



War Without End

The global war against terror from a British perspective

[FAQ](#) [Popular Topics](#) [Search](#) [Memberlist](#) [Usergroups](#) [Register](#)
[Profile](#) [Log in to check your private messages](#) [Log in](#)
[UK and World News](#) [Ignore List](#)

NATO planning strikes on Iranian nuclear sites (for Israel)



[War Without End Forum Index -> Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

[View previous topic](#) :: [View next topic](#)

Author

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 33979

Message

Posted: Sun Feb 05, 2006 12:30 pm Post subject: NATO planning strikes on Iranian nuclear sites (for Israel)



NATO planning strikes on Iranian nuclear sites (for Israel) :

<http://www.india-defence.com/reports/1183>

Iran threatens to close Straights of Hormuz in retaliation:

<http://www.india-defence.com/reports/1301>

More war coming for the bombing of Iran for Israel:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=47176>

What about those 200-300 nukes that the rogue state of Israel possesses as Israel has threatened to use its nuclear missiles on Europe as well?

New York Times

February 3, 2006

Dispute Over Israel Delays Vote on Iran Nuclear Resolution

By ELAINE SCIOLINO

VIENNA, Feb. 3 — The 35-nation board of the International Atomic Energy Agency delayed a vote on a landmark resolution on Iran's nuclear program today largely because of American opposition to a clause indirectly criticizing Israel's nuclear weapons status, according to several diplomats.

The countries that sit on the decision-making council of the world's nuclear watchdog agency will meet again on Saturday.

Several diplomats said that it was unlikely that the problem would derail passage of the resolution, which would report Iran's case to the United Nations Security Council for the first time and which enjoys the support of the United States, Russia, China, France, Britain and Germany.

But many of them insisted that the United States would have to back down from its position and predicted that the resolution might not pass with as strong a majority as they had hoped.

The problem arose when Egypt insisted that the draft resolution include a specific mention of support for the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East.

Egypt and other Arab states routinely demand references to a "nuclear free zone" in the Middle East in Security Council documents, arguing that Israel — which has never admitted that it has nuclear weapons and unlike Iran has never signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — should be part of a general security framework in the Middle East that bans such weapons.

In the current debate, Egypt has argued that if a resolution is passed that makes the Security Council a player in considering Iran's nuclear program, it must include language about a nuclear-free Middle East.

But the problem has exposed a split between the Americans who oppose the Egyptian demand and Russia, China and the Europeans who support it.

Last night, Britain circulated a new informal draft that added a clause that recognized that "a solution to the Iranian nuclear issue would contribute to the goal of a Middle East free of all weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery."

The language reflects the official position of the 25-member European Union. In a statement by European foreign ministers in Brussels last week that sharply criticized Iran for reopening its uranium enrichment plant in Natanz, for example, the reference to a nuclear-free Middle East was included.

But the United States, led by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, has taken the position that such a reference could be used by Iran as a propaganda weapon against Israel, four senior diplomats said, speaking on condition of anonymity under normal diplomatic constraints.

"The Americans are worried that once it is there, it will stay there forever and allow the Iranians to hide behind it" one ambassador involved in the negotiations said.

This evening, the Europeans were pressing the Americans to change their position, other ambassadors said.

"It's five against one," one European ambassador said.

Another key ambassador called the Americans "dogmatists," predicting that in order to pass the resolution, "the Americans will have to give in."

But one Western official predicted that the American position would prevail. "This resolution is about Iran," the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity under normal diplomatic rules.

He added: "One or two countries have raised the question about whether in some fashion we should address a weapons-free zone for the Middle East. Countries, including the United States, support the establishment of a weapons-free zone in the Middle East but we see this as quite a separate issue."

It was impossible to judge how much of the rhetoric was ritualistic posturing in advance of a vote and whether the dispute would be resolved quickly.

Gregory Schulte, the American ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, told reporters that he expected strong support when a vote is taken.

