

## Attacks in Iran

The US covert war against Iran raised the stakes even higher today with the assassination of yet another nuclear scientist, with some analysts saying that the Islamic Republic is being pushed into a corner to either back down in its confrontation with the US or retaliate – the latter most certainly triggering an all-out war.

Thirty-two-year-old chemical engineer Mostafa Ahmadi Roshan was inside his small Peugeot car when two assailants on motorbike rode up alongside and planted a magnetic bomb on his vehicle in the capital, Tehran. The scientist was killed instantly by the explosion. His driver died later from injuries. An elderly bystander was also killed in the attack. Roshan was head of technical procurements at Iran's first uranium enrichment facility at Natanz. His killing bears all the hallmarks of a targeted assassination by foreign covert military agents. Iranian state-owned media and parliamentarians immediately denounced "Mossad", "Zionists" and the Western proxy-terrorist group, the Mujahedine-e Khalq Organisation (MKO), for having a role in the murder.

Such involvement is likely true, but ultimately the author must have been Washington. None of the groups would dare carry out this high-profile hit without clearance from handlers in Washington. Noticeably, Iranian sources shied away from articulating this obvious conclusion, perhaps realizing the gravity of the consequences. For the past two years at least it is an open secret that Washington (along with British MI6, Mossad and local proxies) has been orchestrating a campaign of terrorist subversion in Iran – the ultimate aim being to overthrow the 33-year-old Islamic Republic, which replaced the West's favourite client, the Shah of Iran in 1979. This is the real reason for the contrived confrontation over Iran's nuclear activities.

Dozens of Iranian scientists, engineers and academics have either been abducted or assassinated by US-led covert ops. Most of them have been closely involved in Iran's nuclear research. Two years ago, Professor Massoud Ali Mohammed was killed when a booby-trapped motorcycle exploded outside his home in Tehran. Last year, in an attack identical to the latest, nuclear scientist Majid Shahriari was murdered when motorcyclists planted magnetic bombs on his car. Another scientist, Fereydoun Abbassi, who is now head of Iran's Atomic Energy Organisation, was seriously wounded in a simultaneous attack.

On 12 November last year, a massive explosion ripped through a military installation at Bid Kaneh, near Tehran, killing 17 personnel, including Brigadier Hassan Moghadam who is believed to have been a senior missile technician. In that attack, there is suspicion that the explosive payload may have been fired from a CIA aerial drone. Then two weeks later, another explosion hit a nuclear facility in Isfahan, Western Iran. Combined with CIA cyber-attacks on Iranian research networks and increasing drone incursions into Iranian territory, it is clear that the cold-blooded murder of the country's nuclear experts is part of a deliberate cover campaign of terrorist subversion – orchestrated by Washington.

The latest assassination in Tehran comes only two days after an Iranian court sentenced a former US marine to death after he was convicted of operating in Iran as a CIA spy. That announcement provoked condemnation from the White House and an irate response in the American media. A US state department spokeswoman lashed out at the Iranian regime accusing it of committing routine political abductions of American citizens.

The details on the convicted man, Amir Mirzae Hekmati (28) from Flint, Michigan, seem murky. But it appears that he was given due process since his arrest in August, including access to a lawyer. He has 20 days to appeal the verdict. It should be noted that three other American citizens arrested previously in Iran on suspicion of espionage were eventually released by the Iranian authorities. It has been mooted that the government in Tehran released those detainees as a gesture for diplomatic dialogue with the Obama administration. The rebuff from Washington may have hardened Tehran to push for the full prosecution in the case of Hekmati.

But the wider context is the concerted efforts by Washington to overthrow the Islamic Republic's government headed by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The sentencing of Hekmati is another twist in the spiraling tensions between Iran and the US and its Western allies – tensions that have escalated because of relentless Western aggression over unsubstantiated claims about Iran's nuclear programme. According to Tehran and undisputed by countless UN inspections, Iran's nuclear programme is for civilian energy and medical applications and is legitimately within the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

With tightening US-led sanctions bearing down on Iran's Central Bank and oil industry, the naval war of nerves in the Strait of Hormuz, and the constantly amplified, provocative threats of pre-emptive military strikes against Iran, it is any wonder that Tehran needs to show defiance and assert its sovereign rights with regards to foreign nationals suspected of covert operations.

However, in the climate of hostility, any such move by Tehran is immediately portrayed as a provocation – just as its warning was last week over the closing of territorial waters in the Strait of Hormuz to oil trans-shipments if the West proceeds with sanctions. If the murder of the Iranian scientist is a US strike over the sentencing of the alleged CIA spy, then the Iranians are being told that they have no room for manoeuvre – even when the manoeuvre is covered by a claim to sovereign rights.

It seems that the near decade-long Western confrontation with Iran has now shifted gear to an irrevocable vicious cycle where war is all but inevitable.

The latest murder of a senior Iranian scientist seems to be a trenchant ultimatum dispatched from Washington to Iran. The assassination campaign on Iranian territory against its citizens and scientific experts is not just as an act of war. It is a premeditated taunt for a response.

Finian Cunningham  
cunninghamfinian@gmail.com

NYT reports on Iran policy

Officially, America is now bankrupt: financially, economically, politically – and morally. Its criminal aggression towards Iran is just one of many parts of a jigsaw that add up to a clear and grotesque picture of what the United States of America now represents in the 21st Century world.

The numbers and pictures for these constituent parts of this odious jigsaw puzzle are well known. But what has become glaringly clear is just how integrated the official image of the US now is. Bankrupt. Terminally in debt, mass poverty at record levels, rampant militarism, draconian curbs on civil liberties, government by the rich for the rich, and lately the reactionary, debased cat-fight that passes for political debate among Republican contenders for the Presidency. Cringing is the sight of super wealthy career politicians throwing sand in each other's eyes to scabble up the pole for yet further personal accumulation of capital; disturbing is the easy way that psychopathic targeting of imagined enemies whether at home or abroad is worn like a badge of honour. It is a sign of how depraved the American political mind has become when would-be presidents can so openly talk of conducting foreign policy in terms of unquestioned international aggression.

