

United States ideology of aggression

Syed Mohammad Tariq Pirzada

USA
F. Post 19-2-05

The two sides are testing their nerves. One is a superpower claiming to fight an ideology of hatred, while the other, an occupied country, seeking to dismantle an ideology of aggression. To Condoleezza Rice, "America and all free nations are facing a generational struggle against a new and deadly ideology of hatred", but, to the Iraqis, they, and their civilization are confronting a pretentious ideology underneath an aggression that must not succeed. As the chief exponent of US foreign policy, Miss Rice, the new US secretary of state, appears as committed to US interest, as the freedom movement seems sworn to protect Iraq. The line of clash has never been clearer.

The notion of ideological warfare, so thoughtfully considered, planned, and executed by Washington, has, now, seemingly matured, in the second term of Mr. Bush, to the point that the Senate confirmation hearings of the US secretary of state remained largely focused on crystallizing the clash of ideologies, which, rhetoric aside, means, the clash of civilizations.

The "ideology of tyranny, terror, and hatred", which the US, in the words of Rice, is faced with", and is fiercely fighting against in Iraq so it does not have to face it at home (Bush State of the Union Address), cuts both ways. The argument is also equally reflective, as viewed by the Iraqis and the Muslim community, of all the larger American political, strategic, military, and ideological motives, and objectives, that stand already fully exposed by the US occupation of Iraq in the heart of the Muslim East. That the ideologically driven Whites have captured, like the Crusaders, the heartland of Islam is now widely believed by the vast majority of Muslims from Morocco to Pakistan to Indonesia.

Both the Iraqis and the Bush administration know it well what their respective successes and failures in the upcoming months or years could mean for

their long term interest. If the US prevails over the growing freedom movement in central Iraq--the region from Baghdad to Mosul--then, indeed, a reliable, and resourceful second permanent satellite, an Arab replica of Israel, with a sizeable educated middle class, would be instantly available to recognize, and promote long-term long US security presence, that would enable Washington to comfortably overthrow the Arab governments, and re-shape, at gun point, the states and societies in the Arab and the broader Muslim world.

The Iraqis know, on the other hand, the magnitude of the cataclysmic end that would befall their hard built civilization, if the US could crush their deepening movement, which has essentially arisen as a major indigenous impediment to US expansion in the greater Arab mainland. Washington is shocked by the will of Iraq--at least hundred thousand Iraqis killed by the US since the beginning of invasion, excluding those unaccounted for hundreds of thousands that are only known to the US guns.

In the Iraqi calculation, as it seems to be, the US is not in Vietnam, because the Vietcong made the needed sacrifices. The Iraqis have the message of history: when the US wins, it stays. Tokyo, Soul, and the almost forgotten, Kuwait, are just a few names that represent various periods of long-term US security presence.

The stated US goal is to "build upon the achievements since the defining moment of 9/11/2001. The "task of American diplomacy, as the new Secretary of State proposed in her Senate confirmation hearings, is (a) the establishment of an international system to unite their "community of democracies", (b) "strengthen this community of democracies to fight the threats to our common security", and (c) "spread freedom and democracy throughout the globe. That is the mission president Bush has

set for America in the world". It ought to be recalled that the US policy for the Arab world's forced transformation was formally announced on Dec 12, 2002 by the then secretary of state, Colin Powell, in his address before the Heritage Foundation in Washington.

The Bush declaration of this mission, in his February 2, State of the Union message, was direct and centred on (a) Iran and (b) Syria as the immediate targets. " Syria allows its territory, and parts of Lebanon to be used by the terrorist who seek to destroy peace every chance of peace in the region", said Mr. Bush, as he specifically referred to the Syrian Accountability Act, which "you (the US Congress) have passed and we are applying".

The Iraq watchers remember the Iraq Freedom Act, passed by the US Congress during the Clinton administration, that mandated the overthrow of Saddam. The Syrian Accountability Act is essentially an assault-license similar to the Iraqi Freedom Act. The message is clear, and the threat is real for Damascus that is militarily sand-witched between the US and Israel.

Like Iraq, the US position on Iran has no ambiguities. The Republicans were so serious on this issue that they went beyond the scope of their Party Platform, on the eve of the Republican Convention, and mentioned Iran as a developer of WMD. Thus, the US goal is (a) to eliminate the alleged threat of terror from Tehran, (b) to destroy its nuclear weapons capability, and (c) to bring down the government in Iran.

Those who are advising the Iranian leadership otherwise--that Iran cannot be subjected to a pre-emptive strike--are ignoring the US policy. To Mr. Bush, "Iran remains world's primary state sponsor of terror, pursuing nuclear weapons, and depriving its people of the freedom they seek and deserve".

Sadly, it has, taken the Iranians more than a year to

grasp that the EU and US have had a strong common policy against Iran' nuclear program. The European modus-operandi is to see Iran's nuclear program dismantled through intense political and economic pressure, while the US is impatiently waiting for the failure of EU-Iran talks before it can with or without the Israelis, strike hard.

As time, like always, is of essence, the Iranian leadership, while it continues its political, and diplomatic offensive, needs to brace itself, with a national determination, for the probability of US surgical strikes against its nuclear, and other assets. One cannot overstate the supreme requirement for a massive media blitz that can get across a unified resolve to confront any aggression, backed, of course, by a massive show of people's power, and the readiness to employ a proportionate response, that ought to emanate from a sustainable will to absorb early losses.

Though all possible engagement with the EU, and the US remains critical, Tehran knows that its co-operation with the US on Iraq, and Afghanistan has failed to pay off. For Tehran, capitulation, as evidenced by the experience of Muslim states, is not an option as it can only help the US realize the ultimate: a total disarmament of Iran, that would mean not only the demolition of its nuclear assets, but also that of its conventional defenses.

The comfort of surrender cannot ensure the survival of Colonel Qaddafi, nor that of the others, if they follow the suit. Iran, a major Muslim state, cannot disregard its sovereignty, and the society, the religion, the civilization, and the history it represents.

At this juncture, Islamabad's constraints are understandable, yet it has a historic duty as to the people of Iran. Mr. Musharraf ought to know that if the ideology of aggression reached Tehran, it could also take a flight to Islamabad. The reaction time is short.

E.Mail:

stariqp@isb.paknet.com.pk