why people at indymedia sites routinely just MAKE SHIT UP. And here we have another conspiracy theory, one that will never happen. The US or Israel will not NUKE Iran. They may well attack them, but nuke them, come on. That's the dumbest thing I've ever heard.

If you believe that crap, I've got a nice, sunny lot to sell you in Antarctica.

The standards for publishing at indymedia in general are so low now that it has become the joke of the political blogosphere. Unwittingly, you supply your "right-wing enemies" ammunition. All they have to do is come here and link to one of your articles and it scares the living shit out of the average sane person. Frankly, the thought of such lunacy ever being in power runs people off.

Keep it up, please! I love using you morons to my advantage! What's next? "US to nuke Malta over ice-cream?"

LOL!

great job!!! f*ed situation**

geogie porgie 03.Mar.2006 23:14

thanks for the great research and unreal amounts of links to primary documents and related info! funny to hear the ridicule this amazing amount of time, effort, and astute dot connecting. some folks are so used to swallowing horse doo-doo that when they get a nice, fresh tomato, they think it's inedible! the ORG link is real helpful.

amazing job [as usual]. thanks again, geogie porgie

Indymedia is better known in most anti-fascist circles as Nazimedia

huanita 04.Mar.2006 15:35

NO ONE normal educated person takes Nazimedia seriously.

My dream number one - to meet IMC-'collective' face to face and ask them 'where is your shame ???'

Don't argue so onesidet - it's dangerous.

no nation - no border - no racism... 04.Mar.2006 15:39

I don't like this stupid this arguementation thats beginning with the headline "US/Israel plan nuclear attack on Iran to control oil and defend the dollar" I am against nuclear weopons and against the possible war against iran. And I'm against capitalist globalisation and american AND OTHER world domination. I'm criticize Israel and I'm against all religions and all nations too.

But I hate this stupid antiamericanism and antizionism. There are no very inteligent arguements - or not enough of them.

And it is to open for onesided pro-palestinian and other not-emancipate statements.

And to open for islamism and antisemitism.

It's too dangerous.

You can support that bad oppinions and reproduce antisemite prejudices - when you didn't want to do that too.

Never forget it - and attention: No Black-White-Thinking... because it's dangerous

Sory for my terrible english

Max

to max...

blankall 04.Mar.2006 18:59

I totally agree with your post. This black and white thinking leads to hate mongering every time.

Often it just seems like people take up causes for an excuse to hate. That kind of stuff helps nobody.

I don't understand the black-white criticism

confused 04.Mar.2006 22:02

> But I hate this stupid antiamericanism and antizionism.

I don't understand why you call this antiamericanism and antizionism, nor why you mix up one notion which could be racist, and one notion which regards states, not generalisations about individuals.

There are no negative generalisations about US citizens (which is probably what you mean by "antiamericanism"). There is just a list of the most important facts regarding US, Iranian, Israeli, UK, French military statuses regarding nuclear weapons and nuclear war, and a small selection of facts relating to military aggression during the 20th/21st century - which omits a fact in favour of Iran (it never attacked any country during this period) - and omits many historical facts against the US (constant wars to deter democracy).

As for anti-zionism, there is no claim in the article that anti-zionism (opposition to the state of Israel), is either right or wrong. The only point is not to confuse theoretical political statements aimed to gain support from voters with a realistic military plan.

> There are no very inteligent arguements - or not enough of them.

This is probably correct - the aim is to inform the human rights community about the reality of the situation, not to persuade them of what action they should take - except for the obvious action of opposing any attack whatsoever (whether nuclear or not).

> And to open for islamism and antisemitism.

7.5 million Iranians have the internet, about 70,000 or so write blogs. Islamism requires tight thought control, it requires people memorising the Coran and being desperate and unable to find non-violent methods of sorting out problems. The internet is impossible to control - 7.5 millions Iranians on the internet are linked in a decentralised, non-hierarchical web in which they learn many things from many different sources and their thoughts cannot possibly be tightly controlled.

Stopping the bombing of Iranians is not supporting islamism - it is supporting the right of people in one region of the world to socially and politically evolve through rational discussion and reporting of their different points of view of facts. Killing them would be supporting islamism. Stopping the US/Israel from killing them is opposing islamism.