"We are convinced we have a solid majority for the resolution that reports Iran to the Security Council," he said. "And that majority is growing."

Diplomats met behind closed doors throughout the day to meet some of the other demands by countries in the 16-member non-aligned bloc, which want to delete all references to the Security Council or at least delay any report to New York until after the I.A.E.A. makes its full assessment of Iran's nuclear program in March.

The current text is a compromise between the American push for immediate action against Iran by the Security Council and Russia's preference for a monthlong delay for

more diplomacy.

The resolution recalls Iran's "many failures and breaches of its obligations" under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and "the absence of confidence that Iran's nuclear program is exclusively for peaceful purposes."

In one important concession, the draft resolution was changed to reflect the fact that actions taken by Iran to build international "confidence" that it is not pursuing a nuclear weapon are "voluntary and nonlegally binding."

In a concession to countries that do not want the Iran case to set a precedent in the Security Council that could limit their own nuclear programs, the resolution was amended to state that Iran is "a special verification case."

The non-aligned bloc is also demanding a reference to the nuclear-free zone in the resolution.

In another development, Javad Vaidi, the head of Iran's nuclear delegation, told reporters today that if the resolution reported Iran to the Security Council, it would eliminate a Russian proposal under which uranium would be enriched for Iran's energy purposes at a site in Russia under sole Russian authority.

"If this resolution is adopted, it will tie our hands," he said. "It will kill Russia's proposal."

Underscoring the fluid nature of the diplomacy, however, a Russian diplomat said that talks on the proposal were continuing.

On Thursday, Iran informed the International Atomic Energy Agency in a letter that all "voluntary" nuclear cooperation with the agency would end if the agency board reported Iran's nuclear case to the Security Council.

That would mean that the agency would no longer be allowed to do voluntary spot inspections and would lose access to key sites and installations.

<http://nomorewarforisrael.blogspot.com>

<http://www.nowarforisrael.com>

<http://nogw.com/warforisrael.html>

American Jew Jack Bernstein warned US (before the Israeli Mossad murdered him in Jerusalem) that Zionists in the USA would trick US into fighting wars in the Middle East for Israel with many Americans dying and getting horribly wounded and maimed in the process like we have already experienced with the Iraq quagmire (with Iran to come which will be for Israel as well):

<http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/israel.htm>

Last edited by Alpha on Mon Feb 06, 2006 7:42 pm; edited 1 time in total

 [profile](#)  [pm](#)

Posted: Mon Feb 06, 2006 7:34 pm Post subject: Why Russia caved-in on Iran

 [reply](#)  [quote](#)  [ignore](#)

Why Russia caved-in on Iran

<http://www.opednews.com>

[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 33979

February 4, 2006

by Mike Whitney

Many war-weary newshounds are probably wondering why Russia caved in at the IAEA board meeting and agreed to have Iran sent before the UN Security Council. Russia, of course, is very familiar with Iran's nuclear program (having worked with Iran on its nuclear power projects) and fully realizes that the Mullahs are not developing nuclear weapons.

So, why would they go along with the coercive maneuvering of the United States that is so clearly designed to pave the way for war?

Obviously, Russia's foreign minister's comment that the referral to the UNSC is "only a warning" doesn't adequately explain why Russia would have placed its ally in such grave danger of a preemptive attack.

So why did Russia capitulate?

It may be, in the words of the Godfather, that the Bush administration made Putin "a deal he couldn't refuse". For one thing, MosNews reports just yesterday that "Lukoil will replace the disgraced Halliburton" in providing fuel in Iraq. MosNews states, "Over three months beginning from April 1, LITASCO will have to deliver 180,000 tons of gasoline and 130,000 tons of diesel fuel to Iraq. After this the contract may be renewed.

Halliburton's replacement was chosen by a tender, the results of which the Pentagon announced on March 8. The winners were six Turkish companies and the U.S. Refinery Associates which won the right to the largest contract worth \$108.5 million."

