

## IRAN-US: What's Next?

On 3 January 2020, Iranian commander Qassim Soleimani of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) was killed in a US drone strike in Baghdad. The strike came just days after a US embassy attack by Iranian backed militias, during the violent protests. These protests were considered a retaliation to the previous airstrikes, which killed 25 Kataib Hezbollah in Iraq. The killing of the commander has come as a shock to everyone as targeting high-level Iranian officials was a red line. That the US has conducted such a strike is leading to many to view it as a major escalation. Donald Trump said, "...his reign of terror is over, we took action last night to stop a war. We did not take action to start a war." [1] Joe Biden also added, "Hugely escalatory move in an already dangerous region." He added that, "the US could be on the brink of a major conflict across the Middle East." [2]

The Iranian response has openly suggested "severe revenge against the United States" for Commander Qassim Soleimani. The nature of the revenge is what needs to be answered in order to conclude how serious is Iran, to avenge the death of its prestige commander of the elite Quds force. Many news outlets have stated that Iran will most likely conduct some type of asymmetric attack to avenge the commander's death. "Iran's state-backed hackers are already among the world's most aggressive and could inject malware that triggers major disruptions to the US public and private sector." [3]

This shows that Iran's response will unlikely be a military one. Which goes to show that war is not an option for Iran, and neither is it for the US. But why the attack and why a man who has helped the US over the years, suddenly terminated. What is the US agenda behind the attacks?

The attack was undertaken for the same reason as the sanctions that have been applied upon Iran by the US. It is part of America's maximum pressure strategy. It is to change Iran's behaviour, which is to contain Iran within its borders as the US no longer needs it to carry out actions in Iraq and Syria. The US foreign policy establishment is divided into three factions. The First faction suggests bombing Iran, which consists of the remaining hawkish Neoconservatives, like John Bolton. Which is why Bolton got fired by Trump in 2019, as Trump doesn't prefer a war with Iran. The second faction suggests a wholesome regime change. Third, is changing Iran's behaviour so it can correlate with America's interests much easier, and project less hostility. The third option is the most viable option since, democratisation isn't going to happen and neither a full-blown war. The above statements makes this clear from both sides that, neither the US nor Iran can afford to carry out a full-scale conventional war.

CIA expert Kenneth Pollack stated, "The Iranians also provided considerable assistance to operations enduring Freedom. Tehran offered to allow American transport aircraft to stage from airfields in eastern Iran to assist operations in western Afghanistan. It agreed to perform search and rescue missions for downed American airmen who bailed over Iran .... The Iranian weighed in with the Northern Alliance and

helped convince it that Washington was deadly serious and that therefore, the Northern alliance should participate fully in the American war effort.” [4]

Commander Qassim Soleimani was the one who was involved in helping America on several different occasions over the years. But now he has been terminated, which is for simple reason that there are no eternal alliances but only temporary alliances. The US believes itself to be the most indispensable nation capable of doing whatever it desires, a manifestation of its hideous secular creed. For Trump, the alliance was not required any longer henceforth, to teach Iran a lesson America slaughtered one of its most important figures. So, it can capitulate Iran into changing its behaviour and form new agreements that will correlate with US interests. It also makes Iran aware that the American power, is the paramount power.

America doesn't possess direct control within Iran but rather retains it externally, where it applies external pressure on the Iranian regime to attain its subordination. In 1978 George Lambrakis, a senior US embassy officer in Tehran sent a dispatch to Washington, where he clarified the strong grip of the clergy within Iran. He said, “The Islamic establishment is neither weak nor as ignorant as the Shah's government as some western observers would portray it. It has a far better grip on the emotions of the people and on the money of the bazaar than any other group” [5]. The US has put the Iranian clergy on notice with the assassination that the regime's behaviour requires a change for new negotiations to take place.

