

Iran: The next target of the transnational elite

TAKIS FOTOPOULOS

In the last couple of weeks, the discussion about a probable new attack by the transnational elite, this time against Iran, has reached new heights—with the inevitable consequences this has had on the oil prices. Some^[1] talk of bluffs and counterbluffs which are simply aimed at achieving better negotiating positions for the two sides. Thus, the Iranians are supposed to be bluffing with respect to their hidden agenda for the development of nuclear weapons, while the Anglo-Americans are supposed to be counter-bluffing with respect to a supposed planned military attack against Iran. Others^[2] talk of a genuine US planning process for an attack aiming at the redemption of Bush through a new “Mission Accomplished” moment; this would save the Republicans from the loss of one or both houses of Congress this November and the consequent possibility of the Democrats launching investigations against the Administration, backed by subpoena power. Finally, the reformist Left, as usual, puts victims and aggressors in the same category, clearly playing the ideological game of the transnational elite.

However, as I will try to show here, an attack against Iran with the aim of regime change is only a matter of time—the only real issue being the timing and the form this attack will take. This is because, as I have tried to show in the past,^[3] an attack against Iran is only the next phase of the strategic plan to redraw the political map of the Middle East. This plan began to be implemented by the transnational elite at the beginning of the 1990s with the Gulf war –which set the foundations for the final regime change in Iraq—and continued with the invasion and consequent regime change in Afghanistan. The new phase involves regime change in Iran and consequently in Syria, which is also expected to lead to the final crushing of the Palestinian movement—the last stage of the strategic plan.

The aims of the planned attack against Iran

If we ignore shallow analyses about bluffs and military adventures just for the sake of electoral gains, what are the basic aims of the planned attack on Iran? In my view, the aims are the following:

- first, the full integration of the entire region into the New World Order of neoliberal globalisation, so that, on the one hand, the stability of the Muslim client regimes in the area –from Egypt to Pakistan and Indonesia—whose foundations are being shaken at the moment, may be secured, and on the other, the new protectorates being established in the area after the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq may be founded on solid ground that will be capable of resisting the accumulated blows of the growing

resistance of their own peoples. It is clear today that the long-term success of these invasions crucially depends on the change of regime in Iran which, according to the transnational elite's expectations, would also mean the beginning of the end of Islamic 'terrorism', while simultaneously securing the smooth flow of oil at prices controlled by the world market, i.e. the transnational elite.

- second, the final crushing of the Palestinian movement and the establishment of a kind of Bantustan regime, which has been a long-term aim of the transnational elite, having been vigorously pursued since the beginning of the last decade with the active cooperation of Zionists and the indirect support of part of the Palestinian population (mostly, the emerging bourgeois class around the ex-Palestinian Authority under Abbas). However, this solution has not proved feasible without the prior change of regime in Iran, which supports the Palestinian resistance movement in many ways (military, financial etc). On the other hand, the continuation of the present Iranian regime —which is expected within the next few years to possess a nuclear armament capability— would disturb the entire balance of power in the region and threaten the nuclear monopoly of the Zionist regime in Israel, which is planned to play a crucial role in the new political restructuring of the Middle East with respect to suppressing any 'terrorist' (i.e. resistance) movement against the New World Order.

For the opposite reasons, the Islamic regime in Iran has every reason to attempt to develop a nuclear armament capability, as it is well aware that this is the only way to avoid its final demise under the blows of the transnational elite. The lesson that the Iranian regime has learned from the example of North Korea is that the US leadership of this elite seemed ready to leave this country untouched only when it made clear the fact that it had developed a nuclear capability that could seriously threaten the transnational elite's assets in the Far East; at the same time, this elite had no qualms about invading the relatively undefended Iraq. And, of course, Iran not only has every legal right to proceed with the enrichment of uranium for peaceful purposes^[4], but it also cannot be denied the right of self-defence with the development of nuclear weapons when it is surrounded either by states occupied by hostile nuclear powers (Iraq, Afghanistan), or by client nuclear regimes (Pakistan), with the expansionist nuclear regime of Zionist Israel being so close to its borders.

What form will the new attack take?