That's a pretty hefty reward for Putin's vote on Iran, but apparently it only scratches the surface. (We should also note the generous prizes handed out to the 6 Turkish companies. Is this Turkey's payoff for using its bases in future military operations against Iran?)

Russia's real goal, however, is "the securing of rights for exploration and extraction at the huge West Qurna-2 oil field." Putin has always insisted that the Bush administration honor Saddam's previous commitments with Lukoil. It appears now that Putin is winning that battle.

According to the Boston Globe Lukoil president Vagit Alekperov met with Iraq's oil minister Ibrahim al-Ulloum to firm up "an understanding" about Russia's \$6 billion contract to develop the West Qurna-2 oil field. Al-Ulloum, of course, is just following Washington's directives in reviving the moribund Russian contract. But it is striking that Bush would surrender such an enormous trophy as one of Iraq's main oil fields just to secure Russia's vote.

Why?

Does the administration really need a war with Iran so desperately?

Yes.

The truth is, that even the control of oil is not nearly as critical to the US as maintaining its continued dominance in the exchange of oil in greenbacks. If Iran is allowed to open its oil bourse (exchange) in March and openly compete with the US's monopoly on trading oil in petrodollars, the central banks across the globe will dump hundreds of billions of dollars overnight, and the American economy will disappear beneath the waves.

This is not fiction.

The reason the United States is the unchallenged leader of the global economic system is because it has a stranglehold on the oil trade. Even the oil itself, or the price at which it is sold, is of less importance than the means by which it is traded. The nation that controls the currency, determines the rules of the game. It forces other nations to stockpile mountains of its debt-ridden script, while Congress breezily produces oceans of red ink. America's fat-cat bankers and corporatists are now living off the generosity of the developing world that must hold on to worthless dollars so they can purchase oil. Iran's plan to sell its oil in petro-euros threatens to break up this massive extortion-ring and put the greenback nose-to-nose with its global competitor; the euro.

The Lukoil transaction should prove to skeptics that Washington is prepared to give up anything to prevent the opening of Iran's oil exchange. The UN Security Council is just the last step before military operations begin.

The Bush administration is dead-set on attacking Iran and removing this existential threat to the American economy and the ongoing supremacy of the reserve currency.

Now that the case is in the Security Council, things should move ahead fairly quickly.

The above author conveniently ignores the fact that the Jewish supremacist (JINSA/CSP/PNAC) Neocons (some shown at the top of www.nowarforisrael.com) are after Iran in order to prevent a nuclear program there which could challenge Israel's nuclear hegemony over the region.. In addition, the Israel first JINSA/CSP/PNAC Neocons and their supporters (like the rabid Zionist/Israel firster Daniel Pipes who was on C-SPAN's 'Washington Journal' yesterday as can be watched via the link at the following URL) want Iran neutralized so that Iran's support of Hezbollah (which forced Israel out of Lebanon) can be neutralized as well:

<http://www.c-span.org/videoarchives.asp?CatCodePairs=Series,WJE&ArchiveDays=30>



Posted: Tue Feb 07, 2006 3:00 am Post subject: U.S. may have to go it alone in Iran



<http://washingtontimes.com/upi/20060203-044418-1878r.htm>

U.S. may have to go it alone in Iran

Feb. 6, 2006 at 7:16AM

Policy experts warn that the United States may not be able to rely on perennial ally the United Kingdom for support over Iran's nuclear program.

"We can't look to Britain for (help) on Iran because they've paid the price on Iraq," said Jeffrey McCausland, director of leadership in conflict initiative at Dickinson College. "In Iraq, the coalition of the willing has become the Brits and the Yanks. How Iraq turns out will have a dramatic effect on the relationship (between the United States and the United Kingdom)," he said.