Incidentally, one of the most famous Iranian bloggers just spent some time in Israel:

<http://hoder.com/weblog/archives/015008.shtml>

And the culture minister of Iran is promoting blog use:

<http://hoder.com/weblog/archives/015035.shtml>

Is promoting blog use something islamist? Surely it's more in promotion of freedom of speech. Ministers of Culture in many Western countries are afraid of the internet and desperate to control it. They do claim to support the internet, but they want static web pages which are tightly controlled and for which authors of politically incorrect information can be arrested and

taken to court.

> This black and white thinking leads to hate mongering every time

I don't understand this. The facts regarding *war* are - in an article this short - reasonably black and white. Iran has not attacked any other state at any time during the XXth or XX1st century. That's a fact. We cannot add a false statement in order to make the situation seem more grey.

Of course, we could add Iran's atrocious human rights record in terms of the death penalty, but then we would have to add info on US, France, UK, Israel, German atrocious human rights records throughout the XXth century. I guess you've heard of the Holocaust? Germany's record is not exactly "white". Heard of French torture in Algeria? British use of chemical weapons to kill Kurds (following a recommendation by Winston Churchill in 1919)? Guantanamo Bay? etc etc?

what its always been about

dezaraye 05.Mar.2006 00:21

I fail to understand why we continue to bring race and religion into these discussions. It simply is not about either, it never has been. They are preoccupations for the masses to get themselves tangled in and fired up about so that they fail to see clearly what is really going on. The Civil War was not about slavery, it was about who would control the U.S. economy. If we nuke Iran it will be about maintaining the value of the dollar to prolong for a bit an economy that is about to fold in on itself. This is and always has been about those with power and their struggle for more against others with power. All of us middle class and poor people can just keep calling each other names and making accusations, it's keeps us busy and insignificant. Until we accept the fact that we are all floating in a similar boat changing coarses as the winds of corporations see fit we will never put our oars in the water and fight to steer ourselves in our own direction. I don't care if you are a jew, an arab, a persian, a christian, a catholic, i don't care if you are a wiccan and i really don't care what color any of us are. What I do care about is that being alive is a precious experience and this is what humanity has made of it. We have all set this coarse through action and inaction and we must all take responsibility. A protest isn't going to accomplish much anymore, what is needed is a radical lifestyle change acrossed the board. If you don't like this corporate war mongering consumer country that you live in then stop participating. it is incredibly uncomfortable, but that simple. Who cares about the race or religion of the man that owns the bank, you had better start caring about the fact that that bank owns you.

timing is everything

gawan.greenman 05.Mar.2006 08:31

hear it is.....this is the perfect reason for the land become a land of humans again while you all in act and discuss the possibilities of destruction, and all species do this thing when they feel they are in some sort of jeopardy, for the most part. But the message eye would like to stress is that there are some realistic key measures parts of the planet can take if it can get out of it's nationalistic mentality for a while and realize this is earth calling. Meaning that there is all the talk of cascadia in the NW, which in places is already happening like they are in Brazil using ethanol and ideas like this are existing on the west coast because of self sustainability through unity in community, we all know this shit quite literally so let fuckin get on with. I put out a call on those writers, artists, inventors, musicians, and the ones who can really get down to some basic transitional social engineering ideas like there are quite a few eye can come up with which means by numbers there are many more so it is time to ante up in this poker game of capitalism and call their bluff. Lift the Vail and take time in to our own hands. And remember do not give anyone your name because those of us are doing it only need to be doing one thing that is well you know and those who know will know the ones who know.....

Give it a rest people.

blankall 05.Mar.2006 23:12

There will never be a joing US/Israel attack. Why do you think Israel did not participate in either dessert storm, or the iraq invasion?

The US would never allow it, because it would offend other middle eastern countries such as Saudi Arabia. The oil of these countries is way too important to the US to ever dream of a joint attack

IRAN : LA PROCHAINE GUERRE DES USA ?

itos 06.Mar.2006 00:02

IRAN : LA PROCHAINE GUERRE DES USA ?

Les raisons et les enjeux de ce conflit potentiel

 <http://autreinfo.free.fr/nfor1.htm>

this feature really is dumb

but i'll ad a link 06.Mar.2006 18:03

Iran: Is There a Way Out of the Nuclear Impasse?

respect

neo 07.Mar.2006 15:03

I have just lost all respect for this site. This is not media, this is bullshit. Stick with media or go join informationclearinghouse or some other fucked up conspiracy site.

to blankall (on your comment)

chhoc 09.Mar.2006 16:49

I agree with you on your comment about quoting blogs as news though I think it is debatable whether what they say is true or not. I am confident though that the compilers of this piece have established whether what is said in the particular blogs does merit credibility or not against facts gathered in their research. Since I rely less on mainstream news than ever even blogs when taken against each other seem more reliable.