It is almost inconceivable that the attack will be a new invasion of the Iraq type. Neither the US nor the other members of the transnational elite, who would probably take part in a similar campaign, have the power or the desire to undertake a similar operation, particularly when they are fully aware that Iran is much stronger than Iraq. Therefore, this attack will most probably be an economic one initially, in the form of a strict embargo imposed by the main members of the transnational elite. The aim would be the economic crippling of a regime already facing a 16-20 percent unemployment rate^[5] and the initiation of an economic crisis which would turn the extremely consumerist^[6] bourgeois class of Iran (the 'modernisers') against the regime —very much like what happened in Yugoslavia. In case the embargo were to prove sufficient in overthrowing the Islamic regime, the transnational elite would then undertake the economic 'rebuilding' of the country, under the condition that the new client regime would stop any attempt to develop a nuclear weapon. If, however, the embargo proved insufficient in leading to a change of regime as a result of possible disagreements among members of the transnational elite for

instance, the Zionist regime of Israel, or even members of the transnational elite itself, could undertake a campaign of 'surgical' air raids with the direct aim of destroying the nuclear installations of the regime and the indirect aim of changing the regime itself for the benefit of the modernising elite.

It is, therefore, clear that the outcome of the new attack against Iran potentially involves huge dangers for the transnational elite, as the failure of this operation could risk the collapse not only of Iraq and Afghanistan but possibly also of a whole series of client regimes, quite apart from the continuation and further intensification of 'terrorism'. However, neither the Iranian Islamists nor the transnational elite have any other choice. Particularly so when the transnational elite does not even discuss the only solution to the problem of nuclear armaments : a general nuclear disarmament beginning with that of the entire Middle East and, of course, including Zionist Israel.

A Confederal Inclusive Democracy as the way out of the blood cycle in the Middle East

On the basis of the above problematic it is clear that the blood cycle is not going to cease, either if the transnational elite succeeds in its plans to redraw the political map of the Middle East, or if the Iranian Islamists —with the help of the peoples in the area— succeed in heading off their plans. In the former case, it is likely that the New Order which would be imposed in the area would lead to an even greater rise in resistance against it, ending with the 'Palestinisation' of the entire Middle East for many years to come. In the latter, the transnational elite would use every means at its disposal —with the support of the privileged elites which would have lost their grip on power in the meantime —to revive the civil wars in each country, exploiting not just the class differences but also the national and religious differences between the peoples of the area.

A Confederal Inclusive Democracy is, therefore, offered not only as perhaps the only rational solution for the end of the blood cycle in Palestine^[7], but also in the entire Middle East region. 'Divide and rule' was the basic policy implemented by the Great Powers during the entire last century, ever since they drew the first map of the area at the beginning of it, with the sole objective of perpetuating their dominance over the Arab peoples in an effort to secure control of the vital oil resources.^[8] The fact that made the implementation of such a policy particularly easy was the panspermia of nationalities and religions that always characterised the peoples of this historical area. The Ottoman empire, which had no incentive to cultivate these sorts of differences among the peoples under its yoke, united all these peoples through the conquerors' violence. The rivers of blood that have been shed by these peoples in the last 100 years or so, for the sake of a pseudo-autonomy obtained through the recognition of their national identity —which in reality has led to a relationship of dependence on the Great Powers—can only run dry in one way: if the peoples themselves set the institutional bases for a genuine autonomy at the collective as well as the individual levels.

A multicultural Confederal Inclusive Democracy could secure this genuine autonomy, through the development of local Inclusive Democracies, which would offer the institutional preconditions not only for the preservation of the cultural identity of each people, but also for securing the individual and collective self-determination of citizens at

the political and economic levels. The unity of peoples which is founded on genuine autonomy, namely freedom, is the only unity that can endure through time and also head off any plots by external forces to break it.

-
- [1] Gaby Hinsliff, 'So how close is a showdown over Iran?', *The Guardian* (16/4/2006).
- [2] See e.g. Paul Krugman, "Oh yes he would", *The Guardian* (11/4/2006).
- [3] See Takis Fotopoulos, "[The global 'war' of the transnational elite](#)", *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (July 2002).
- [4] See article IV of the Treaty for the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (Cyrus Saftari, "Iran needs nuclear energy, not weapons", *Le Monde diplomatique* (November 2005).
- [5] See the report of the European think-tank Foreign Policy Centre, *Understanding Iran*, *The Guardian* (20/4/2006).
- [6] Robert Tait, 'A consumer society not ready for sanctions', *The Guardian* (6/2/2006).
- [7] See Takis Fotopoulos, '[Palestine: the hour of truth](#)', *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (January 2006).
- [8] See Takis Fotopoulos, "[Iraq: the new criminal 'war' of the transnational elite](#)", *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (July 2003).