Of course, this kind of political and moral bankruptcy is not just confined to those seeking office. It is the coin of those who are already in office. In a report in the New York Times Monday we have the startling admissions that, taken together, show that the US government should be certified as criminal (if further proof were needed) [1]. First we have the top US military man confirming that long-averred war plans against Iran are indeed going ahead.

The NYT: "When asked on [CBS's] Face the Nation about the how difficult it would be to take out Iran's nuclear ability in a military strike, Gen. Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: 'Well, I would rather not discuss the degree of difficulty and in any way encourage them to read anything into that. But I will say that my responsibility is to encourage the right degree of planning, to understand the risks associated with any kind of military option, in some cases to position assets, to provide those options in a timely fashion. And all those activities are going on.'" In other words, the US is preparing for war.

Ironically, in the above lengthy article about the imminent opening of Iran's second uranium enrichment plant at Qom, located under a mountain and impregnable from attack, the New York Times buries General Dempsey's admission deep within the folds of its paragraphs perhaps in a bid to make it impregnable from attack by sane readers. Granted, the bellicose talk from US Commander-

in-Chief Barack Obama and his administration of all options on the table has become so routine that the editors at the NYT have probably become inured to criminal admissions and so don't think them worth any higher prominence than a final paragraph. But here is the second part of the equation that adds up to definite criminality. In the same story, the New York Times quotes US Defence Secretary Leon Panetta making what should be a startling admission: that Iran does not have a nuclear weapons programme. Panetta says: "Are they [Iran] trying to develop a nuclear weapon? ". "No."

That Panetta finally admits what many people around the world know to be true, including American intelligence agencies in at least two US National Intelligence Estimates in 2007 and 2010 – that is, that Iran is not attempting to develop a nuclear weapon, should be a front-page headline. Especially when taken together with General Dempsey's disclosure that war plans are afoot. From its own admission, therefore, the US government is pushing the world into possibly a World War III scenario on the basis of a totally spurious claim that even its own top brass do not believe.

Reflecting the bankruptcy that has corroded the US political establishment is the way that the New York Times – America's self-styled premier newspaper – glides over these nuggets of self-indictment as if they were worthless banalities. So if Iran is not even trying to develop a nuclear weapon, as Panetta now admits, what then is the criminal US warmongering predicated on? Unofficially, the real reason is imperialist rivalry with other powers (Russia and China in particular) in the energy-rich Persian Gulf and Central Asia regions, and the attempt to engineer "regime change" in Iran to one that is pliant with Washington's geopolitical designs. Officially, for what it is worth, it seems now that the US is not happy even with the mere suspicion that Iran maybe, just maybe, might one day be capable of developing nuclear capability.

This is where facts can be helpful. As a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran has the legal right to develop nuclear capability for civilian purposes. This is what Iran has consistently said it is doing and what countless UN inspections of facilities over many years, including the new plant at Qom, have verified. The enrichment of uranium constitutes "nuclear capability" and is an essential part of harnessing nuclear energy for civilian energy. Iran should be congratulated for this achievement given years of gratuitous sanctions by the US and its Western allies. But, the way the US government and its Western allies put it, Iran's legitimate nuclear capability is made to sound like a diabolical threat. Panetta again: "But we know that they're trying to develop a nuclear capability. And that's what concerns us."

There you have it. The United States can drop nuclear weapons on civilians, possess up to 10,000 nuclear warheads, supply its allies illegally with such weapons and continue to violate the purpose of the NPT by not disarming its nuclear arsenal – yet if a country uses the provisions of the NPT legitimately to pursue nuclear capability then it is reviled and made a target for an illegal war of aggression, most probably with nuclear weapons. This is depravity-turned-foreign policy – emanating from supposedly the most democratic government in the world. In that way, the unseemly Republican

Party cat-fight between Romney et al is but a symptom of the chronically bankrupt body politic that is American government in the 21st Century.

Finian Cunningham  
cunninghamfinian@gmail.com

US Troops "deployed" to Israel:

Accompanied by a US aircraft carrier, 9,000 US troops including airmen, missile interceptor teams, marines, technicians and intelligence officers are scheduled to land in Israel in the coming weeks. Many will stay up to the end of the year as part of the US-Israeli Army deployment in readiness for a military engagement with Iran, aiming at a synchronized military front against Iran. US Third Air Force Lt. Gen. Frank Gorenc commented in his visit two weeks ago that the coming action is more a "deployment" than an "exercise,". The joint force will now be in place ready for a decision to attack Iran's nuclear installations or any combat emergency.

After Tehran had released a bulletin about another Iranian naval exercise at the Strait of Hormuz in February, US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak and the two army chiefs, US Gen. Martin Dempsey and Lt. Gen. Benny Gantz decided to announce the coming of the force on Thursday night, Jan. 5. During his visit to Washington, British Defense Minister, Phillip Hammond, confirmed that Britain stands ready to strike Iran if the Strait of Hormuz is closed. Tehran stage military's maneuvers every few days to assure the Iranians that it is prepared to defend the country against an American or Israeli strike on its national nuclear program.

The joint US-Israeli drill is going to test several Israeli and US air defense systems against incoming missiles will also practice intercepting missiles and rockets coming in from Syria, Hezbollah Party in Lebanon, and Hamas in the Gaza Strip.

**Obama facilitates Military dictatorship in USA:**

"I believe," warned James Madison in a speech to the Virginia Convention on June 16, 1788, "there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations". Surely, this is the story behind the New Year's Eve, 2011, signing by President Obama of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). While they were merry-making and tootling horns, NDAA stripped Americans of the last vestiges of their liberties. Now that President Obama can order the military to arrest and imprison you indefinitely on suspicion without trial, your First Amendment rights of speech, press, assembly, and petition have no meaning. Who are you going to assemble with from your jail cell?