The European Union should shoulder more global leadership responsibility, said Chris Patten, Chancellor of Oxford University, England, and former European Commissioner for External Relations. "That's what Europe should be seeking to do with the United States ... seeking to be a partner in economic, political, and security terms."

Instead, the EU is a "dead end," said John Hulsman, senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington, DC-based think tank. "The United States and the United Kingdom are the only two that can do things around the world," he said.

"The United Kingdom is the default (ally) in a crisis. On Sept. 11, nobody said, 'get Brussels on the phone,'" he said.

If U.S.-U.K. relations worsen, the United Kingdom might not rush to the head of the line to back U.S. action. The United Kingdom could become "not the first of three allies but the third of three," to support U.S. objectives, he said.

"The [U.S.-U.K.] 'special relationship' is in trouble," said Andrew Apostolou, assistant director of programs at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, DC-based think tank.

Michael Calingaert, executive vice president of Brookings' Council for United States and Italy, agreed. "U.S. policy and attitudes have damaged our relationship with the United Kingdom and the rest of the world."

In a 2005 Pew poll, only 55 percent of Britons had a favorable opinion of the United States, down from 75 percent in 2002, pre-Iraq.

Patten said there has always been a "seam of anti-Americanism in European attitudes."

The relationship between the United States and Europe is so important to both sides, he said, he doesn't believe that recent trends indicate a major shift.

"Over the years there were rows about Vietnam, Central America ... but overall (U.S.-Europe relations have been) a huge success," he said. "I hope we may find some way in which we can work together on the real threat of Iran becoming a nuclear power."



[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 33979

[Back to top](#)

Date: Mon, 06 Feb 2006 19:38:15 -0800

From: "Jeff Blankfort" <jblankfort@earthlink.net>

Subject: **Fast-track Israel's membership in NATO so an attack on Iran can be pushed as a NATO rather than Zionist project**

Thanks to Karim AG:

The following editorial comes from this morning's Wall Street Journal.

Just to recall: Aznar's government was tossed out of office after the March 11, 2004 train bombings in Madrid. These bombings were seen by many Spanish voters as a transparent NATO effort to stage an incident that would assist Aznar's re-election. As seems to be getting quite usual, e.g., last week in Palestine, an electorate under pressure from foreign state terrorists did what the exact opposite of what all the pundits predicted. Since his defeat, Aznar has been mobilised by his US friends to continue working on alienating the European Union from Cuba; during his last term in office, Aznar greatly increased Spain's military spending and heightened its diplomatic involvement in NATO:

Review and Outlook

NATO for Israel

February 6, 2006; Page A18

As diplomatic triumphs go, the weekend referral of Iran to the U.N. Security Council by the International Atomic Energy Agency is very small beer. It came without a call to action, and even any U.N. debate was postponed to give Iran more time to embrace Russia's offer to let the mullahs enrich uranium under Moscow's auspices.

Even at that minor rebuke, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad ordered a resumption of homegrown uranium enrichment and barred snap IAEA inspections. But if the Iranians are as smart as they are devious, they'll accept the Russian offer, let the Europeans pretend the crisis is over, and continue to build a nuclear weapon in secret. Yesterday Iran said it will again consider Moscow's offer, and all signs point to the fact that on present course Iran is going to get the bomb one way or another.

Which is all the more reason for the U.S. to promote a more serious diplomatic response suggested to us last week over lunch at the Journal by former Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar: Begin NATO accession talks with Israel.

Israel's NATO membership has been mooted before, but the suggestion is especially compelling as a response to the Iranian nuclear threat. Iran's apocalyptic President Ahmadinejad has called for Israel to be "wiped off the map," and influential former President Hashemi Rafsanjani has said an Islamic bomb "would not leave anything in Israel but the same thing would just produce damages in the Muslim world."

