

BRANDISHING THE SWORD OF JUSTICE

The student-led, protest demonstrations in Teheran, the Capital City of The (fundamentalist) Muslim Republic of Iran, of the past 3 weeks or so, invoked a great deal more comment from the President of the United States (US), Mr George W. Bush, than one, otherwise, may have imagined, considering his complete and utter obliteration of the previous Government of Iraq, led by Saddam Hussein, in a war that lasted just 21 days.

Some of his most telling utterances on this matter included:

'This is the beginning of people, expressing themselves toward a free Iran, which I think is positive ... I think that freedom is a powerful incentive ...'

Then, on being apprised of the report of the United Nations (UN) International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the determinations of its Director General, Mr Mohammed El Baradei, who maintains that Iran has failed to report some of its nuclear activities, President George W. Bush said:

'The international community must come together to make it very clear to Iran that we will not tolerate construction of a nuclear weapon ... Iran would be dangerous if they have a nuclear weapon.'

Point of fact: Any Islamic government of the world, which has the ability to control a population of about 70 million of the Muslim faithful, with an active militia of not less than 500,000 fighting men and women, comprising an internal security force, The Revolutionary Guard, a rural police force, a navy and an air force, in addition to another 200,000 men and women, who are serving in the volunteer reserve force, the Basij, and where there is a 2-year period of compulsory military service of all male citizens, aged 18 years and older, must be considered a threat to any country which does not agree with its politics. And, when a country has a landmass of about 1.65 million square kilometres, it definitely would present a conundrum to any would-be invasion force.

It is, at this point, that political observers may care to note the use of the first person plural in President George W. Bush's comments: Did his use of 'we' refer to the IAEA and/or the UN; or, was it meant to refer to the US, alone?

One may wonder where and when he obtained his mandate to speak on behalf of the IAEA and/or the UN, if that is what he meant to imply; or, if he meant, only, to refer to the US, may one deduce that the US has determined that it would act, proactively, pre-emptively, and unilaterally when the spirit moved it, irrespective of any determinations of the UN or any other world body to which the US is a member?

Director General Mohammed El Baradei had proposed to try to nudge Iran into signing an additional protocol, linked to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, a protocol which would allow the UN to inspect all nuclear sites in Iran – at short notice.

Iran, in no uncertain terms, said that it would not sign such a protocol.

There followed more protests in Iran, culminating in the arrests of quite a number of Iranian students who, no doubt, joined the hundreds of other students, who had been arrested in the past month for staging protests in the vicinity of Teheran University.

Whether or not Iran has nuclear weapons or is about to have the capability of producing nuclear weapons, or any other weapons of mass destruction, for that matter, is a question, which is still undetermined by the Western World.

It is fact, however, that, in 1996, Iran and Russia concluded what was, then, considered a controversial agreement, whereby Russia would assist Iran in building a nuclear power plant at Bandar-e 'Abbās.

That must suggest that Russia, of all of the countries of the world, would know of the capabilities of Iran's nuclear programme, which cannot be older than 6 years.

At this period of time, the IAEA only has circumstantial evidence, suggesting the possibility, or probability, of a failure(s) on the part of the Government of the Muslim country to report certain activities with regard to its nuclear programme.

However, that circumstantial evidence is sufficient, it appears, for the US Government to unsheathe The Sword of Justice.

One may ponder, also, whether or not, had the Government of the **People's Republic of China (PRC)** just initiated a nuclear programme, the Texan in the White House would have been as stentorian in his condemnation of that powerhouse as he is of Iran.

While it may be argued that Iran would not stand a ghost of a chance in winning a war against the US, in the case of the PRC, the US may well be hard-pressed to win a war against that fundamentalist Communist country, whose recent history indicates a very repressive governmental policy toward its population.

The crackdown on the falun gung, which was labelled as being an evil cult by the Government of the PRC, sent shock waves, round the world.

In the case of the falun gung, the PRC leaders were, and still are, afraid that its very existence in the PRC could lead to its many members, who claim only that they practise meditation and embrace a belief in health and wellness, getting involved in PRC politics due to the way in which membership of the falun gung has been mushrooming.