NDAA is only the most recent chapter in a creeping totalitarian horror story going back decades. President Harry Truman vetoed the Internal Security Act of 1950 that codified indefinite detention without trial but his veto was overturned by Congress. Truman called the Act "the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press, and assembly since the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798, a "mockery of the Bill of Rights" and a "long step toward totalitarianism."

That Act, a.k.a. the McCarran-Walter Act, was aimed at the Communist Party of the United States and authorized incarceration of those who would "probably engage in espionage or sabotage." At the time it would have been difficult to think of any example of any known U.S. Communist Party member anywhere engaging in sabotage. By contrast, it was about the same time the CIA was getting off to a jump start at overthrowing foreign governments by force and violence. Under the Act, prominent individuals considered subversive were barred entry to the United States, limiting the free speech of American citizens. Among them: Argentine novelist Julio Cortazar, Colombian novelist Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Chilean poet Pablo Neruda, and British novelist Graham Greene, Wikipedia recalls.

Totalitarianism continued its creep despite the objections of Senator George McGovern of South Dakota in 1970, who vainly blasted the "no knock" ordinance Congress pressed down upon that occupied territory known as the District of Columbia. This law allowed police to bust into any dwelling without a court order. McGovern referred to it as the Big Brother Act, pointing out that "your home is no longer your castle and your liberties are no longer your own." That was but one small foretaste of today's police state powers.

In 1978, President Jimmy Carter signed into law the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) that violated the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. It set up the FISA Court, and later the FISA Court of Review, true "Star Chambers" that international law Professor Francis Boyle of the University of Illinois says "are nothing more than rubber stamps for government requests for unconstitutional surveillance on U.S. citizens."

"With the FISA Amendments Act approved by Obama," Boyle continues, "there is nothing left of the Fourth Amendment that protects 'The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.' I do not understand how any self-

respecting U.S. Federal Judge can serve on the FISA Court and the FISA Court of Review and actively participate in the interment of the Fourth Amendment."

According to Boyle, "After the "draconian Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act(AEDPA) passed by Congress in 1996 in reaction to the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, there was no legitimate law enforcement need for the Patriot Act." Among other things, the AEDPA drastically limited the right of inmates to appeal their death sentences.

Enactment of the Patriot Act of 2003, rushed through Congress after 9/11 and since renewed at leisure, opened the spillways of totalitarianism to flood an entire nation. "From the gagging of our nation's librarians under the national security letter statute to the gutting of time-honored surveillance laws, the Patriot Act has been disastrous for Americans' rights," said Caroline Fredrickson, Director of the ACLU's Washington office. "In the panic following the events of 9/11, our nation's lawmakers hastily expanded the government's authority to a dangerous level and opened a Pandora's box of surveillance," she cautioned in a statement on ACLU's web site.

Amazingly, there has been scant public outcry condemning these government actions. Few Americans objected when President Obama in March, 2011, by executive order decreed Guantanamo detainees could be held indefinitely---a policy that NDAA now applies to American citizens under the NDAA.

"No president," said the ACLU, "should have the power to declare the entire globe a war zone and then seize and detain civilian terrorism suspects anywhere in the world---including within the United States---and to hold them forever without charge or trial."

"By signing this defense spending bill(NDAA), President Obama will go down in history as the president who enshrined indefinite detention without trial in US law," said Kenneth Roth, executive director of Human Rights Watch. "In the past, Obama has lauded the importance of being on the right side of history, but today he is definitely on the wrong side."

"This amounts to the repeal of the U.S. Constitution," Roth said, adding, "We have a Republican Party that is a Gestapo Party---to arrest American citizens and put them in concentration camps." (Author's note: NDAA could not have passed without the strong support of Democratic lawmakers.) Roth goes on to say: "The (NDAA) law replaces an effective system of civilian-court prosecutions with a system that has generated the kind of global outrage that would delight recruiters of terrorists."

With the NDAA, America has now returned to the disgraceful Korematsu Era, when President Roosevelt ordered the military to round up law-abiding Japanese-American citizens and stick them in concentration camps for the duration of World War II. "By comparison," Boyle says, "there is no end in sight to the bogus U.S. war on terrorism. The United States Supreme Court has never overruled the

Korematsu case. And as a teacher of constitutional law, President Obama is fully aware of this loaded-gun that he now has in his hands waiting to fire on the American people by means of the NDAA."

Boyle also warns that the NDAA, coupled with the notorious Pentagon and CIA "murder lists," means President Obama could now start CIA and Joint Special Operations Command(JSOC) death squads and/or disappearance squads to render American citizens to Guantanamo Bay prison or abroad "for torture and murder." If most Americans are unfamiliar with JSOC, perhaps that's because it operates in secret. That this menacing terror law has been enacted, like the unconstitutional laws that preceded it, with barely a murmur of outrage, speaks volumes about the manner in which the repressive aspects of these laws have been hidden from the general public. It also reflects on the indifference of the American people to the incineration of their once cherished civil liberties on the bonfires of totalitarianism.

You can't say James Madison didn't warn us in 1788.

***Sherwood Ross is a Miami-based public relations consultant for good causes. He formerly worked for civil rights groups, major dailies and wire services. Reach him at [sherwoodross10@gmail.com](mailto:sherwoodross10@gmail.com); Professor Francis Boyle is the author of "Tackling America's Toughest Questions" from Clarity Press.***

## **Manipulation of the UN Security Council in support of the US-NATO Military Agenda Coercion, Intimidation & Bribery used to Extort Approval from Reluctant Members**

**by Carla Stea**

United Nations Security Council decisions are portrayed as "the will of the international community," and Security Council action in support of a national agenda confers moral authority upon that agenda. For this reason it is crucial to understand the tactics by which UN Security Council independence is frequently usurped, and the methods of coercion, intimidation and bribery used to extort approval from reluctant members of the Security Council, or from those members adamantly opposed to a particular course of action.

