

## *The Betty Letters*

*My Dear Grandchild,*

*Given his head, it is possible that US President George W. Bush could provoke another war before the year is out. He said, just last Monday, that the United States was ready and quite willing to use military force against Iran if needs be such. It was the second such definitive statement to have issued forth from the most-powerful leader of the world in the past fortnight. Addressing the City Club of Cleveland, Ohio, he said, among other things: 'The threat from Iran is, of course, their stated objective to destroy our strong ally: Israel. That's a threat – a serious threat. It's a threat to world peace. I made it clear ... I'll make it, again, that we (the United States of America) will use military might to protect our ally, Israel.' Iran's elected President, Mr Mohmoud Ahmadinejad, has stated, openly, that Iran desires the destruction of the Jewish State of Israel. Israel has called on the United Nations to oust Iran from the world body on the grounds that the stated policies of this fundamentalistic Islamic country are contrary to the aims and objects of the United Nations. While the United Nations Security Council debates what message should be sent to Iran over its intransigent stance with regard to its avowed determination to press ahead with its nuclear programme, President George W. Bush is beating the American war drums and giving reasons for an armed attack on Iran, his statements, being nothing to do with Iran's nuclear ambitions, at all. I recall that when the United States and Great Britain attacked Iraq on March 20, 2003, President George W. Bush called the invasion the 'liberation' of the country from the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein. Three years later and two thousand-plus dead American servicemen later, chaos reigns supreme in Iraq. If the United States does attack Iran, one wonders whether or not the result of the 'liberation' of this Muslim country, whose President was fairly elected in a democratic manner, Muslim style, will be similar to that which is present in Iraq, today. However, as I have written to you before on this subject, any attack on Iran is tantamount to an attack on the entire Muslim world. The reprisals could well be horrendous and very costly in terms of lives lost. As I see the situation, today, the world is, already, split into two separate spheres: The Caucasian Christians; and, the Semitic Muslims. From President George W. Bush's point of view, he claims that it is his duty to democratise the Middle East. The Semitic tribes of Iran, Iraq, Syria, etc, etc, etc, must all learn of the benefits of democracy and be free of the shackles of Islamic fundamentalism. I have no argument with this idea because I happen to think that democracy is the best form of government in today's world, but should it not come from within these countries, not from without? Surely, the peoples of the Arab world must covet the fruits of Western-styled democracy, first. It must come from the people, themselves, it seems to me. It is not for the United States of America, or any other Western government, for that matter, to force-feed the peoples of the Middle East with the concept of a democratic government, one which may be alien to century old traditions of the majority of the population and, perhaps more important, completely alien to the teachings of the Holy Q'ran.*

*Iran, today, is counting on the followers of Islam to stand shoulder to shoulder with it in respect of its determination to join the international nuclear club. From the highest religious levels of Islam – Ayatollah Ali Khamenei – the Government of Iran has support for its stand. Iran's Supreme Leader has stated that*

*Iran has 'an absolute right' to nuclear technology. The Security Council of the United Nations, after more than two weeks of deliberations, still cannot agree on the wording of a declaration to be sent to Iran, demanding (in diplomatic language, of course) to cease and desist in its plans to enrich uranium into weapons grade. Iran claims that it wants nuclear power for peaceful purposes. The West is unconvinced and is of the opinion (and, probably, correctly so, too) that Iran wants to be able to create weapons of mass destruction. To force Iran into a shell so that it will no longer cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency would appear to be a retrograde step for the United Nations. For this reason, the Security Council is loath to impose sanctions on Iran at this juncture. In November 2004, Iran agreed to stop uranium enrichment activities. In return, it was rewarded economically. Today, there is a change of heart in Iran. But is that an excuse for the United States of America to be bellicose toward Iran? Clearly, the utterances of President George W. Bush at the City Club of Cleveland, Ohio, on Monday, was a political ploy, which was calculated to remind Iran that the military might of the United States is capable of crushing just about any country of the world, today. Iran might well be a threat to world peace – assuming that it is, in fact, preparing to manufacture atomic bombs and suchlike – but is it any more of a threat to world peace than the United States of America with its evangelistic outlook on the Middle East? What I fear, My Dear Grandchild, is that the United States will, once again, perpetrate an act, which is contrary to the mandate of the United Nations, claiming that the United Nations is a toothless tiger. This is, exactly, what happened when the United States military might, along with a small contingent of British troops, drove to Baghdad, Iraq, and toppled the Saddam Hussein Regime about three years ago. It acted illegally then, and, if it unilaterally attacks Iran without the endorsement of the United Nations, it will be acting illegally, again. The United States has, already, lost a great deal of credibility on the world stage. Can it afford to lose more? Lastly, is the United States of America willing to risk an international conflict between Muslims and infidels?*

*Talk to you next week.*

*Chief Lady*

***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](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com) or [targnews@hkstar.com](mailto:targnews@hkstar.com). TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*