

## US-IRAN RELATIONS

Ever since the Anglo-American Operation Ajax succeeded in overthrowing the Iranian shah, the United States and Iran have been engaged in a bitter relationship. Today Iran has become a powerful nation that is threatening to use all of her resources to defend herself from an American invasion, which can mean the use of weapons of mass destruction if she actually has any. As proven in the war against Afghanistan or Iraq the United States will not take any chance and will strike Iran if she proves to be a threat to world security.

The Iraqi government was accused of possessing weapons of mass destruction although this was never proved neither by the United Nations nor by the United States. The fear of the possibility of the Iraqis being in the possession of such weapons as well as the American wish of overthrowing the Bath government in Iraq led to the Iraqi invasion by the United States. Before the war even took place, the Iranian and Syrian governments publicly condemned the American invasion of Iraq. Although the Iranian government condemned this war, during the first days of war the situation seemed to be positive. After being a week into the war an interview was held in Tehran by Iranian journalists. They asked the people whether they liked the idea of US Marines occupying Baghdad and most of them responded positively. It seemed that the American intention of encouraging other people in the Middle East to overthrow their governments and establishing democracies was working.

Once the actual war was over and the United States military occupied Baghdad, the Bush Administration then went on to dismiss all the Sunnis from the Iraqi military and police force and went on to help the Shiites set up their own government. This totally contradicts what is occurring now; the American government has stopped dealing with the Shiites and now supports the Sunnis. This is because the great majority of Iranian habitants are Sunnis.

The United States recently set up a coalition of countries in the Middle East which include: Egypt, Great Britain, Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the United States which was set up to fight the Hezbollah leader, Nassan Hasrallah, who is in charge of a coalition which is challenging the pro-American government in Lebanon. Hezbollah operates in Lebanon. The United States and her allies in the Middle East have decided that under no circumstances will there be any compromise with Hezbollah. In Lebanon, as well as Hezbollah there are three other "Zalafi Jihadist groups" which are connected to Al-Qaeda. These groups are "tolerated by the Sunni government" and the Lebanese government provides those with arms and allows them to recruit. "No one bothers them."

Why? These terrorist groups are "much more Anti-Shiite, much more Anti-Hezbollah, mucho more Anti-Iran than they are Anti-American" which is "a counterbalance to Shiite Iran." Covert money obtained from Iraq and from the Saudi Arabian prince is supplied to these groups. Although this happens it is not a direct action. First the American government provides this money to the Siniora government and then

it is passed on from the Lebanese government onto the terrorist organizations. The Lebanese even acknowledge it openly that these groups are present in Lebanon.

The Middle East is the American target and Iran is its next victim. The American government has made plans for open confrontation against Iran already. "Contingency plans" have been going on for a long time. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have even planned a possible attack upon twenty-four hour notice. All of this is being happening without formally telling Congress. The Bush Administration could even attack Iran without the Congress' approval. According to the bill passed while voting for the war in Iraq, the President of the United States is allowed to attack any country preemptively under only one condition. The only condition is that if the accused country presents any threat to another nation or to the security of the world. In this case the Bush Administration could attack Iran with or without Congress.

In the span of the years the "contingency plan" has been developing more and more. Now there are three possible targets. The first one would be the "counter-proliferation targeting" which consists in targeting the sites of the weapons of mass destruction. Another target which was set last year was the one of "decapitation." This consists in "overthrowing leadership" and replacing the government with a democratic form of government. "Terrorism targets" is another part of the "contingency planning." The President of the United States has been publicly convincing the people that the Iranians have been crossing the border into Iraq and have been killing Americans. Although this has not changed the opinion of the people Bush continuously tries to find reasons to attack Iran.

Before there was even the option of a nuclear attack on Iran but some members of the Joint Chief Staff were very troubled by this and warned the Bush Administration that they would resign if the war was going in that direction. Therefore the plan was cancelled. A year back also five generals and admirals wanted to resign due to with similar excuses.