Twenty-two years ago, as a result of the United Nations Security Council adoption of Resolution 678, which authorized the use of "all necessary means" to end the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and "approved" the launch of the first United Nations supported Persian Gulf War, former United States Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, who had witnessed the devastating consequences of that war's saturation

bombing of Baghdad, stated that "The United Nations, which was created "to prevent the scourge of war," has become an instrument of war."

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Security Council has been in danger of becoming a political battering ram used for the purpose of "legitimizing" the neo-imperial adventures, and the reassertion of Western dominance over former colonial territories in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East . Since 1991, the United Nations Security Council has often been referred to as "an arm of the Pentagon," or "an annex of the US State Department." In 1990, only two countries in the United Nations Security Council opposed the passage of Resolution 678, and when Yemen cast one of these votes, the U.S. Ambassador brazenly threatened him: "That will be the most expensive vote you ever cast," and the U.S. immediately cut off 70 million dollars in aid to Yemen .

Several months prior to the vote, on September 25, 1990, Mr. Abu Hassan, Foreign Minister of Malaysia stated before the Security Council:

"We cannot but feel perturbed over the headlong rush, moving from one resolution to another in a period of seven weeks. The question may be asked whether enough time is given for each resolution to take effect. Are we moving at this speed to make sanctions effective, or are we readying ourselves early for a situation where we will conclude that sanctions are not effective and that other measures must therefore be taken? Malaysia will not accept the latter course being applied. We do not accept that war is inevitable....Malaysia believes our sense of uneasiness is shared by many outside the Council and that the council should take stock of where it is going. Malaysia , as a principle, is averse to the involvement of the armed forces of major powers in any region...As a non-aligned member and coming from a region which has been a casualty of the battles and wars fought by armies of major powers, we fear the consequences of a long term presence of military forces of major powers."

On September 25, 1990 the Colombian Foreign Minister stated:

"We wish, above all to appeal for peace and reflection...concerned as we are that any military confrontation would be a tragedy which we would regret for the rest of our lives." The following day the Colombian Ambassador stated: "We hoped that a draft resolution along these lines could be submitted to the Council with our co-sponsorship in the next few days. The very next day we submitted a draft resolution, along with Cuba , Malaysia and Yemen , developing the remarks made by our Foreign Minister the day before. But the truth is that the very next day, too, all kinds of pressure began to be exercised to induce us to forget about our text...What is more, we were given to understand that our draft did not have the approval of the Secretary-General. That did not prove to be the case...Last week, in order to arrive at the final text of what is now Resolution 674, intensive consultations took place that left us hurt and frustrated and wondering about the way the Security Council operates. My delegation is not making any judgement about these procedures. We ask

everyone here to do so, from the depths of his soul, keeping in mind the future of the United Nations and of the world, which is all that really matters.”

Despite consistent determined opposition to military action expressed by Colombia and Malaysia during the months prior to January 16, 1991, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker was determined to force these two non-permanent members of the Security Council to support the war, regardless of their convictions. Baker made a whirlwind tour to accomplish this, and told the Columbian President that his Ambassador was “going crazy with these peace initiatives, and must be stopped.” This was accompanied by the usual threat of cut-off of aid. Baker pursued the Malaysian Foreign Minister to his hotel in Tokyo , and succeeded in forcing him to reverse his position, and vote in favor of military action against Iraq . Again similar tactics were used, again successfully.

During the weeks preceding January 15, 1991, the President of Algeria had traveled throughout the Middle East speaking to leaders in Syria , Egypt , Jordan , Oman , Iraq and Iran . He also spoke twice with the advisor for King Fahd of Saudi Arabia . Highly placed diplomatic sources accredited to the United Nations confirmed that the agreements the Algerian President obtained from the leaders of each country would have led to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in compliance with UN requirements. The final meeting was to be held with King Fahd of Saudi Arabia . At the last moment the King refused to meet with the Algerian President, and denied him a visa to enter Saudi Arabia , claiming that he “needed more time.” According to a highly placed diplomatic source, “ Washington did not want this meeting.”

On January 17, 1991 President Bush stated his goal as the liberation of Kuwait , not the conquest of Iraq , additionally claiming that “we are determined to knock out Saddam Hussein’s nuclear bomb potential. We will also destroy his chemical weapons facilities.” With this, the U.S. placed itself in violation of a UN General Assembly Resolution (A/C.1/45/L.38) “prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities.” Attempts to enforce the resolution were met by threats from the U.S. and Egyptian authorities, advising that such efforts be dropped.

Article 22 of the Hague convention specifically declares the use of “all necessary means” illegal. Resolution 678 also violates the Hague convention’s articles 25 and 27, and violate Articles 1, 2a, 2b and article IIIc of the Convention Prohibiting Genocide. United Nations investigator Marti Ahtisaari disclosed that coalition bombing had caused “near-apocalyptic damage, destroying the economic infrastructure necessary to support human life in Iraq,” and warning “the Iraqi people may soon face a further imminent catastrophe, which could include epidemic and famine, if massive life-supporting needs are not met.” The July 15 report of the United Nations Humanitarian Mission to Iraq , submitted by Sadruddin Aga Khan, states that: “The aftermath of the Persian Gulf war of January and February 1991 presented a compelling spectacle of suffering and devastation to the international community. The tragic consequences of conflict, the untold loss of life and destruction, were compounded by massive displacements of ill-prepared populations, by ecological disasters of unprecedented

magnitude, by the collapse of the structures that sustain life in today's human societies.....It is evident that for large numbers of the people of Iraq, every passing month brings closer the brink of calamity. As usual, it is the poor, the children, the widowed and the elderly, the most vulnerable amongst the population, who are the first to suffer."

