

Why Not Attack Iran?

Iran will retaliate against U.S. troops and Israel

By [David Swanson](#)

Global Research, January 06, 2012

[DontAttackIran.org](#) 6 January 2012

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

Global Research announces the launching of the [DontAttackIran.org](#) website by David Swanson

The push to attack Iran has been on for so long that entire categories of arguments for it (such as that the Iranians are fueling the Iraqi resistance) have come and gone.

At [DontAttackIran.org](#) we've been collecting the arguments for and against attacking Iran for years. We've campaigned against an attack, but never been able to claim a success, because decisions not to launch wars are never announced, because those pushing for wars never give up, and because those believing what their government tells them think the Pentagon never campaigns for wars but is forced into them defensively on short notice by attacks from evildoers.

While Iran has not attacked any other country in centuries, the United States has not done so well from Iran's standpoint.

Remember (or, like most U.S. citizens, learn for the first time): the United States [overthrew](#) Iran's democracy in 1953 and installed a dictator.

Then the United States aided Iraq in the 1980s in attacking Iran, providing Iraq with some of the weapons (including chemical weapons) that were used on Iranians and that would be used in 2002-2003 (when they no longer existed) as an excuse for attacking Iraq.

For the past decade, the United States has labeled Iran an [evil nation](#), attacked and destroyed the other non-nuclear nation on the list of evil nations, designated part of Iran's military [a terrorist organization](#), falsely accused Iran of crimes including the [attacks of 9-11](#), murdered Iranian [scientists](#), funded [opposition](#) groups in Iran (including some the U.S. also designates as terrorist), flown [drones](#) over Iran, openly and illegally [threatened](#) to attack Iran, and built up military forces [all around](#) Iran's borders, while imposing cruel [sanctions](#) on the country.

The roots of a Washington push for a new war on Iran can be found in the 1992 [Defense Planning Guidance](#), the 1996 paper called [A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm](#), the 2000 [Rebuilding America's Defenses](#), and in a 2001 Pentagon memo described by [Wesley Clark](#) as listing these nations for attack: Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, and Iran. In 2010, Tony Blair [included](#) Iran on a similar list of countries that he said Dick Cheney had aimed to overthrow. The line among the powerful in Washington in 2003 was that Iraq would be a cakewalk but that [real men go to Tehran](#). The arguments in these old forgotten memos were not what the war makers tell the public, but much closer to what

they tell each other. The concerns here are those of dominating regions rich in resources, intimidating others, and establishing bases from which to maintain control of puppet governments.

Of course the reason why “real men go to Tehran” is that Iran is not the impoverished disarmed nation that one might find in, say, Afghanistan or Iraq, or even the disarmed nation recently found in Libya. Iran is much bigger and much better armed.

Whether the United States launches a major assault on Iran or Israel does, [Iran will retaliate](#) against U.S. troops and probably Israel and possibly the [United States itself](#) as well. And the United States will without any doubt re-retaliate for that. Iran cannot be unaware that the U.S. government’s pressure on the Israeli government not to attack Iran consists of [reassuring](#) the Israelis that the United States will attack when needed, and does not include even threatening to stop funding Israel’s military or to stop vetoing measures of accountability for Israeli crimes at the United Nations. In other words, any U.S. pretense of having seriously wanted to prevent an attack is not credible. Of course, many in the U.S. government and military oppose attacking Iran, although key figures like Admiral William Fallon have been moved out of the way. Much of the Israeli military is [opposed](#) as well, not to mention the Israeli and U.S. people. But war is not clean or precise. If the people we allow to run our nations attack another, we are all put at risk.

