

UN “Green Light” for a Pre-emptive US-Israel Attack on Iran? Security Council Resolution Transforms Iran into a “Sitting Duck”

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)
Global Research, June 11, 2010
11 June 2010

Theme: [United Nations](#), [US NATO War](#)
[Agenda](#)
In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

“A sitting duck is a defenceless victim, an easy target, vulnerable to attack”

What this latest resolution suggests is that Washington and its NATO allies not only control the UN Security Council, they ultimately also call the shots on foreign policy in Moscow and Beijing.

This Security Council resolution should dispel the myth of competing super powers. Both China and Russia are an appendage of the New World Order.

As far as international diplomacy is concerned, both China and Russia are “Paper Tigers”, with no teeth. “Paper Tiger” [纸老虎 (zhǐ lǎohǔ)], meaning something that seems as threatening as a tiger, but is really harmless.”

Both China and Russia are the victims of their own failed decisions within the United Nations Security Council.

An attack on Iran would immediately lead to military escalation. Syria and Lebanon would also be targeted. The entire Middle East Central Asian region would flare up, a situation which could potentially evolve towards a World War III scenario.

In a very real sense, the US-NATO-Israel military adventure threatens the future of humanity.

The UN Security Council voted on June 9 the imposition of a fourth round of sweeping sanctions against The Islamic Republic of Iran, which include an expanded arms embargo as well “tougher financial controls”.

In a bitter irony, this resolution was passed within days of the United Nations Security Council’s outright refusal to adopt a motion condemning Israel for its attack on the Gaza Freedom Flotilla in international waters.

It also followed the holding of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) conference in Washington under UN auspices, which called for the establishment, in its final resolution, of a nuclear free Middle East as well as the dismantling of Israel’s nuclear weapons arsenal.

Israel is considered to be the World's sixth nuclear power, with, according to Jane Defense, between 100 and 300 nuclear warheads. ([Analysts: Israel viewed as world's 6th nuclear power, Israel News, Ynetnews](#), April 10, 2010). Iran in contrast has no known nuclear weapons capabilities.

UNSC Resolution 1929 is based on a fundamental falsehood. It upholds the notion that Iran is an upcoming nuclear power and a threat to global security. It also provides a green light to the US-NATO-Israel military alliance to threaten Iran with a pre-emptive punitive nuclear attack, using the UN Security Council as rubber stamp.

The Security Council exercises double standards in the application of sanctions: Whereas Iran is the target of punitive threats, Israel's extensive nuclear arsenal, is either ignored or tacitly accepted by "the international community". For Washington, Israel's nukes are an instrument of peace in the Middle East.

Moreover, whereas all fingers are pointed at Iran which does not possess nuclear weapons, five so-called "non-nuclear" European states including Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy and Turkey not only possess tactical nuclear weapons under national command, these warheads are deployed and targeted at Iran.

Resolution 1929 (June 9, 2010):

"7. Decides that Iran shall not acquire an interest in any commercial activity in another State involving uranium mining, production or use of nuclear materials and technology as listed in INFCIRC/254/Rev.9/Part 1, in particular uranium-enrichment and reprocessing activities, all heavy-water activities or technology-related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and further decides that all States shall prohibit such investment in territories under their jurisdiction by Iran, its nationals, and entities incorporated in Iran or subject to its jurisdiction, or by persons or entities acting on their behalf or at their direction, or by entities owned or controlled by them;

"8. Decides that **all States shall prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale or transfer to Iran, from or through their territories or by their nationals or individuals subject to their jurisdiction, or using their flag vessels or aircraft, and whether or not originating in their territories, of any battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, missiles or missile systems** , decides further that all States shall prevent the provision to Iran by their nationals or from or through their territories of technical training, financial resources or services, advice, other services or assistance related to the supply, sale, transfer, provision, manufacture, maintenance or use of such arms and related materiel, and, in this context, calls upon all States to exercise vigilance and restraint over the supply, sale, transfer, provision, manufacture and use of all other arms and related materiel;" ([Security Council Imposes Additional Sanctions on Iran, Voting 12 in Favour to 2 Against, with 1 Abstention](#), Includes complete text of UNSC Resolution 1929, UN News, June 9, 2010, emphasis added,)

The Arms Embargo. Implications for Russia and China

Both the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China have caved in to US pressures and voted in favor of a resolution, which is not only detrimental to Iran's security, but which seriously weakens and undermines their strategic role as potential competing

World powers on the Eurasian geopolitical chessboard.