The failure of the administration of George W. Bush to obtain United Nations Security Council support for the "Shock and Awe" bombing attack on Iraq in 2003 seriously undermined both the credibility and the morale of the operation, and weakened Bush's popularity to the point where he became the object of ridicule, his "mission accomplished" posturing mocked, and it was in part the conspicuous and disastrous result of that war, and the exposure of the lies used to justify the war, that became a major factor in the successful presidential campaign of Barack Obama..

On October 4, 2011 United Nations Security Council draft resolution S/2011/612, which sought Security Council approval for punitive measures against Syria, was defeated by the vetoes cast by Russia and China. Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa were outraged that Resolution 1973, authorizing a no-fly zone in Libya for the exclusive purpose of protecting civilians, morphed into promiscuous attacks on Libya by NATO, and blatant NATO support of the Libyan opposition, in gross violations of NATO's mandate. Indeed, former Chairman of the Arab League, Amre Moussa had called an emergency meeting of the Arab League, and stated: "What is happening in Libya differs from the aim of imposing a no-fly zone, and what we want is the protection of civilians, and not the bombardment of more civilians."

Resolution 1973 culminated, in violation of its mandate, in "regime change" and the extrajudicial murder of Omar Khaddafy, the Libyan president, resulting, ultimately in innumerable violations of international law that could be traced to the blessing given by the United Nations to Security Council Resolution 1973.

In explanation of the veto cast by Russia on October 4th, the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation stated:

"The situation in Syria cannot be considered in the Council separately from the Libyan experience. The international community is alarmed by statements that compliance with the Security Council resolution on Libya in the NATO interpretation is a model for the future action of NATO in implementing the responsibility to protect....The demand for a quick cease-fire turned into a full-fledged civil war, the humanitarian, social, economic and military consequences of which transcend Libyan borders. The situation in connection with the no-fly zone has morphed into the bombing of oil refineries, television stations and other civilian sites. The arms embargo has morphed into a naval blockade in Western Libya, including a blockade of humanitarian goods....With respect to Syria ...the continuation of this tragedy cannot be blamed only on the harsh actions of the authorities. Recent events convincingly show that the radical opposition no longer hides its extremist bent and is relying

on terrorist tactics, hoping for foreign sponsors and acting outside of the law. Armed groups supported by smuggling and other illegal activities are providing supplies, taking over land, and killing and perpetrating atrocities against people who comply with the law-enforcement authorities.”

The Russian-Chinese veto which defeated draft resolution 612 was not, however the end of the story. It was the beginning of the stealthy and not so stealthy US/NATO campaign to force the Security Council to support its agenda to subjugate and impose regime change in Syria . Relentless pressure on Russia and China to reverse their position ensued.

Soon thereafter, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and 17 other states co-sponsored a resolution which was submitted to the UN General Assembly Third Committee condemning the Syrian authorities for human rights violations, a resolution at no point referring to gross human rights violations committed by the Syrian opposition in what was swiftly becoming a civil war. It was far easier and more expeditious to get a resolution condemning the Syrian authorities adopted by the General Assembly, where many smaller, weaker countries would be more accessible to various forms of influence than would be the case in the Security Council. Once adopted, the General Assembly Third Committee Resolution could be used to pressure, and if necessary bludgeon or blackmail members of the Security Council perceived as recalcitrant by the US/NATO powers. The Resolution entitled “Situation of Human Rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (A/66/462/Add.3) was adopted on December 19th by a vote of 133 in favor, 54 opposed or abstaining. The extreme pressure on Russia and China continued throughout December, when Russia held the Presidency of the Security Council.

On December 8th, in a fortuitous coincidence, the United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights, Mrs. Navi Pillay was in New York , and the French Ambassador, Gerard Araud urged that she “drop by” and brief the Security Council on Syria . There have been serious questions raised about Mrs. Pillay exceeding the mandate of her office, and allowing her office to be politicized. There have also been doubts about her impartiality. There were questions raised about whether her coincidental presence in New York warranted her visit to the Security Council, and whether she was welcomed unanimously by all Council members. Suddenly a large number of reporters swarmed toward the Security Council after a “Procedural Vote” was announced. And then the “procedural vote” did not occur. Evidently the French Ambassador had threatened the procedural vote to embarrass Russia and China , and force another audience for Mrs. Pillay at the Security Council.

To provide balance, the Chinese Ambassador urged that the issue of Palestine also be considered, and the briefing focus on urgent problems and serious human rights violations in the Middle East, not exclusively Syria . There was such massive opposition by the US, the UK, France and Germany to inclusion of Palestine in Mrs. Pillay’s briefing that, although these Permanent Representatives insisted that they had not opposed the inclusion of Palestine at the briefing, they proceeded to state, incensed, that the inclusion of Palestine was a “red herring,” and an attempt to distract attention from the

problems in Syria. The Russian Ambassador, President of the Security Council, when asked whether he had encountered opposition to the inclusion of Palestine in the briefing replied: "What opposed means may turn into something of a linguistic discussion...I saw every trick in the book being thrown at me, short of trying to strangle the President of the Security Council."

The Russian Ambassador made a statement to the press regarding the absurdity of this imbroglio at the Security Council: "in some science fiction there was this little poem. It is difficult to translate poems from Russian into English, but it went something like this: This morning a rocket was launched. It is flying sixteen times the speed of light, so it will reach its destination at 6PM...yesterday."

Following the closed briefing, Mrs. Pillay spoke briefly to the press, alleging that as of December 12th, there were 5,000 people dead in Syria, including 300 children, thousands of people in detention, torture had occurred, and she had recommended that the Syrian authorities be referred to the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity. At no point did Mrs. Pillay identify the source of her information, and she left before I had an opportunity to inquire about the identity of her sources. Then the French, British, Portuguese and American representatives spoke to the press reiterating that it was "unconscionable that the Security Council did not take action" and "unbearable that the Council is forced to remain silent" in view of Mrs. Pillay's horrifying disclosures."

