

Obama Wreaks Duplicity

By <u>Stephen Lendman</u> Global Research, April 09, 2012 9 April 2012 Region: <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>US NATO War Agenda</u>

Like most in Congress, he serves wealth and power alone. People needs don't matter. Rule of law principles are spurned.

Peace is deplored. War is official policy. So are other duplicitous foreign policies for unchallenged global dominance.

Imagine what's ahead in a second term, regardless of which party controls Congress. Both are in lockstep on issues mattering most. They include pursuing regime change in Syria and Iran.

At the same time, Obama delivers mixed messages on Iran. Conciliatory comments follow baseless accusations and hawkishness, then more threats. In late March, he appealed directly to Iranians, saying there's "no reason for the United States and Iran to be divided from one another."

America seeks dialogue, not confrontation, he suggested, or did he? At the same time, he added:

"Increasingly, the Iranian people are denied the basic freedom to access the information that they want."

"Instead, the Iranian government jams satellite signals to shut down television and radio broadcasts. It censors the Internet to control what the Iranian people can see and say. The regime monitors computers and cell phones for the sole purpose of protecting its own power."

In fact, Iranians have legitimate news, information, and analysis media like Press TV. It shames Western scoundrel alternatives, including BBC, and major US print and broadcast services.

In addition, Obama and Congress support bills targeting Internet freedom. Something this year will pass. Net Neutrality will be compromised, perhaps en route to destroying it altogether and remaining First Amendment rights with it.

On April 5, <u>Washington Post</u> commentator David Ignatius headlined, "Obama signal to Iran," saying:

He'll "accept an Iranian civilian nuclear program if Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei can back up his recent public claim that his nation 'will never pursue nuclear weapons.' "

He said it many times, most recently on February 22. His public statement stressed:

"There is no doubt that the decision makers in the countries opposing us know well that Iran is not after nuclear weapons because the Islamic Republic, logically, religiously and theoretically, considers the possession of nuclear weapons a grave sin and believes the proliferation of such weapons is senseless, destructive and dangerous."

On April 8, Iranian lawmaker Gholam Reza Meshbahi Moqaddam repeated it, stressing:

"I firmly announce that the Islamic Republic of Iran invariably does not seek to produce, maintain or use a nuclear weapon. We will never need one."

Repeating it numerous times falls on deaf ears. Washington hears selectively and speaks with forked tongue. Obama does it repeatedly. While allegedly extending an olive branch, he said there's "great urgency." Time's running out to resolve Iran's nuclear issue. He stressed:

"I believe there is a window of time to solve this diplomatically, but that window is closing. (T)ime and space" remain, but "the window for diplomacy is shrinking."

Earlier in mid-March, he asked Russia to warn Iran of a "last chance" to avoid military confrontation. Either accede to Western demands, or face attack in months. At the same time, Netanyahu said:

"We're not standing with a stopwatch in hand. It's not a matter of days or weeks, but also not of years. The result must be removal of the threat of nuclear weapons in Iran's hands."

The so-called nuclear threat is red herring cover for Washington's longstanding regime change plans. No one's fooling anyone, especially Iranians knowing they've been targeted for decades.

Hostile Obama administration policies show how viciously it's done today. More on that below.

On April 6, <u>Haaretz</u> headlined, " 'Obama signaled to Khamenei that US could accept civilian nuclear program in Iran,' " saying:

He's agreeable, provided Iran can prove a negative. Saddam got the same deal. War followed. Nine years later, it continues.

On April 7, <u>The New York Times</u> headlined, "US Defines Its Demands for New Round of Talks With Iran," saying:

Upcoming nuclear talks will demand "the immediate closing and ultimate dismantling of a recently completed nuclear facility deep under a mountain, according to American and European diplomats."

"They are also calling for a halt in the production of uranium fuel that is considered just a few steps from bomb grade, and the shipment of existing stockpiles of that fuel out of the country, the diplomats said."

National Security Council spokesman Tommy Vietor stressed the same issues, saying:

"Our position is clear: Iran must live up to its international obligations, including full suspension of uranium enrichment as required by multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions."

In other words, we're boss, and what we say goes.

That's Obama's "last chance" notion. Instead of an offer Iran can't refuse, this one won't be accepted. That's why it was made.

At issue is Iran's Fordo facility. According to Fereydoun Abbasi, head of the Atomic Organization of Iran (AEOI), the site's built underground deep within a mountain for protection against Western and/or Israeli attacks.

Wanting it shut down is outrageous. Of course, Iran won't agree nor should it. The facility's legal and closely monitored 24-hours a day by IAEA cameras and inspectors on frequent visits.

The same goes for all Iranian nuclear sites. No nation gets greater attention. Not according to scoundrel Times writers, saying Tehran refuses to give IAEA "inspectors full access to all Iranian sites." It also "barred inspectors from talking to key nuclear scientists."