About the alledged possible nuclear attack on Iran by US/Israel it is not the first time I read about its possibility and I do give it credibility since some stock brokers in New York and people very worried about the state of US economy and the value (or should I say decrease in value) of the dollar are talking about it on their own blogs, newsletters and websites.

Furthermore, I am not at all surprised the US would consider such a possibility since harmony between peoples of this world is seldom the first consideration of US Foreign policy apart maybe in the Middle East right now and that only because it would heighten the terrorist threat to their own territory and allies.

back to chhoc

blankall 10.Mar.2006 05:59

Listen I am not saying either Israel or the US would never attack Iran. After all, Israel did make a strike on Iraq when they tried to develop nuclear weapons in the 80s. The ideas that it would be a) a nuclear strike and b) a joint strike are ridiculous.

Also, can you please clarify how another war would increase the value of the US dollar. One of the main obstacles to US investment is its questionable foreign

policy. Another war (which is unlikely given the way US troops are already stretched out) would only decrease the value of the dollar (just like the last one did).

Also, how would spending more money on another war help the US economy. The only possible way would be to control oil reserves in Iran. From experience in Iraq, this would however be a long term investment with negative effects on oil prices for the short term that the US as a net energy importer simply cannot afford.

Given all this, I don't see why any "stock brokers in New York" would want a war right now.

Also could you please explain your comment that you are "confident though that the compilers of this piece have established whether what is said in the particular blogs does merit credibility or not against facts gathered in their research". Against what facts? If the writers of this article have facts then why are they using blogs instead of giving us these "facts"?

This article has pulled a ridiculous tactic to present its accusations as fact. It has referenced a bunch of historical facts which are true. Then it has tried to slip in a combination of blogs and other even more ridiculous crackpot articles in order to give the appearance of genuine news reporting and steer the article to some baseless conclusion. Anyone can reference a crackpot on the net for support of their argument. For example: Islam wants to destroy America. See... my sources say so: <http://ijihadwatch.org/>, www.frontpagemag.com. Therefore its gotta be true. Right?? Right..... This is essentially what this article has done and it blows my mind people are supporting it!!!

Do you see how ridiculous this whole article is now....

Grateful for this summary

anon 10.Mar.2006 16:19

Thanks Indymedia for this summary of this US-Iran situation. Once again you provide the lucid, insightful, and broad-based leftist perspective that the corporate propaganda machine (AKA the "news cycle") deliberately obscures.

The article stated that the attack was "planned". Cheney's orders for the development of plans for an attack on Iran possibly involving nukes, and Israel's using conventional ordnance is in the public domain. The opinions of Chris Cook (which have just been brought to my attention thanks to this article) clearly substantiate the idea that the process of "turning the heat up on Iran" over WMD is precisely as much of a sham as it was over Iraq.

Everytime an Indymedia feature contains analysis-led reporting, it gets shouted down in the comments by suspiciously professional trolls. They try to deceive people that the factual reporting of independent media is propaganda, but in reality it's simply more persuasive because it contains new factual information and objective evidence rather than mindless appeals to the truths of authority and diplomatic doublespeak which corporate media use to obfuscate and fudge the issues.

It's fucking obvious the US wants the oil in Khuzestan province.

THIS IS NOT A CONSPIRACY THEORY!

youre missing a few points

fluffy 11.Mar.2006 02:25

its hard and almost impossible to trust a country that says its going to destroy another country
theres clear evidence that iran is trying to hide how they violated most of the things they agreed on

impossible to trust Cheney/Bush

citizen 11.Mar.2006 19:37

> its hard and almost impossible to trust a country
> that says its going to destroy another country

True. The US administration has destroyed Iraq, and has promised to destroy Iran - it's hard and almost impossible to trust Dick Cheney (and his deputy GWBush) and his government.