I was finally able to ask the British Permanent Representative, Mark Lyall Grant what was the source of Mrs. Pillay's information, and I was told the source of the United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights' horrific details was 233 defecting members of the military. Leaving aside the various possible motivations defecting members of the military might have for distorting information, Mrs. Pillay's failure to provide any information about possible violent acts committed by the opposition, and her exclusive focus upon violence committed by the government raises extremely serious questions about her objectivity, and the propriety and legality of her giving the imprimatur of her office to one side in what is essentially a civil war. Mrs. Pillay maintains that she had no access to Syria . How then is she able to interview a credible cross-section of witnesses to provide an accurate report of violence by the Syrian government? The Council President reminded the press that on August 3rd there were reports that the Syrian navy fired at the opposition. Russian witnesses residing in Syria repudiated these reports. No subsequent mention was made of this discrepancy, nor did Mrs. Pillay at any time investigate the reports by the Russian witnesses disputing allegations against the Syrian navy.

On December 18th The New York Times reported horrific civilian deaths as a result of NATO strikes on Libya . On December 19th UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon initially denied these reports. That afternoon, at a stake-out the Council President stated that NATO's claim of zero civilian casualties was cruel and cynical. NATO was evidently reluctant or incapable of effectively investigating the results of the 7,700 bombs or missiles it dropped on Libya . The New York Times stated:

“an on-the-ground examination by The New York Times of airstrike sites across Libya – including interviews with survivors, doctors and witnesses, and the collection of munitions remnants, medical reports, death certificates and photographs – found credible accounts of dozens of civilians killed by NATO in many distinct attacks. The victims, including at least 29 women or children often had been asleep in homes when the ordnance hit....By NATO’s telling during the war, and in statements since sorties ended on October 31, the alliance-led operation was nearly flawless – a model air war that used high technology, meticulous planning and restraint to protect civilians from Colonel Qaddafi’s troops, which was the alliance’s mandate. ‘We have carried out this operation very carefully, without confirmed civilian casualties, the Secretary-General of NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen said in November.’ The Security Council President stated that the United Nations should help in investigating civilian casualties if NATO cannot do this on its own.”

While the Security Council President had stated on December 9th that pressures on him by the US, UK, France and Germany within the Security Council had ‘stopped short of strangling him,’ on December 16th a media advisory was sent to the UN press corps by Fehmi Khairullah of the “Syria First Coalition,” a US based organization, (the source of whose funding is unclear).....announcing Syrian Day of Rage, stating: “Syrian Regime is killing his own people with support of the Russian Federation to the Criminal Syrian Regime.” The media advisory announced demonstrations “to protest the Russian Support of the Criminal Syrian Regime,” held Friday, December 16, 2011 from 3PM till 5PM at the Russian Mission to the United Nations, 136 East 67 Street, New York 10065, demonstrators to include “outraged Syrians Gathering to Condemn the Continuous Russian Support to the Syrian Criminal Regime.”

Pressure on the President of the UN Security Council within the Security Council itself, which, in his words ‘stopped just short of strangulation,’ was augmented by demonstrations by ‘Syria First Coalition’ outside the Russian Mission to the UN, including a letter addressed to the Russian Ambassador, accusing: “Your veto in the United Nations not only supports the murderous regime, but also blocks any humanitarian aid to the desperate people of Syria, who are freezing cold, starving, scared and out of medical supplies.” The letter’s statistic of 5,078 Syrians killed does not mention that this includes the 1,000 Syrian government official killed by the opposition, a figure admitted even by Mrs. Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner of Human Rights.

By December 22, at the Security Council stake-out, the Council President was forced to defend his inclusion on the December Security Council agenda of discussion of human rights violations of the Palestinian people, and the crucial matter of Libyan civilians killed by NATO strikes. Evidently the US/NATO group demanded that only the matter of Syria be included on the Security Council agenda. US Ambassador Susan Rice, outraged that the Security Council had focused on the deaths of 70 Libyan civilians as a result of the US/NATO bombing of Libya , declared: “Welcome to the bombast. I was recently in Libya , and the Libyan people expressed overwhelming gratitude for NATO’s help. “ Ambassador Rice evidently neglected to meet Mustafa Naji al Morabit, among many other victims of

NATO airstrikes. According to the New York Times, "On August 4th a bomb roared down in the early morning quiet and slammed into their concrete home causing its front to buckle. Mr. Morabit's wife Eptisam Ali al-Barbar died of a crushed skull. Two of their sons, Mohammed, 6, and Moataz, 3 were killed too. Three toes on the left foot of Fatima Umar Mansour, Mr. Morabit's mother, were severed, her lower left leg was snapped."

"On August 8th, four days after destroying the Morabit home, NATO hit buildings occupied by civilians again, this time in Majer, according to survivors, doctors and independent investigators. The strikes were NATO's bloodiest known accidents in the war. The attack began with a series of 500-pound laser-guided bombs, called GBU-12s, ordnance remnants suggest. The first house, owned by Ali Hamid Gafez, 61 was crowded with Mr. Gafez's relatives, who had been dislocated by the war, he and his neighbors said. The bomb destroyed the second floor and much of the first. Five women and seven children were killed; several more people were wounded, including Mr. Gafez's wife whose lower left leg had to be amputated, the doctor who performed the procedure said. Several minutes after the first strikes, as neighbors rushed to dig for victims, another bomb struck. The blast killed 18 civilians, both families said...The initial findings on the Majer strikes, part of the United Nations investigation into actions by all sides in Libya that harmed civilians, have raised questions about the legality of the attack under international humanitarian law, according to an official familiar with the investigation."