False on all counts, and Times writers know it. Criticism is unwarranted. It's also red herring duplicity. It masks Washington's regime change agenda.

If Iran had no nuclear facilities, another issue would be raised. That's how imperial Washington works. With Iraq, it was nonexistent WMDs. With Afghanistan, it was spurious

9/11 involvement claims.

In the 1960s, the false flag Tonkin Gulf attack fueled all-out Southeast Asian war. In June 1950, North Korea responding to repeated Seoul incursions launched what Pyongyang called the Fatherland Liberation War.

If America attacks Iran, expect something similar used. Tehran threatens no one. It abhors war and won't start one. In contrast, war is official US policy. So is ravaging the world one country at a time.

Syria's under assault. Regime change there's planned. Iran's next, then on to new targets, one after another. Endless carnage and destruction follow. Victims are blamed for aggressor crimes. Washington's are the worst. Humanity's literally threatened.

Only deranged leaders act this way. Attacking Iran is insanity. Yet plans are made to do it, perhaps cooperatively with Israel. When is unknown. Accusing Tehran of refusing to negotiate seriously heightens tensions.

Scoundrel media escalate them. The Times article spuriously claimed "evidence" shows "Iran may have worked on warhead designs and nuclear triggers."

Nothing, of course, was explained because no evidence exists. The Times and other scoundrel media repeatedly make false accusations. Truth and full disclosure are scrupulously avoided.

Perhaps that's why their circulations and television news audiences are declining. People eventually catch on and walk away. Maybe one they all will, especially from TV news that provides none. It long ago stopped pretending it did.

US Forces in Iran

On April 6, Seymour Hersh's <u>New Yorker</u> article headlined, "Our Men in Iran?" saying:

Iranian MEK (Mujahideen-e-Khalq) dissidents have been secretly trained in Nevada and deployed covertly. The State Department designated it a foreign terrorist organization.

After Saddam fell, MEK/Western ties deepened. Moreover, US Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) forces "began operating inside Iran in an effort to substantiate" whether or not nuclear bomb technology and production existed.

JSOC and MEK operations remain ongoing. A senior US intelligence official told Hersh Washington trained and deployed MEK operatives, saying:

"We were deploying them over long distances in the desert and mountains, and building their capacity in communications—coördinating commo is a big deal."

They became a "major instrument (of) Bush administration" war on terror policy. "The JSOC trainers were not front-line guys who had been in the field, but second-and third-tier guys – trainers and the like – and they started going off the reservation. 'If we're going to teach you tactics, let me show you some really sexy stuff..."

In other words, hardball tactics, as well as penetrating Iranian communications systems, intercepting and translating information, then keeping US authorities informed.

In addition, attacks are carried out. Facilities and pipelines are targeted. So are Iranian nuclear scientists. Cyberwar's employed. Other covert tactics are used.

MEK operatives started out "a total joke," but training gave them "a capacity for efficient operations (they) never had before."

In the 1980s, Washington created, funded, armed and used Mjuahidden/Al Qaeda forces against Soviet Russia in Afghanistan. The war ended. Al Qaeda's been used strategically since then as both enemies and allies.

In Syria, Hillary Clinton admitted using Al Qaeda forces, saying:

"We have a very dangerous set of actors in the region, Al Qaida, Hamas, and those who are on our terrorist list, to be sure, supporting – claiming to support the (Syrian) opposition."

In 1995, the CIA helped establish the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG). At issue then was toppling Gaddafi. Ideologically allied with Al Qaeda, latter day elements fought Soviet forces in Afghanistan.

In December 2004, the State Department designated LIFG a foreign terrorist organization. Its members were accused of being allied with bin Laden and Al Qaeda.

In 2007, the State Department said "Libyans associated with the LIFG are part of a broader international terrorist movement....The LIFG constitutes a serious threat to US interests and personnel."

The State Department also said they were responsible for a failed 1996 Gaddafi assassination attempt. At the time, CIA and MI5 operatives were involved. America strategically uses Al Qaeda, LIFG, and other groups as friends and foes. MEK elements are used the same way.

It's longstanding imperial Washington policy. It's sinister, lawless, and destructively used for unchallenged global dominance, no matter the body count to achieve it.

A Final Comment

Imagine the worst ahead because it's possible. In 2008, candidate Obama, in part at least, portrayed himself as a peace candidate. Instead he wages wars and plan new ones.

Hopefully cooler heads will stop him, including Pentagon top brass. They know the insanity of attacking Iran. So do key world leaders. Doing so embroils the entire region and beyond in conflict.

If nuclear weapons are used, humanity's threatened. Leaders willing to risk it should be impeached and removed. The sooner the better!

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago and can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net.

Also visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com and listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network Thursdays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening.

http://www.progressiveradionetwork.com/the-progressive-news-hour/.

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © <u>Stephen Lendman</u>, Global Research, 2012

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Stephen Lendman	About the author:
	Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III." http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting- edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio

Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca