



‘The basis of socialism is the human being... Socialism is the movement to restore human being’s conscious will.’

- Mansoor Hekmat

The great Marxist thinker and leader of the Worker-communist Party and worker-communist movement, 1951-2002

The Israeli State’s Renewed Aggression is condemned!

Recently, the Israeli state has re-occupied Palestinian areas, destroyed Arafat’s Headquarters, and killed and wounded numerous Palestinians. During the past year, under the guise of ‘fighting terrorism’, the Israeli state has systematically engaged in terrorising, killing, occupying and imposing fear, insecurity and immense poverty upon Palestinians by employing an all out fascist policy with the unconditional backing of the USA. The continuation of this naked state terrorism has also provided Islamic terrorist

groups in the opposing camp with the justification and capability to take the lives of defenceless Israeli civilians viablind and inhuman ‘suicide bombings’.

The Worker-communist Party of Iran (WPI) strongly condemns the Israeli government’s fascist policy and state terrorism against the people of Palestine. Furthermore, the WPI unequivocally condemns the terrorist race from either side. In order to bring an end to this situation, the WPI emphasizes that the Israeli government

must immediately end the killing of Palestinians and the occupation of Palestinian territories, pull out from all occupied territories and acquiesce to the just demand for the formation of an independent state of Palestine.

The charlatanry of the state of Israel and its disregard for international protest and scorn must be answered with ever escalating protests. The WPI calls upon all advocates for freedom around the world to protest against the fascist policies of the state of Israel and compel it to fully retreat and recognise the state of Palestine.



On the USA Attack on Iraq

Interview with **Koorosh Modaresi** on the USA’s New Global Strategy

Question: The Worker-communist Party of Iran has stated that the USA war against Iraq must be stopped and that any USA military attack on Iraq is condemned. How would you explain the difference between the USA attack on Iraq and its attack on the Taliban; how do you

explain the different positions of the WPI vis-à-vis the two USA attacks?

Koorosh Modaresi: It is not a question of war; it is obviously a question of a USA attack on Iraq. The attack that the USA is preparing for is different from

The Gory Dawn of the New World Order, Part I

Mansoor Hekmat

Given the importance and relevancy of Mansoor Hekmat’s article on the New World Order, WPI Briefing reprint this article first published in 1991.

JUDGING by what is being done in the Gulf, and by what we are told about it by the media, we must all be thankful for the fact that this is a world of hypocrisy, selective morality and double standards. Just imagine the chaos if all United Nation resolutions were to be enforced with equal

rigour and resolve. Just imagine how many thousands of tons of bombs would have to be dropped, to start with, on Israel for its occupation of Palestinian land and its treatment of the Palestinian people, on South Africa for its denial of human status to the majority of its inhabitants, and on the USA itself for uninterrupted harassment of humanity for decades. Imagine the number of fighter and bomber ‘sorties’ and cruise missile launches that would be required to neutralize weapons of mass destruction stockpiled in the USA, USSR, China, Britain,

On the USA Attack on Iraq, Cont. from Page 1

the USA-Taliban war. The USA attack on Iraq is the continuation, or better stated, expansion of the policy the USA was pursuing during the Gulf War, i.e. the imposition of a New World Order, which will guarantee complete USA domination. The Afghanistan war was a war by the USA and a coalition of many countries across the world to overthrow the Taliban, one of the centres of political Islam in the region. In that war, the downfall of the Taliban and political Islam was both beneficial for the people of Afghanistan and positive for the people of the region and the world. In that framework, whoever was to replace the Taliban would reduce the suffering of the people of Afghanistan and weaken political Islam in the region. The war that the USA is preparing for today, however, is a completely different issue. The downfall of Saddam Hussein and possibly the Ba'ath regime will not be the only result of this attack. Before anything else, this war will secure USA domination, a seriously harmful phenomenon for the people of Iraq, region and world, and will negatively impact on people's progressive movement throughout the world.

This war must be looked at from two angles that are certainly related to each other. One is the issue at hand itself that the USA poses and the other is the more general strategy that its bourgeoisie's extreme right is putting forth as a framework for US foreign policy in today's world.

The USA has presented the issue as one of overthrowing a dictatorial, fascist and criminal regime. This is not the issue at hand, however; it is the hue and cry that the USA has raised in

order to cover up the real issue. We have previously spoken extensively on this, i.e. bringing up the characteristics of the Ba'ath regime, which was incidentally supported by the USA during most of its tenure, in connection to the Gulf war and economic sanctions on Iraq. Readers can refer to Mansoor Hekmat's articles about the Gulf War and my interview in the 'Porsesh' journal.