Over the past 4 decades, Henry Kissinger's policy has been operating within the Middle East. This is based upon the US dominating the Middle East and using the Zionist entity as one way to interfere in the region. The Zionist entity views all the Muslim majority nations in the region as threats to its security and that's why it undertakes aggressive actions against the Ummah. Saudi Arabia's task has been to pump oil and finance militia groups in the region (Sunni ones). The war in Afghanistan during the 1980s, was funded by the US backed Saudi regime via so called “Islamic banks”, which were built by King Faisal, to finance pro-American policies, in the region. This was the balance of power constructed by the US, where the Zionist entity administers the West Bank (Jordan) and the Golan Heights (eastern Syria), however, without possessing sovereignty over them, which the US made sure of by threatening to cut 'Israel's' military and economic aid at any time. The US also utilises Iranian militias in Lebanon to scare the Zionist entity if it ever tries to expand in the region. This policy creates a balance, which prevents the Zionist entity from expanding and prevents the Arabs expanding beyond the artificially created borders. As for Iran, the US contained it by isolating it in the region and by using Saudi Arabia to stand against Iran.

Trump now wants Iran to have a minimised role in the region and accept the one state solution, where Saudi Arabia and the Zionist entity will take on the America's burden thus, shifting the balance of power within the Middle East. Where the Zionist entity now possesses full sovereignty over the Golan Heights. Trump does not care for the 242 UN Resolution; at all rather, his focus is towards the rising power China, and the internal issues within America. For too long the US has been involved with radical Islamists, unnecessary wars and fighting rogue nations, which it has helped create in the first place. It is too costly therefore, Donald Trump aims to shift the

balance within the region and make an American exit, while leaving strategic US bases behind. Thus, bullying the Iranians will help him carry out the negotiations that are necessary for this plan, and also to win the upcoming elections in November 2020. Trump's statement in 2011 proves this, "He is weak, and he is ineffective. We have a real problem in the White House, so I believe that he [Obama] will attack Iran sometime prior to the election." [6]

Iran needs to accept the new order in the Middle East and the one state solution, hence, America needs to bring Iran onto the table for the negotiations, to accept the new order. Trump's withdrawal from eastern Syria has exposed the Zionist entity towards the 40,000 Iranian militias, which is causing agitation for the "Israelis". Trump is putting pressure on the Zionist entity by increasing the Iranian threat, which can lure Iran towards an unwanted conflict with the Zionist entity. It, then 'Israel' will be backed by the US to prevail over Iran. It is also to help Netanyahu to win support from the parliament by him convincing them of Iran, as a belligerent threat. The Zionist entity is deeply concerned about the Iranian backed Militias in eastern Syria, but the US won't allow the Zionist entity to engage in a conflict with the Iranians until it's feasible for American interests. A conflict taking place is unlikely but if it does, then the US allies- the Zionist entity and Saudi Arabia will be backed by the US, to carry out an attack on Iran. Either way the US will win, and Iran will be forced to come to terms. Just like Anwar Sadat had to recognise the Zionist entity after the 1973 War.

At the end of the day, Iran still remains an agent but not a very cooperative one, which is due to all those years of brutal imperialism on the country by America. Donald Trump is using Iran now for his own domestic purposes and this is becoming a regular occurrence with the Trump presidency. America's Middle Eastern plan is a terrible plan for the Middle East. Even if the Iranians do submit and give up on their hunger for regional power, which is very likely, it does not erase the fact that the intimate open relations with Saudi Arabia and "Israel" and other Arab states, will cause problems in the Ummah in the foreseeable future, which can precipitate into an explosion of another Arab Spring, which is already on the verge.

**Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by  
Mohammed Mustafa**

## **References:**

- [1] <https://www.ft.com/content/e81763aa-2e5f-11ea-a126-99756bd8f45e>
- [2] <https://www.bostonherald.com/2020/01/03/foreign-policy-focus-after-trumps-iran-strike-could-benefit-joe-biden/>
- [3] <https://globalnews.ca/news/6364324/iran-cyberattacks-feared-after-us-airstrike/>
- [4] Abid Mustafa (2010) essays on 21st century, Khilafah Publications.
- [5] George Lambrakis, "Understanding the Shi'ite Islamic movements," "confidential dispatch" February 2, 1978
- [6] <https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1223528/iran-news-donald-trump-world-war-3-prediction-election-barack-obama-spt>