It's also true that we should not trust Ahmadinejad. His comments recommending regime change in Israel are just as unacceptable as Bush/Cheney's decision to do regime change in Iran. However, there is a difference: Cheney/Bush have the means to nuclear bomb the fuck out of Iran. But Ahmadinejad has neither the political nor the technical means to attack Israel. It's legitimate to be worried about Ahmadinejad, but threatening a war against Iran is NOT acceptable and is complete rubbish in the internet era. Safety and trust depend on information exchange and good communication. There are plenty of ways to improve trust and cooperation in order to decrease risks of military conflict. The internet era has made war outdated. War is no longer an option.

Anyway, Ahmadinejad has said he wants a nuclear-weapons-free-zone in the Middle East. As long as there are guarantees of security all around - including for Israel - where is the problem?

> theres clear evidence that iran is trying to hide
> how they violated most of the things they agreed on

Please try READING the IAEA's report:

<http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2006/gov2006-15.pdf>

It's clear that ElBaradei is suspicious of the Iranians - but at the same time, it's wrong to say that they "violated most of the things they agreed on". I don't see much evidence that they violated anything they agreed on - even though, as we should remember, ElBaradei only kept his job on the condition that he "gets tough with Iran". I'm sure that as a person, his work is sincere, but he also has a wife and kids to feed. The Iranians "voluntarily" agreed to an Additional Safeguards Agreement two years ago, in addition to the previous standard Safeguards Agreement, and they only suspended this because they felt that the EU-3 (UK-Fr-De) violated their side of the agreement. It takes two to tango.

Before you believe corporate media accounts of which state violated which agreement, please try to be a bit sceptical and try looking for the facts - diplomats and politicians want to retain power and they will violate agreements whenever it is in their interests and when they think they can do this without losing power - whether they are from the US, UK or Iran...

GOOD! Restore Greater Israel; stamp out Islam

Shadow Merchant 12.Mar.2006 18:48

I am all in favor of this. It's time Islam suffered retribution for its 1400 years of war on Jews and Christians.

I want Greater Israel restored from the Persian Gulf to the Nile. Not one filthy Muslim sub-human animal left alive in the Holy Land, especially the murderous Egyptian and Jordanian squatter scum who call themselves Palestinians.

Let's see all mosques defiled with pig blood and burned to the ground. All the oil of the Middle East returned to Israel as reparations for 1400 years of oppression by the murderous Mahometan scum.

Avenge the Banu Qurayza! Death to Islam! Piss on Allah, shit on his pedophile Prophet, and spittle on his cursed book of lies, the Koran. DEATH TO ISLAM! STAMP IT OFF THE FACE OF THE EARTH!

US Examining likelihood of Israeli Attack on Iran

Sir K 15.Mar.2006 19:10

The Jerusalem Post ran the following March 14 article: US monitoring Israel's Iran options

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull&cid=1139395596422>

Surely, "[examining] the likelihood of an Israeli pre-emptive attack against Iran and the method in which such an attack could be carried out" and discussing "whether Israel would inform the US in advance in case such an attack is to take place and when would such an advance notice be given" is not an indication that "all options are on the table."

They must be planning for the time, around ten years from now, according to US intelligence experts, when Iran will be close to being able to produce nuclear weapons. Yeah, that's all it is, just planning for the distant future...

Oh please!

ShadesOfKnight 15.Mar.2006 20:36

So the author quotes blogs. As criticism, that's pretty piss poor. After all, the mainstream media said Iraq has WMD... Blogs said they didn't. Who was right and who was lying?? Don't dismiss information based strictly on source.

Secondly, let's just for argument's sake say that Iran IS building nukes. So what? We here in the US have spent BILLIONS of tax dollars on a "nuclear deterrent." If Iranian nukes are such a threat that we have to invade, one of two things is true:

1) We wasted Billions (with a B) of tax dollars, because it doesn't work... and I WANT MY MONEY BACK!

or

2) We spent the money wisely and the threat is nonexistent...

As was said to Socrates: Pick your poison.

Stupid pro-big government posters

A. Magnus 15.Mar.2006 21:15

Anyone who denies that the U.S. would nuke any country needs to Google the following terms:

1) NATO Flexible Response

2) CONPLAN 8022

The first term is the NATO doctrine of reserving the right to use nuclear weapons even at the onset of conventional hostilities. It was this policy that stopped Soviet tanks from crossing the Fulda Gap in the 1970s and 1980s.