In brief, I must say that the issue of Afghanistan had a real and actual foundation, which separates it from other parts of the world-political Islam's domination and the expansion of its terrorist base. On Iraq, however, the issue raised is arbitrary and as such cannot reflect reality, i.e. the issue that the USA is raising in this war is not particular to the Iraqi government; the majority of USA friendly states are such. By separating Iraq, we give the judging of who is criminal and despotic to the USA. Let me give some examples: They argue that the Iraqi regime is despotic. But are the regimes of Saudi Arabia and other US allies less despotic than the Iraqi regime? By accepting this, we are consenting that the USA determines the despotic nature of regimes. They argue that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. But doesn't the USA, UK, Pakistan, India, Israel, France, China, etc. have the same weapons? If we accept this, then we accept that owning weapons of mass destruction is a crime only if the USA thinks it is. They contend that Iraq has used these weapons. But isn't the USA the only state that actually used nuclear weapons in the world? Were not the defenceless people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki victims of this? What about the

people of Vietnam? Did the USA have any doubts on using chemical and biological weapons against the people of Vietnam? Wasn't the USA and West supporting Iraq exactly when it used chemical weapons, including against us? Didn't they ignore and silence the protests and objections raised by us and the people of Iran and Iraq who were victims of Saddam? Was it not the USA that used depleted uranium in the very same Gulf War? Haven't hundreds of thousands of children, young and old become victims of this, according to the UN; has not the USA used the most horrific weapon of mass destruction, i.e. economic sanctions, for more than ten years against the people of Iraq? The truth is that the issue at hand is not having or using weapons of mass destruction; if we accept this from the USA, then we have officially accepted that the use of weapons of mass destruction is a prerogative of a small number of countries and their permission to use it is given by the USA and its friends.

There is only one fact in light of the hue and cry that the USA has raised. The USA can overthrow anyone that it determines to be contrary to its interest. Today the 'change of regime' is aimed at the fascist regime of Iraq. With this same reasoning, if this is established, then tomorrow, the USA can remove any regime or system it considers contrary to its interest under the slogan of 'regime change'. A 'regime change' in Iraq is most certainly the demand of any decent human being but in reality this is not the issue at hand for the USA. Raising this is merely a propaganda war to secure a special role for the USA.

The second angle that must be considered, and which I believe is the main pillar of explaining USA policy, is the debate about the new USA strategy in the contemporary world, i.e. the New World Order. We are witnessing a fundamental change in the philosophy of the USA's international policy. Up until now, even at the height of Reaganism, the official USA international policy was that the USA must be so powerful militarily so as to deter the enemy, particularly the Eastern Bloc, from militarily attacking the US and use this to defend its political, economic and military domain. This policy was called the 'Deterrence Policy'. Today, however, we are witnessing the pronouncement of a new policy by the extreme right of the US bourgeoisie called the Pre-emptive Strike Policy. The White House has recently announced this as the basis of USA foreign policy. According to this policy, the USA must not allow the shaping of any competitor, be it economic, political or military, that can ignore or threaten USA interests; the USA must be able to suppress the shaping of such a power by use of military force. Adopting this policy does not require United Nation or any other state's backing, but rather requires that the USA act unilaterally by relying on its own power and independently of others. This is the basis of the USA policy towards Iraq. Upon establishing this policy, from tomorrow, people anywhere who demand certain freedoms that threaten USA interests will face the military might of this state. By adopting this policy, the USA is turning the world into its own backyard. It is doing what it has done over the past century in Latin America - coup d'etats, military interventions, and maintaining states that guarantee USA interests. Saudi

On the USA Attack on Iraq, Cont. from Page 2

Arabia, Kuwait and Israel are contemporary examples in the Middle East.

We must also, however, take into account the human dimensions of this adventurism in USA policy. Economically speaking, Iraq is a much more complicated country than Afghanistan. Attacking Iraq will again mean the destruction of its economic foundations, from its electricity grids and water networks to bridges, roads, etc., examples of which we saw in the Gulf War. One pillar of the USA war against Iraq will be the destruction of its infrastructure and economic basis. Also, the USA has shown that it is willing to kill thousands of innocent people to prevent even one casualty on its side. Furthermore, this time, the Iraqi

regime will be dragged into a war of life and death. Does anyone have any doubts about the brutality of the Iraqi regime? Can anyone guarantee that Iraq will not use chemical or biological weapons? If it does, what will happen? In the last war, Iraq was officially warned that if it uses chemical weapons, nuclear bombs would be used against Baghdad. In this case, the regime is facing its overthrow and no retreat has been left for it, therefore, the possibility of its using chemical weapons is more probable and real; what would they do then? Would they not bomb Baghdad with a nuclear bomb? Do they have any moral dilemma with this? Did they not do it in Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Vietnam? By attacking Iraq, the USA will begin a war of luna-

tics! The people of Iraq will be the first victims of this war. The USA-made government, which is to replace the Iraqi regime, is to replace the Iraqi regime, is an interesting one - a collection of tribal leaders and generals who should be in tried next to Ba'ath leaders, Islamists who have been one pillar of political Islam in the region, and so on. The war hasn't even started and Jalal Talebani's Patriotic Union of Kurdistan and Masud Barzani's Kurdistan Democratic Party are talking and planning the ethnic cleansing of Karkuk.