Most at risk, of course, are the people of Iran, people as peaceful as any other, or perhaps more so. As in any country, no matter what its government, the people of Iran are fundamentally good, decent, peaceful, just, and fundamentally like you and me. I’ve met people from Iran. You may have met people from Iran. They look like [this](#). They’re not a different species. They’re not evil. A “surgical strike” against a “facility” in their country [would cause](#) a great many of them to die very painful and horrible deaths. Even if you imagine that Iran would not retaliate for such attacks, this is what the attacks would in themselves consist of: mass murder. And what would that accomplish? It would unite the people of Iran and much of the world against the United States. It would justify in the eyes of much of the world an underground Iranian program to develop nuclear weapons, a program that probably does not exist at present, except to the extent that legal nuclear energy programs move a country closer to weapons development. The environmental damage would be tremendous, the precedent set incredibly dangerous, all talk of cutting the U.S. military budget would be buried in a wave of war frenzy, civil liberties and representative government would be flushed down the Potomac, a nuclear arms race would spread to additional countries, and any momentary sadistic glee would be outweighed by accelerating home foreclosures, mounting student debt, and accumulating layers of cultural stupidity.

Strategically, legally, and morally weapons possession is not grounds for war, and neither is pursuit of weapons possession. And neither, I might add, with Iraq in mind, is theoretically possible pursuit of weapons never acted upon. Israel has nuclear weapons. The United States has more nuclear weapons than any other country. There can be no justification for attacking the United States, Israel, or any other country. The pretense that Iran has or will soon have nuclear weapons is, in any case, just a pretense, one that has been revived, [debunked](#), and revived again like a zombie for years and years. But that’s not the really absurd part of this false claim for something that amounts to no justification for war whatsoever. The really absurd part is that it was the United States in 1976 that pushed nuclear energy on Iran. In 2000 the [CIA gave](#) the Iranian government (slightly flawed) plans to build a nuclear bomb. In 2003, Iran proposed negotiations with the United States with

everything on the table, including its nuclear technology, and the United States refused. Shortly thereafter, the United States started angling for a war. Meanwhile, U.S.-led [sanctions prevent](#) Iran from developing wind energy, while the Koch brothers are allowed to [trade with Iran](#) without penalty.


Another area of ongoing [lie debunking](#), one that almost exactly parallels the buildup to the 2003 attack on Iraq, is the relentless false claim, including by [candidates for U.S. President](#), that Iran has not allowed inspectors into its country or given them access to its sites. Iran has, in fact, [voluntarily accepted](#) stricter standards than the IAEA requires. And of course a separate line of propaganda, albeit a contradictory one, holds that the IAEA has discovered a nuclear weapons program in Iran. Under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), Iran was [not required](#) to declare all of its installations, and early last decade it chose not to, as the United States violated that same treaty by blocking Germany, China, and others from providing nuclear energy equipment to Iran. While Iran remains in compliance with the NPT, India and Pakistan and Israel have not signed it and North Korea has withdrawn from it, while the United States and other nuclear powers continuously violate it by failing to reduce arms, by providing arms to other countries such as India, and by developing new nuclear weapons.

This is what the empire of U.S. military bases looks like to Iran. Try to [imagine](#) if you lived there, what you would think of this.



Who is threatening whom?

Here are the sizes of national militaries:



Who is the greater danger to whom? The point is not that Iran should be free to attack the United States or anyone else because its military is smaller. The point is that doing so would be national suicide. It would also be something Iran has not done for centuries. But it would be [typical U.S. behavior](#).

Are you ready for an even more absurd twist? This is on the same scale as Bush's comment about not really giving much thought to Osama bin Laden. Are you ready? The proponents of attacking Iran [themselves admit](#) that if Iran had nukes it would not use them. This is from the American Enterprise Institute:

"The biggest problem for the United States is not Iran getting a nuclear weapon and testing it, it's Iran getting a nuclear weapon and not using it. Because the second that they have one and they don't do anything bad, all of the naysayers are going to come back and say, 'See, we told you Iran is a responsible power. We told you Iran wasn't getting nuclear weapons in order to use them immediately.' ... And they will eventually define Iran with nuclear weapons as not a problem."

Is that clear? Iran using a nuclear weapon would be bad: environmental damage, loss of human life, hideous pain and suffering, yada, yada, yada. But what would be really bad would be Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon and doing what every other nation with them has done since Nagasaki: nothing. That would be really bad because it would damage an argument for war and make war more difficult, thus allowing Iran to run its country as it, rather than the United States, sees fit. Of course it might run it very badly (although we're hardly establishing a model for the world over here either), but it would run it without U.S. approval, and that would be worse than nuclear destruction.