CONPLAN 8022 is a contingency plan drawn up for airstrikes on a third world nation, utilizing both tactical nuclear weapons and conventional ordnance. This is a matter of stated Pentagon policy.

The shrill idiots who think that the Pentagon 'would never nuke Iran' are just like Stalin's 'useful idiots' who refused to believe that Stalin would murder millions of his own people.

The sad part is, just as history proved Stalin's useful idiots wrong, so too will history prove Bush's useful idiots wrong as well.

Pull your heads out of the sand and use them people

Blankall 15.Mar.2006 23:46

Because

1) the US has said it would use nukes under certain circumstances

2) blogs have guessed (thats right guessed, unless it was Saddam Hussein writing the blog noone actually knew if there were WMDs) right in the past

3)Its possible either Israel or the US might make an attack.. although highly unlikely given the current situation

does not mean that the:

"US and Israeli governments plan a military attack against Iran, possibly using nuclear bombs [1] [2] [3] [4] [5], possibly this month (March 2006)". That is the opening line of this article.... It is totally irresponsible to publish things like this.

There is a difference between actual news and spreading propaghanda. If in the next two weeks there is a JOINT NUCLEAR attack by both Israel and the US I will eat my words. The odds of this are extreeeeemely low. The rationale of oil and the US dollar make no sense either. A war with Iran would have a negative effect on both.

I think people are just looking for a reason to justify their own hate mongering

What "Hate Mongering?"


Sir K 16.Mar.2006 03:20

"I think people are just looking for a reason to justify their own hate mongering "

Can you explain how posters are hate mongering? Just because people happen to read international news, and just because said news mentions possible illegal actions by the Israeli government, and readers decide to comment on what they read, DOES NOT MAKE THEM HATE MONGERERS.

Why is it hateful to describe plans by the US and Israel to bomb Iran, but not hateful to endlessly write & speak about Iran attacking Israel or the US? Can you say H Y P O C R I S Y?

FOX-ed UP TV guy Bill O'Reilly can say things like "the sane thing to do" would be to "unite against Iran and blow it off the face of the Earth," and supposed man of religion, Pat Robertson, can call for the assassination of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, but let's not have any negative talk of Ariel "The Butcher" Sharon, or any of the other bloodthirsty members of the Israeli government. Oh, no! That would be "hate mongering."

Oh, and here's a great article about John Bolton's diplomatic stance on Iran. You remember Bolton, the current UN Ambassador, who, according to Wikipedia, "has been a prominent participant in many neoconservative lobbying groups such as the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), and the Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf (CPSG). March 15th, Reuters: "Bolton compares Iran threat to Sept 11 attacks" 
http://today.reuters.com/news/newsArticle.aspx?type=worldNews&storyID=2006-03-16T005859Z_01_N15396640_RTRUKOC_0_US-NUCLEAR-IRAN-UN.xml

Hate mongering or truth telling? You be the judge...

To Blankall, An Answer to Your Economics Question

Sir K 16.Mar.2006 03:43

Iran is set to open an oil bourse, in which it will offer its oil for sale on the world market in euros. Currently, all oil sales and purchases are in US dollars. This causes all oil purchasing countries to keep massive amounts of US dollars on hand. The US, on the other hand, simply has to print what it needs. It is my understanding that once the US dollar was unpegged from gold, any amounts of paper money can be printed with only the "good name" of the US as backing.

But suppose lots of countries want to buy and sell oil in euros. Suppose that nobody needs US dollars any more. They will be as useless as so much paper. That's why the US thinks it can afford to go deeper into debt to attack Iran because (1) they eliminate the threat of oil being bought and sold in euros, and (2) I believe the plan is to only control a small area adjacent to Iraq, the Khuzestan region. That's where the majority of Iran's oil fields are. (Nobody in Washington

seems to be concerned about the massive losses of life and limb on both sides of these conflicts.)

Lots of information exists about the oil bourse; none of it has made its way into the US media. Google: Iran oil bourse. There are lots of good articles, written by many knowledgeable scholars. One article that explains the economic fallout from the bourse in simple terms is http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne_mike_whi_060123_iran_92s_oil_exchange_.htm

BTW, Did you know that Saddam Hussein started selling Iraqi oil for euros in late 1999? And did you know that one of the first official acts of the Coalition Provisional Authority after the fall of Baghdad was to begin to offer Iraqi oil in US dollars once again? Mission Accomplished????? You be the judge...