We can see that the war in Iraq is going to be repeated in Iran. The wish of the Bush Administration to declare war on Iran is clear. The United States wants to maneuver the situation like they did against Iraq in order to declare war on Iran. Sooner or later the United States will invade Iran. There is no proper course of action to take upon Iran because it's a deliberate wish of the Bush Administration to declare war on Iran. This sounds to be the beginning of Middle Eastern *Realpolitik*.

## **ANALYSING MUSHARRAF**

Ever since the creation of Pakistan in 1947, it has been faced with responsibility to control two very unstable borders. On one side the Islamic Jihadists continuously seek for a hideout in Pakistan and on the other hand the Kashmiri terrorists constantly challenge Pakistani intelligence. Instead of controlling both

frontiers with honesty and courage, Pervez Musharraf has demonstrated to be a corrupt and inadequate leader for Pakistan.

Musharraf has been accused in multiple occasions of having sponsored terrorism in Kashmir. First of all, the CIA director George Tenet and State Department Coordinator for Counterterrorism Michael Sheen said that the US intelligence services have evidence that Pakistan “is a state sponsor of terrorism against India.” This has resulted in 50,000 Hindus killed and another half a million which “fled Kashmir in terror.” A few years back even US President George Bush, former British Prime Minister Tony Blair and ex-French President Jacques Chirac pressurized Musharraf to stop executing such illegal actions in Kashmir. Although he is highly responsible, Musharraf is not the only responsible for these acts of terrorism. According to the New York Times and Boston Globe 4,000 army officers were involved with the Pakistani Intelligence (ISI) while carrying out terrorism against India. Musharraf “has crossed all limits.” If the Kashmir conflict would have been treated with more delicacy, there would have been more probability of peace with India.

The Pakistani leader’s stubbornness, lack of interest and lack of initiative also hurt Indo-Pakistani diplomatic relations. Musharraf declares that “we want to reduce tensions and we want to deescalate.” But how is this ever going to be done if he does not take any initiatives? He claims to have taken many initiatives and believes that “it is high time he [Vajpayee] takes some initiatives also,” although most of the “peace talks” were an Indian initiative. His lack of interest in reaching to a settlement with India is shown by his comments: “I do not have to show anything to them [India] really...”, “If it suits them alright, if it doesn’t, well...” If the Pakistani leader himself doesn’t show any courage to further the “peace talks” then who will?

On the other border, Musharraf is internationally pressurized to search for Osama bin Laden. According to Musharraf there are four different possibilities where to as Osama bin Laden is concerned. The most rational one according to Musharraf is that he is dead due to his kidney problems and impossibility of cure. Critics discuss that this has not been proven and could just be a rumor. Another possibility would be the one of him hiding in the mountain range in Afghanistan. Musharraf supports this idea by saying that the mountain range in Afghanistan is vast and the US intelligence cannot cover everything; he might be moving strategically from place to place. The third possibility is that Osama bin Laden has gone north towards Turkmenistan, Tajikistan or Uzbekistan or gone west towards Iran. This is just a small possibility but it cannot be discarded. The last possibility is Pakistan. “I don’t think Osama bin Laden could be in Pakistan,” although “anyone can come across those [streams from the Afghani border].” “This border is impossible to seal completely.” “There are

innumerable routes coming in.” There is a possibility that terrorists achieve to enter Pakistan.

The ISI (Pakistani Government Intelligence Service) is misled by Musharraf. The Jaish-e-Mohammed terrorist organization, which was behind the kidnapping and murder of the American journalist Daniel Pearl, was linked with the Pakistani Intelligence according to New York Times and the Newsweek. Evidence was found that even his killers might have been agents of the Pakistani government. The Pakistani intelligence under the supervision of Musharraf has played a part in terrorist activities.

Peace with India and the War on Terrorism are the major issues Musharraf is faced with. He has encouraged and sponsored terrorist groups in Kashmir and at the same time fails to “completely seal” his borders from Taliban terrorists. “The world is counting on Musharraf to help steer South and Central Asia from local chaos to regional security” although he proves to be inadequate for what is in Pakistani interests.