Inspections were allowed in Iraq and they worked. They found no weapons and there were no weapons. Inspections are being allowed in Iran and they are working. However, the IAEA has come under the [corrupting influence](#) of the U.S. government. And yet, the bluster from war proponents about recent IAEA claims is [not backed up](#) by any actual claims from the IAEA. And what little material the IAEA has provided for the cause of war [has been](#) widely [rejected](#) when not being [laughed at](#).

Another year, another lie. No longer do we hear that North Korea is helping Iran build nukes. Lies about [Iranian backing](#) of [Iraqi resisters](#) have faded. (Didn't the United States back French resistance to Germans at one point?) The latest concoction is the "Iran did 911" lie. Revenge, like the rest of these attempted grounds for war, is actually not a legal or moral justification for war. But this latest fiction has already been put to rest by the indispensable [Gareth Porter](#), among others. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia, which did play a role in 911 as well as in the Iraqi resistance, is being sold record quantities of that good old leading U.S. export of which we're all so proud: [weapons of mass destruction](#).

Oh, I almost forgot another lie that hasn't quite entirely faded yet. Iran [did not](#) try to [blow up](#) a Saudi [ambassador](#) in Washington, D.C., an action which President Obama would consider perfectly praiseworthy if the roles were reversed, but a lie that even Fox News had a [hard time stomaching](#). And that's saying something.

And then there's that old standby: Ahmadinejad said "Israel should be wiped off the map." While this does not, perhaps, rise to the level of John McCain singing about bombing Iran or Bush and Obama swearing that all options including nuclear attack are on the table (I'm really starting to despise that table, by the way). Yet, it sounds extremely disturbing: "wiped off the map"! However, the translation is a bad one. A more accurate translation was "the regime occupying Jerusalem must vanish from the page of time". The government of Israel, not the nation of Israel. Not even the government of Israel, but the current regime. Hell, Americans say that about their own regimes all the time, alternating every four to eight years depending on political party (some of us even say it all the time, without immunity for either party). Iran has made clear it would approve of a two-state solution if Palestinians approved of it. If we launched missile strikes every time somebody said something stupid, even if accurately translated, how safe would it be to live near Newt Gingrich's or Joe Biden's house?

The real danger may not actually be the lies. The Iraq experience has built up quite a mental resistance to these sorts of lies in many U.S. residents. The real danger may be the slow start of a war that gains momentum on its own without any formal announcement of its initiation. Israel and the United States have not just been talking tough or crazy. They've been [murdering Iranians](#). And they seem to have no shame about it. The day after a Republican presidential primary debate at which candidates declared their desire to kill Iranians, the CIA apparently made certain [the news](#) was public that it was in fact already [murdering Iranians](#), not to mention [blowing up buildings](#). Some would say and have said that the [war has already begun](#). Those who cannot see this because they do not want to see it will also miss the deadly humor in the United States asking Iran to return [our brave drone](#) to us.

Perhaps what's needed to snap war supporters out of their stupor is a bit of slapstick. Try this on for size. From [Seymour Hersh](#) describing a meeting held in Vice President Cheney's office:

“There was a dozen ideas proffered about how to trigger a war. The one that interested me the most was why don’t we build — we in our shipyard — build four or five boats that look like Iranian PT boats. Put Navy seals on them with a lot of arms. And next time one of our boats goes to the Straits of Hormuz, start a shoot-up. Might cost some lives. And it was rejected because you can’t have Americans killing Americans. That’s the kind of — that’s the level of stuff we’re talking about. Provocation. But that was rejected.”