The resolution strikes at the very heart of the structure of military alliances. It prevents Russia and China to sell both strategic and conventional weapons and military technology to their de facto ally: Iran. In fact, that was one of major objectives of Resolution 1929, which Washington is intent upon enforcing.

At the same time, by barring Iran from purchasing conventional military equipment, the resolution prevents Iran from defending itself from a US-NATO-Israeli attack.

The resolution, were it to be fully enforced, would not only invalidate ongoing bilateral military cooperation agreements with Iran, it would create a wedge in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO).

It would also significantly weaken trade and investment relations between Iran and its Russian and Chinese partners. The financial and banking provisions in the resolution also point to Washington's resolve to not only isolate Iran but also to destabilize its financial system.

Washington is intent upon enforcing this resolution. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has appointed Robert Einhorn, Special Advisor for Nonproliferation and Arms Control, as U.S. coordinator for the implementation of the sanctions regime directed against both Iran and North Korea.

"U.S. President Barack Obama hailed the resolution, saying it will put in place the toughest sanctions ever faced by the Iranian government and send an "unmistakable message" to Tehran about the international community's commitment to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons."([Clinton appoints coordinator for sanctions against Iran, DPRK](#), Xinhua, June 10, 2010

"We expect every country to aggressively implement Resolution 1929" said State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley. Were China and Russia to decide not to abide by the resolution's provisions, particularly those relating to weapons sales to Iran (art. 8), Washington would use this as an opportunity to engage in an increasingly confrontational diplomacy in relation to Beijing and Moscow.

The resolution is also intended to establish a US led hegemony in the production and export of advanced weapons systems. It is a heavy blow, almost a "death sentence", for China and Russia's lucrative international weapons trade, which competes with the US, UK, France, Germany and Israel. In the post-Soviet era, the arms trade has become a central component of Russia's fragile economy. The potential repercussions on Russia's balance of payments are far-reaching.

Disabling Iran's Missile Defence System

UN Security Council resolutions are an integral part of US foreign policy. They are on the drawing board of Washington's think tanks, including the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and the Heritage Foundation. In this regard, it is worth noting that the substance of article 8 of UNSC Resolution 1929 (June 9, 2010) was contained in a January 2010 report of the Heritage Foundation, which calls for "blocking

arms sales to Iran” including Russia’s S-300 missiles:

“Washington and its allies should make every effort to deprive Iran of foreign arms transfers, **particularly the impending sale of Russian S-300 surface to air missiles, which could provoke Israel to strike sooner rather than later.** Stronger multinational efforts also need to be made to prevent Iran from transferring arms to Hezbollah and Palestinian terrorist groups, which pose a threat not only to Israel, but to stability in Lebanon, Egypt, and Jordan. On November 3, Israeli naval forces intercepted the Francop, an Antigua-flagged cargo ship that was transporting about 500 tons of weapons from Iran to Hezbollah, via Syria.^[22] The U.S. should press other allies to join in giving greater assistance to Israeli efforts to intercept Iranian arms flows, particularly to Hezbollah and Hamas.” (James Phillips, [An Israeli Preventive Attack on Iran’s Nuclear Sites: Implications for the U.S.](#), The Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC, January 2010)

Did Moscow assess the implications of the proposed arms embargo?

Immediately following the adoption of the UNSC resolution on June 9th, several Russian press reports indicated that the sale of Russian S-300 missiles to Iran would be frozen, despite assurances by foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov that the UNSC resolution would not affect the air-defence deal..([Russia says in talks with Iran on new nuclear plants, Haaretz, June 10, 2010](#)) These contradictory statements suggest that there are significant divisions within the Russian leadership, without which Russia would have duly exercised its veto power in the UN Security Council.



Russia’s S-300 Surface to Air Missile

Without Russian military aid, Iran is a “sitting duck”. Its air defence system depends on continued Russian military cooperation. Moreover, without Iran, Russia would be constrained to selling military equipment to countries in the US-NATO orbit. (See [Russia to offset loss of Iran arms sales with Iraqi, Afghan deals, Russia, RIA Novosti](#), June 11, 2010)

Pre-emptive nuclear attack on Iran

The World is at dangerous crossroads. The real threat to global security emanates from the US-NATO-Israel alliance. The UN Security Council directly serves the interests of the Western military alliance. The Security Council resolution grants a de facto “green light” to wage a pre-emptive war against Iran, which has been on the Pentagon’s drawing board since 2004.