And its membership explosion was, by the middle of the 1990s, reaching many countries of the world: It was not confined just to Asia, any more.

The ghosts of the Tiananmen Square Protest uprising of May and June of 1989 were haunting the Government of the late Deng Xiao Ping.

In that little fracas, student-led, pro-democracy demonstrations swept throughout the PRC, following the death of the former Communist Party Secretary General, Mr Hu Yao Bang.

The students called for the removal of Mr Deng Xiao Ping, the then Paramount Leader of the Government of the PRC.

On May 4, 1989, it is estimated that some 100,000 Chinese students had congregated on Tiananmen Square, Beijing, demanding democratic reforms of its Government.

The world's television cameras focused on the Tiananmen Square Chinese students' uprising.

The students were well behaved, law-abiding, and had arranged matters, themselves, with regard to sanitation and victualling, in and around the historic site in Beijing.

Martial law was declared by the PRC Government about 16 days later and, then, 18 days after that event, on the stroke of midnight of June 3, tanks, belonging to the People's Liberation Army (PLA), entered Tiananmen Square, killing hundreds of the students and injuring thousands more.

Then came the pogrom, with hundreds of students, being arrested and imprisoned.

According to **TARGET**'s source, who witnessed part of the massacre, and after gathering first-hand information from European businessmen, who managed to beat a hasty retreat from the Capital City, it was clear that soldiers of the PLA, also, fired upon Europeans, living in residential compounds in Beijing.

The PLA troops, who took part in the attack on Tiananmen Square on June 3 and 4, 1989, appeared to have carte blanche.

The Government of the PRC conducted widespread arrests, summary trials, and executions of anybody, thought to have been closely connected to the protests.

The late Deng Xiao Ping was seen on television, following the bloodshed of June 4, 1989, shaking hands with his generals in a gesture of gratitude at the way in which the PLA braved the situation.

All of the protestors at Tiananmen Square were completely unarmed and none of whom made any attempt to fight the PLA troops, but, instead, begged the soldiers not to engage in combat against their Chinese '*brothers*' and '*sisters*'.

There was one televised image of a Chinese individual, trying to prevent a tank from entering Tiananmen Square by standing in front of the 50-tonne, armed war machine, which was menacing the protests.

The Government of the US condemned the acts of the PLA, on that occasion, but that was that: No further action was taken or suggested.

There were no threats from the US that it would act against the Government of the PRC, in any manner, shape or form, due to the repressive acts against the unarmed Tiananmen Square students by the PLA.

Ironically, the first representatives of companies to re-enter the PRC, in order to do business with this internationally condemned regime of the day, were the US multinationals even though companies, such as Levi Strauss and Company, had made the headlines, announcing that it was shutting up shop in the PRC in view of the political attitude of the Government of Deng Xiao Ping, et al.

As **TARGET** has commented, many times in the past: Money talks; bullshit walks.

The Major Differences

The major and overriding differences between the present situation in Iran and of the PRC of 1989, as far as the US is concerned, are the number of men under arms, the quality of the militia of both countries, the number of fully operational tanks, warplanes, battleships, aircraft carriers, etc, the number of strike-ready inter-ballistic missiles and, of course, the numbers of weapons of mass destruction.

The PRC has, most likely, the nuclear delivery systems that would enable the country's militia, estimated to be a standing army of upwards of 4 million men and women, to strike at the heart of the US, whereas, it is unlikely that Iran has very much in the way of a strike force that could challenge the US's military might.

Armed with that knowledge, it would appear that Iran is ripe for the picking, as far as the US is concerned.

And, ironically, the US may well prove to be correct at the end of the day in that, if Iran is capable of producing a nuclear arsenal, together with a delivery system, it could pose an international threat.

But to whom?