On December 23 the Security Council President held a press conference at which he described Ambassador Rice's 'unusually explosive rhetoric,' and fury at the Russian Ambassador's discussion of Libyan civilians slaughtered by NATO airstrikes. He stated that it was necessary to address Ambassador Rice's outburst which "drowned in expletives." He quoted Ambassador Rice's December 22 accusations of "bombast, bogus claims, a cheap stunt, duplicitous, redundant and superfluous" all expletives used by Ambassador Rice in referring to the Russian Ambassador's discussion of Libyan civilian victims of NATO bombardment. The Russian Ambassador then remarked: "You cannot beat a Stanford education, can you?"

The Russian Ambassador stated that within the Security Council there had been no call for investigation into the Libyan civilian victims of NATO bombardment, and the issue had been entirely ignored. He also reminded the press that President Obama had stated he wanted dialogue with the United Nations and the Security Council. He added, in that case he suggests that the "Stanford Dictionary of Expletives be replaced by something more Victorian."

In response to a question about the breakdown of working relationships between the Permanent Five Security Council members in an atmosphere of acrimony at the Security Council, the Russian Ambassador stated that he is worried that the Security Council is not moving in a good direction," that there are members who are inflexible and demand that 'things must be done in their own way and no other way,' no other views are entertained, and they must have what they demand immediately.' This

will “harm the ability of the Security Council to work.” He stated that Security Council action to end violence in Syria should under no circumstances be an ‘auxilliary of regime-change policy,’ as Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya had proved to be. He said that regime change engineered and forced from outside the country is “inevitably destructive, causing bloodshed, and the Security Council and the United Nations should have nothing to do with that.” He stated that at 11AM that morning the Russian Federation had submitted its third draft resolution on Syria, and stated that “we will not drop references to violence caused by the extreme opposition and will not call for sanctions or an arms embargo, since in Libya the arms embargo blocked weapons to the government, but the opposition illegally received massive arms supplies from many sources.

The fate of the third draft resolution submitted by Russia on December 23 is still undetermined. As of this writing, the changes and deletions required by the US/NATO countries transform this resolution into something unrecognizable, precisely the opposite to its original intent. Its current form includes:

“Emphasizing the need to resolve the current crisis in Syria peacefully, and stressing that nothing in this resolution compels states to take measures or actions exceeding the scope of this resolution including the use of force or threat of force” (United Kingdom)

Deleted from the original Russian draft resolution: “Ruling out any military intervention from outside.”

“ Demands the Syrian government to meet its responsibility to protect its population, to immediately put an end to attacks against those exercising their rights to freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and association and to fully comply with its obligations under applicable international law.”

Deleted from the original Russian draft resolution: “ Demands that the armed opposition groups of Syrian opposition stop violence, human rights violations and terror attacks against civilians, state institutions, army and law enforcement personnel and members of their families.”

Deleted from the original Russian draft resolution: “Urges the Syrian opposition leaders to dissociate themselves from extremists, to accept the League of Arab States initiative and to engage without preconditions in substantial and in-depth dialogue with the Syrian authorities on ways of reforming the Syrian authorities.”

US required changes:

Travel ban/asset freeze on 19 named Syrian officials

Asset freeze on government of Syria , including Central Bank Syria and Syrian Commercial bank

Ban on governmental trade transactions with Syria , except for strategic commodities affecting the Syrian people

Ban of flights to/from Syria

Arms embargo (US/UK)

Deleted from the original Russian draft resolution: “Decides that nothing in this resolution shall be interpreted as an authorization of any sort of military interference in Syria by anyone.”

Conspicuously ignored in all this is the 600 pound gorilla in the living room. On March 17th Resolution 1973 on Libya was adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and NATO bombardment of Libya immediately followed. The very next day, March 18th, anti-government demonstrations began in Syria . On April 18, 2010, the front page of The Washington Post reported:

“U.S. Provides Secret Backing to Syrian Opposition. Leaked Cables Reveal Funding. “The State Department has secretly financed Syrian political opposition groups and related projects, including a satellite TV channel that beams anti-government programming into the country...Barada TV is closely affiliated with the Movement for Justice and Development, a London-based network of Syrian exiles. Classified US diplomatic cables show that the State Department has funneled as much as \$6 million to the group to operate the satellite channel and finance other activities inside Syria...The leaders of Movement for Justice and Development are former members of the Muslim Brotherhood.... Several US diplomatic cables from the embassy in Damascus reveal that the Syrian exiles received money from a State Department program called the ‘Middle East Partnership Initiative.’ According to the cables, the State Department funneled money to the exile group via the Democracy Council, a Los Angeles based non-profit. According to its website, the council sponsors projects in the Middle East, Asia and Latin America to promote the ‘fundamental elements of stable societies.’ The council’s founder and president, James Prince is a former Congressional staff member and investment adviser for Price Waterhouse Cooper...Edgar Vasquez, a State Department spokesman said the Middle East Partnership Initiative has allocated 7.5 million for Syrian programs since 2005. A cable from the embassy in Damascus , however, pegged a much higher total – about \$12 million between 2005 and 2010.”

U.S. funding and involvement in destabilizing independent governments throughout the world follows a similar pattern throughout its long history, from the destabilization and overthrow of the

democratically elected government of Mossadegh in Iran in 1953, to the destabilization and overthrow of a long succession of democratically elected presidents: Arbenz in Guatemala, Juuan Bosch in the Dominican Republic, Goulart in Brazil, Sukarno in Indonesia, Allende in Chile, (where Kissinger famously declared: 'We cannot permit Chile to go communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people.')

In all cases these democratically elected governments independent of US corporate control, were replaced by military dictatorships which institutionalized torture, and placed their nations' economies under control of US based multi-national corporations, impoverishing their own citizens.