Those are unprecedented threats, which are all the more likely to be carried out if the mullahs think that the only retaliation would come from Israel itself. It may be that the mad mullahs aren't deterrable, since they claim to welcome mass martyrdom. But if Israel were part of NATO, the saner elements in Tehran would at least have to worry about the collective response of the West. Only last week President Bush promised that the U.S. would come to Israel's defense against Iran, but the NATO proposal has the additional virtue of forcing Europe to take a firmer stand against an Iranian bomb.

Many Europeans will object that NATO is a geographic defense pact, but it has already expanded its field of operation beyond Europe into Afghanistan. If NATO is going to continue to be relevant, it has to adapt to confront new threats to global stability, and a nuclear Iran certainly qualifies. It's fanciful for Europe to think it could stay aloof from an Iranian strike against Israel or the U.S., since the latter would surely retaliate and wider regional war would ensue. Iran is also developing ballistic missiles that will eventually have the capitals of Europe within range.

Even apart from the Iranian threat, a strong case can be made for Israeli membership. Israel is a liberal democracy, which is why nobody seriously worries about Israel's

bomb. The Jewish state has also taken unprecedented steps for peace with its Palestinian neighbors over the past decade, relinquishing territory even as it became clear that there was little good faith on the other side. Ariel Sharon's Gaza withdrawal and the subsequent victory of Hamas in Palestinian legislative elections are more than enough reason for the rest of the world to now reciprocate with a gesture of solidarity regarding Israel's defense.

Unless the civilized world unites to make it clear that Iran's current combination of rhetoric and nuclear armament is intolerable, Mr. Ahmadinejad and the mullahs will likely continue to believe they can have their nuclear apocalypse at a "reasonable" price. Inviting Israel to join NATO will send a far tougher message to Iran than mere referral to that tower of delay and rationalization known as the United Nations.



Posted: Tue Feb 07, 2006 8:40 am Post subject: Rumsfeld says military force an option against Iran



Rumsfeld says military force an option against Iran

AFP

Mon Feb 6, 8:35 AM ET

US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said the United States does not rule out using military force against Iran to prevent it from obtaining nuclear weapons.

"All options, including the military one, are on the table," Rumsfeld said in an interview with Monday's edition of German financial newspaper Handelsblatt.

"Today, biological, chemical and radiological weapons are available which could kill tens of thousands of people," Rumsfeld said, in comments in German.

"There is a genuine possibility that these weapons could fall into the hands of people who behead innocent people and blow up children.

"The people of the free world must realize that they have been warned."

Rumsfeld said Iran must be prevented from developing a nuclear weapon.

"We know that terrorists are desperately seeking ever more deadly weapons.

"Iran is the main sponsor of terrorist organisations such as Hezbollah and Hamas," he told Handelsblatt.

The Iranian nuclear crisis escalated on Saturday when the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency, voted to report the Islamic republic to the UN Security Council over its atomic programme.

Iran said on Monday that large-scale uranium enrichment work, which is the the focus of fears that it is seeking nuclear weapons, would begin in "due course" in response to the IAEA decision

More war for Israel coming with the bombing of Iran:

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=47176>



[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 33979

[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Tue Feb 07, 2006 9:08 am Post subject: The Iran Crisis -- "Diplomacy" as a Launch Pad for

reply quote ignore

The Iran Crisis -- "Diplomacy" as a Launch Pad for Missiles

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/norman-solomon/the-iran-crisis-diplo_b_15193.html

[Back to top](#)

profile pm

Display posts from previous: All Posts Oldest First

new topic post reply

[War Without End Forum Index -> Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

All times are GMT

Page 1 of 1

Jump to:

You **cannot** post new topics in this forum
You **cannot** reply to topics in this forum
You **cannot** edit your posts in this forum
You **cannot** delete your posts in this forum
You **cannot** vote in polls in this forum

www.NO2ID.net
Stop ID cards and the database state

Powered by phpBB © 2001, 2005 phpBB Group

Miserable Failure POODLE OPERA FIREFOX