It is well known that Iran has no territorial ambitions although it did finance Ayatollah Mohammed Baqr al-Hakim in building up a 15,000-man army, all trained in Iran, in order to permit the Ayatollah and his little army to return to Iraq in order that the Shi'ite majority of that country may have a say in that Government, after being persecuted for 24 years by the Regime of Saddam Hussein, Saddam Hussein, having professed to be a Sunni Muslim.

As the Texan in the Whitehouse would be quick to point out: Guns don't kill; only people do that.

History may well record that the US was wrong for the right reasons with regard to its determinations in respect of Muslim Iran.

The Warning

Last Saturday, the Government of the US warned Iran that it reserved the right to employ its military might against the Ayatollahs (high-ranking male Shi'ite religious authorities) in order to prevent Iran from being in a position to manufacture and/or to deliver weaponry that could threaten the US.

The US was, once again, usurping the authority, which is, exclusively, the bailiwick of the UN.

It is argued that the US acted illegally when it attacked Iraq without the express authority of the Security Council of the UN.

The US maintains that it had the authority in UN Resolution 1441.

As a permanent member of the UN, along with the PRC, Russia, the United Kingdom (UK) and France, it could not gather the mandatory number of votes to urge the UN's Security Council to make a recommendation to issue a proclamation, permitting an armed intrusion into Iraq, in accordance with precepts of Resolution 1441.

France, Germany, Russia and the PRC all determined not to support the US in its avowed intent to attack – labelled, '*liberate*' – the people of Iraq.

Initially, that left only the UK to side with the US in its invasion of Iraq.

And President George W. Bush went on national television to state to the UK's Prime Minister, Mr Tony Blair: '*Thank you, friend.*'

By the time that the war with Iraq was over, it was reported that 42 nations had gone over to the side of the victor.

Might is right.

Unfortunately for The Islamic Republic of Iran, it is sandwiched between Afghanistan, to the east, and Iraq, to the west.

The US has armed forces in both countries.

President George W. Bush has labelled Iran as part of his now famous '*axis of evil*', along with North Korea and the former Government of Iraq.

North Korea, for all its bluster, is for sale; Washington is well aware of it.

As such, at this point in time, the Government of Kim Jong Il poses no immediate threat because, in the event that it attempted to launch just one nuclear missile, the missile would be destroyed before it ever left North Korean airspace – and Pyongyang would cease to be within minutes of that missile's launch because the US would authorise the pressing of the red button in one of its many submarines, patrolling the South China Sea,

thus launching a nuclear missile that would completely obliterate the Capital City of North Korea in a flash – literally.

The recent actions of the US Government in respect of Iraq, prior to the '*liberation*' of the country, have been divisive to the UN, but, since the US is the world's only superpower, there appears to be little that the other members of the UN can do about the US's clear propensity to jingoism, which has led to militant devotion and fanatical patriotism.

The UN knows, full well, that it is better that the US is a member of this international organisation than to ostracise it.

As a member of the UN, it is possible to curb the enthusiasm of the US to attack its perceived enemies or countries whose politics do not sit well with the President of the day.

Many countries are afraid to create a bouleversement with the US for fear of the inevitable repercussions.

Canada, for instance, shares a common border with the US where the value of 2-way trade is of the order of \$US1.30 billion, daily.

More than 85 percent of Canada's exports go to the US: The country is dependent on its trade ties with its major trading partner to the south for its very existence.

The Government of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien may have balked at sending men to fight alongside the US in Iraq, but Canada does not want to suffer the way in which the French have suffered when that Republic came out, strongly, against the US in its plans to invade Iraq.

Today, French Fries have become known as Freedom Fries; many people in the US have stopped drinking French wines; and, this summer's tourism to Paris, France, has slowed to a trickle as patriotic Americans have sought other holiday climes.

It is a well-known axiom that, as one gains power, so one has to learn to rein in that power, and even be circumspect before employing it.

As that unknown English poet said, more than 300 years ago:

*'Many times more bless'd is he
Who hides from pomp and power;
In sylvan shades or solitary bower,
Where balmy the winds, the word is spread:
Beware of Pride
And of Lust;
All things must die;
All blood is red.'*

-- END --

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com or targnews@hkstar.com. TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.