The current pattern emerging in the Middle East portends ominous developments within a trajectory that is becoming evident. UN Security Council authorization of "all necessary measures" in Resolution 1973 against the Libyan government gave license for impermissible imperial aggression and bloodshed: The New York Times reported on August 21, 2011:

"Coordination between NATO and the rebels, and among the loosely organized rebel groups themselves had become more sophisticated and lethal in recent weeks, even though NATO's mandate had been merely to protect civilians, not to take sides in the conflict...at the same time, Britain, France and other nations deployed special forces on the ground inside Libya to help train and arm the rebels."

The overthrow of Mossadegh in Iran is described in detail by Robert Dreyfus in "Devil's Game: How the United States Helped Unleash Fundamentalist Islam" (Page 109):

"Mossadegh pushed through the nationalization of Anglo-Persian Oil Company (APOC). It was a catastrophic blow to England ...APOC was the pride and joy of Britain's imperial assets. Mossadegh instantly became a hated man in London. The story of the coup, run jointly by the CIA and M16 has been told many times. Almost never reported, however, is the fact that the two intelligence agencies worked closely with Iran's clergy, the ulema, to weaken and ultimately overthrow Mossadegh. A critical role was played by street mobs, bought and paid for by the CIA and mobilized by rabble rousers tied to the ulema, who demanded the ouster of Prime Minister Mossadegh and the return of the Shah. Ayatollah Kashani, the Chief representative of the Moslem Brotherhood in Iran, was a central figure in the campaign."

If the UN Security Council adopts any resolution that could morph into authorization permitting "all necessary measures" to be used to justify military action to force regime change in Syria, this would be disguised by a fig-leaf of concern for the 'human rights of the Syrian people, in a civil war provoked by US/NATO encouragement of a pre-fabricated opposition. This would inevitably culminate, as in Libya, in 'coordination between NATO and the opposition,' and would eliminate the last curb on US/NATO's grandiose imperial designs. It would unleash the pathological fantasies of global dominance long cherished by the Russophobe Brzezinski, and other similarly inclined policy makers, rupture their precarious grip on reality, and hurl the US/NATO powers into the fatal mistakes of

Napoleon and Hitler, full-blown psychosis. A UN Security Council resolution that could be interpreted to permit US/NATO military action against Syria would propel these forces, already drunken with power, to next seek a resolution authorizing military action against Iran .

Libya, Syria and Iran have much oil and as yet no nuclear weapons. Any action against Iran , whether undertaken by US/NATO or Israel , would spark a conflagration impossible to control, potentially involving nuclear states, and the direction of which would be impossible to determine or limit at the outset. And the endpoint of this trajectory would inevitably be Russia , which controls huge reserves of oil and gas coveted by the West. But unlike the insane adventures of Napoleon and Hitler, prior to the atomic age, today Russia possesses nuclear weapons, and surrounded by hostile NATO countries and confronting the menace of NATO's missile defense, Russia , now existentially threatened, has abandoned the Soviet Union 's doctrine of "no first use of nuclear weapons."

If Russia withstands escalating pressure, and continues to prohibit any UN Security Council resolution authorizing "all necessary means" against Syria, this may be the moment when, denied United Nations Security Council support, and unable to claim they act in accordance with "the will of the international community," the psychological force of US/NATO will be exhausted, as was Napoleon at the Battle of Borodino in 1812, and Hitler at Stalingrad in 1943. The road to World War III will have been blocked, and the United Nations Security Council would be redeemed from its current status as "an instrument of war."

**Carla Stea is a journalist holding press accreditation at the U.S. Department of State and the United Nations. Her articles have been published in the US, UK, Russia, Latin America, and have appeared in Latin American Perspectives, Covert Action Quarterly, War and Peace Digest, Rock Creek Free Press, Komsomolskaya Pravda, Rabochaya Tribuna, Sovetskaya Rossia, Novosti Press and Tapol, Report on Human Rights, Indonesia.**

## **Waging War against Iran is a Criminal Act, in Violation of International Law**

**The death toll from World War III will be incalculable...**

**by Prof. Francis A. Boyle**

**Article 2 (3) of the United Nations Charter requires the pacific settlement of the international dispute between the United States and Iran. To the same effect is article 33 and the entirety of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter that mandate and set up numerous procedures for the pacific settlement of the international dispute between the United States and Iran. And of course Article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter prohibits both the threat and use of force by the United States against Iran.**

Furthermore, both Iran and the United States are parties to the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact of 1928, upon which legal basis the Nazi Leaders were prosecuted by the United States, inter alia, at Nuremberg for Crimes against Peace, sentenced to death, and executed. In Article I thereof the States Parties "condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it, as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." The United States has been illegally threatening war against Iran going back to the Bush Jr. Administration. Article II requires the United States only to pursue a pacific settlement of its international dispute with Iran: "The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

Finally, both the United States and Iran are parties to the 1899 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. This seminal Hague Peace Convention establishes numerous mechanisms for the pacific settlement of international disputes between contracting parties that are too numerous to analyze here. But they are discussed in detail in my book *Foundations of World Order* (Duke University Press: 1999). According to article 27 thereof, if a serious dispute threatens to break out between contracting powers, it was the DUTY of the other contracting powers to remind them that the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague is open to them, and such reminder could not be treated as an unfriendly act of intervention by the disputants. Today the world needs one State party to either the 1899 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes or the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes to publicly remind both the United States and Iran that the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague, together with its International Bureau and the entirety of the 1899 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, are available to the two States in order to resolve their dispute in a peaceful manner.

After the terrorist assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand in Sarajevo in June of 1914, Serbia made an offer to Austria to submit the entire dispute to “the International Tribunal of The Hague”— i.e., to the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague. Austria did not accept the offer, the First World War broke out, and about 10 Million Human Beings were needlessly slaughtered.

The death toll from World War III will be incalculable. Humanity must not allow our history to repeat itself! Otherwise, that could be the end of our Humanity.

**Francis A. Boyle is Professor of International Law**