Now, Dick Cheney is not your typical American. Nobody in the U.S. government is your typical American. Your typical American is struggling, disapproves of the U.S. government, wishes billionaires were taxed, favors green energy and education and jobs over military boondoggles, thinks corporations should be barred from buying elections, and would not be inclined to apologize for getting shot in the face by the Vice President. Back in the 1930s, the Ludlow Amendment nearly made it a Constitutional requirement that the public vote in a referendum before the United States could go to war. President Franklin Roosevelt blocked that proposal. Yet the Constitution already required and still requires that Congress declare war before a war is fought. That has not been done in over 70 years, while wars have raged on almost incessantly. In the past decade and right up through President Obama’s signing of the outrageous National Defense Authorization Act on New Years Eve 2011-2012, the power to make war has been handed over to presidents. Here is one more reason to oppose a presidential war on Iran: once you allow presidents to make wars, you will never stop them. Another reason, in so far as anybody any longer gives a damn, is that war is a crime. Iran and the United States are parties to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which [bans war](#). One of those two nations is not complying.

But we won’t have a referendum. The U.S. House of Misrepresentatives won’t step in. Only through widespread public pressure and nonviolent action will we intervene in this slow-motion catastrophe. [Already](#) the [United States](#) and the [United Kingdom](#) are preparing for war with Iran. This war, if it happens, will be fought by an institution called the United States Department of Defense, but it will endanger rather than defending us. As the war progresses, we will be told that the Iranian people want to be bombed for their own good, for freedom, for democracy. But nobody wants to be bombed for that. Iran does not want U.S.-style democracy. Even the United States does not want U.S.-style democracy. We will be told that those noble goals are guiding the actions of our brave troops and our brave drones on the battlefield. Yet there will be no battlefield. There will be no front lines. There will be no trenches. There will simply be cities and towns where people live, and where people die. There will be no victory. There will be no progress accomplished through a “surge.” On January 5, 2012, Secretary of “Defense” Leon Panetta was asked at a press conference about the failures in Iraq and Afghanistan, and he replied simply that those were successes. That is the kind of success that could be expected in Iran were Iran a destitute and disarmed state.

Now we begin to understand the importance of all the media suppression, blackouts, and lies about the damage done to Iraq and Afghanistan. Now we understand why Obama and Panetta have embraced the lies that launched the War on Iraq. The same lies must now be revived, as for every war ever fought, for a War on Iran. Here’s a video explaining how this will work, even with some new [twists](#) and [lots](#) of [variations](#). The U.S. corporate media is [part of the war machine](#).

Planning war and funding war [creates](#) its own [momentum](#). Sanctions become, as with Iraq, a stepping stone to war. Cutting off [diplomacy](#) leaves few [options](#) open. Electoral pissing


contests [take us all](#) where most of us did not want to be.

These are [the bombs](#) most likely [to launch](#) this ugly and quite possibly terminal chapter of human history. This [animation](#) shows clearly what they would do. For an even better presentation, pair that with this audio of a misinformed caller [trying hopelessly](#) to persuade George Galloway that we should attack Iran.

On January 2, 2012, the New York Times [reported](#) concern that cuts to the U.S. military budget raised doubts as to whether the United States would “be prepared for a grinding, lengthy ground war in Asia.” At a Pentagon press conference on January 5, 2012, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reassured the press corpse (sic) that major ground wars were very much an option and that wars of one sort or another were a certainty. President Obama’s statement of military policy released at that press conference listed the missions of the U.S. military. First was fighting terrorism, next deterring “aggression,” then “projecting power despite anti-access/area denial challenges,” then the good old WMDs, then conquering space and cyberspace, then nuclear weapons, and finally — after all that — there was mention of defending the Homeland Formerly Known As The United States.

We’re in bad straights.

Click on this image:



The cases of Iraq and Iran are not identical in every detail, of course. But in both cases we are dealing with concerted efforts to get us into wars, wars based, [as all wars are based](#), on lies.

One thing you can do is to ask U.S. and Israeli air, missile, and drone crews to refuse to attack Iran at [DontAttackIran.org](#).

[Sign the appeal to US and Israeli forces!](#)

David Swanson is the author of “[When the World Outlawed War](#),” “[War Is A Lie](#)” and “[Daybreak: Undoing the Imperial Presidency and Forming a More Perfect Union](#).” He blogs at <http://davidswanson.org> and <http://warisacrime.org> and works for the online activist organization <http://rootsaction.org>

The original source of this article is [DontAttackIran.org](#)
Copyright © [David Swanson](#), [DontAttackIran.org](#), 2012

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

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [David Swanson](#)

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