“An operational plan to wage aerial attacks on Iran has been in “a state of readiness” since June 2005. Essential military hardware to wage this operation has been deployed. (For further details see [Michel Chossudovsky, Nuclear War against Iran, Jan 2006](#)). In 2005, Vice President Dick Cheney ordered USSTRATCOM to draft a “contingency plan”, which would “include a large-scale air assault on Iran employing both conventional and tactical nuclear weapons.” (Philip Giraldi, [Attack on Iran: Pre-emptive Nuclear War](#) , *The American Conservative*, 2 August 2005).

Under the Obama administration, the threats have become increasingly pervasive and far more explicit than under the NeoCons. In October 2009, The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) organized an Event at Washington’s Wohlstetter Conference Center on “Should Israel Attack Iran?”:

“Iran’s nuclear weapons development continues apace, threatening the security of its neighbors and the international community. According to a recent survey by the Pew Research Center, more than 60 percent of the American public believes preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons warrants military action. Israel’s deputy foreign minister, Daniel Ayalon, emphasized on September 21 that Israel has “not taken any option off the table” when it comes to countering the Iranian threat. The same day, Israel’s top general, chief of staff Lieutenant General Gabi Ashkenazi, made it clear that he would not rule out a military strike on Iran’s nuclear installations, repeating that “Israel has the right to defend itself and all options are on the table.” As the debate intensifies over how to respond most effectively to Iran’s provocations, **it is timely to explore the strategic and legal parameters of a potential Israeli strike against the Islamic Republic and provide some thorough analysis about implications for the United States.** ([American Enterprise Institute, Should Israel Attack Iran?](#), October 2009, emphasis added)

From a military standpoint, Israel *could not* undertake a unilateral attack on Iran without the active coordination of the Pentagon:.

“As President Obama extends “an open hand”, seeking direct talks with Tehran in his attempt to halt its nuclear programme, Mrs Clinton appeared [June 2009] ready to unnerve the Iranian leadership with **talk of a pre-emptive strike “the way that we did attack Iraq”**. She said that she was trying to put herself in the shoes of the Iranian leadership, **but added that Tehran “might have some other enemies that would do that [deliver a pre-emptive strike] to them”**. It was a clear reference to Israel, where **Binyamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister, has talked about the possibility of military action to halt Iran’s nuclear programme** — something he views as a threat to the Jewish state. ([Don’t discount Israel pre-emptive strike, Hillary Clinton warns Iran, Times Online](#), June 8, 2009, emphasis added)

In April 2010 the message was crystal clear: Washington “would use atomic weapons only in ‘extreme circumstances’ and would not attack non-nuclear states, but singled out “outliers” Iran and North Korea as exceptions.” ([Iran to Take US to UN Over Obama’s Threat to Use Nuclear Weapons against Iran](#), Aljazeera, April 11, 2010). Defence Secretary Robert Gates explained in a television interview “that Washington was making exceptions of Tehran and Pyongyang because they had defied repeated UN Security Council ultimatums over their nuclear programmes.” (Ibid).

UN “Green Light” for a World War Three Scenario?

Is this latest Security Council resolution “the green light” which Washington has been seeking?

The substance of the Security Council resolution is also directed at Iran allies: China and Russia.

Ironically, while China and Russia failed to exercise their veto power, they are nonetheless the object of veiled US threats. China is surrounded by US military facilities. US missiles in Poland and the Caucasus are pointed towards Russian cities. More recently, the Obama administration has called for the extension of the sanctions regime directed against Russia’s ally, Belarus.

Washington has also announced that “The Pentagon is preparing to embark on a mini-building boom in Central Asia, which would include the construction of strategic US facilities military “in all five Central Asian states, including Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.” (See [Defense Dollars Building Boom: Pentagon Looks to Construct New Military Bases in Central Asia](#), Eurasianet, June 6, 2010). These various military cooperation agreements with former Soviet republics are not only intent upon weakening the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the CSTO, they are part of the US-NATO strategic encirclement of Russia and China.

What this latest resolution suggests is that Washington and its NATO allies not only control the UN Security Council, they ultimately also call the shots on foreign policy in Moscow and Beijing.

This Security Council resolution should dispel the myth of competing super powers. Both China and Russia are an appendage of the New World Order.

As far as international diplomacy is concerned, both China and Russia are “Paper Tigers”, with no teeth. *“‘Paper Tiger’ [纸老虎 (zhǐ lǎohǔ)], meaning something that seems as threatening as a tiger, but is really harmless.”*

Both China and Russia are the victims of their own failed decisions within the United Nations Security Council.

An attack on Iran would immediately lead to military escalation. Syria and Lebanon would also be targeted. The entire Middle East Central Asian region would flare up, a situation which could potentially evolve towards a World War III scenario.

In a very real sense, the US-NATO-Israel military adventure threatens the future of humanity.

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

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