The result of the arbitrary separation of Iraq from other reactionary states and alongside the brutal incursions of the Israeli state will be the expansion of political Islam in the region. Islamists will once again have an

audience for their bleak propaganda. This policy will give them legitimacy. It will encourage fascism vis-à-vis fascism. The 'Pre-emptive Policy' will be used against regimes unacceptable to the USA and not against despotic regimes. In its opposition, this policy will promote various kinds of corrupt and foul ideologies such as political Islam and nationalism. In a single sentence, the outcome of the USA attack against Iraq will be nothing but deprivation and corruption. Do not forget that the formation and development of Al-Qaeda was the result of the first Gulf War, which defined itself in reaction to it. This time however more foul groups will come to the fore.

The above is the translation of an interview in International Weekly number 125 dated 27 September.

The Gory Dawn of the NWO, Cont. from Page 1

France, Israel and all other states with enough cash to afford them. Imagine the kind of wars which had to be waged if we were to prevent monopolistic control of not just oil, but also grain, technology, vaccines, information, etc. Just think of the number of ships required to blockade all dictatorships; the number of judges and courtrooms needed to try all war criminals regardless of race, creed, nationality and table manners; the environmental cost of trying to tame all trigger-happy global and regional superpowers. And just think of the cost of it all - no Japan or Saudi Arabia could possibly cough up that much money. It would be a nightmare. Let it be. It is just safer as it is. Let us join the parade of self-deception and Euro-American jingoism. Let us share in the juvenile excitement of our overpaid 'objective journalists' and TV panel 'experts' over

their real life computer war games.

Or perhaps not. Instead, we must free ourselves from their assumptions and justifications. We must look at the real issues involved. This war is not over democracy and dictatorship. Killing and maiming Iraqi people in their thousands and destroying their homes, schools and factories is indeed a sick way of liberating them from political oppression. The war has nothing to do with preventing oil-starvation of the West. There is no point in owning more oil if you do not intend to sell it. This war is not for upholding international law. In the light of the past record of the law enforcers themselves, from Hiroshima and Vietnam to Grenada and Nicaragua, such suggestions cannot be taken seriously.

These are not the real issues.

These are exactly what they are: war propaganda. The main clues for understanding the real causes of this conflict are to be found in Bush's seemingly harmless allusion to a 'New World Order' and Saddam Hossein's rejected demand for a 'linkage' (between the future of Kuwait and the resolution of the Palestinian question).

The New World Order

The conflict in the Gulf is merely one manifestation of the contradictions and uncertainties in the post-Cold War international relations. With the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the old international power structure, based on the military, political and, to a lesser extent, economic, opposition of the two power blocs of East and West, also disintegrated. While the mass media and political commentators in the West rejoiced over the so-

called 'collapse of communism' and promised a future of peace and harmony under the unchallenged sway of the glorious market, it was evident to anybody with a sober mind that the post-Cold War world will be ridden with serious economic, political and ideological tensions and confrontations. Western political commentary is usually focused on the volatile situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the so-called North-South divide, the environment, regional conflicts and so on - i.e. problems which supposedly originate outside the boundaries of the 'democratic' and 'civilised' West. These are indeed part of the problems that face the '90s, however, the main challenge, and the central issue in any attempt to shape a 'New Order', lies in the West itself. The collapse of the East meant also the demise of the West as its opposite pole, as a defined economic, political,

The Gory Dawn of the NWO, Cont. from Page 3

military and ideological entity forged to contain and defeat the Soviet bloc after the Second World War. The old West, both as a concept and as a politico-economic reality, was erected on the basis of the hegemony, or the so-called 'leading role', of the United States. The preservation of this role, or even its extension, in the radically transformed world of post-Cold War politics, is the essence of the American vision of the 'New World Order'.



Prior to the recent crisis in the Middle East, such a vision appeared to lack practical venues for self-realization. The rise of Japan and West Germany as formidable economic powers, the march towards European unity and the actual reunification of Germany, the political shift in Eastern European countries in favour of the pro-market Right and, last but not least, the political and economic opening of the Soviet Union itself to the West, undermined every aspect of the old West. Not only the leading role of the US, but even the actual institutions that embodied and safeguarded US hegemony, such as NATO, appeared to become increasingly redundant. The whole American foreign policy lost its focus. Even some

of the most hawkish Cold War warriors on the extreme right of American politics turned into advocates of isolationism. The crisis in the Gulf presented the US government with an opportunity to try to reverse these trends. In a recent speech to a gathering of Religious Broadcasters, George Bush spelled out US intentions in the war with astonishing clarity. The aim was to 'restore the leadership' and 'reliability' of the United States. Once this was achieved, said Bush, international problems such as the Palestinian question, could be resolved with the US 'taking a leading role'.

The United States seized the opportunity created by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait to reassert

itself as a superpower. With a massive campaign of propaganda and provocation skilfully carried out by the high-tech bootlicker journalism in the West, itself a product of mass political apathy of the 80s, a new 'Evil Empire' was created overnight. A Third World country of no more than 17 million people, indebted, totally dependent on its oil exports to the West, and worn out after eight years of war with the neighbouring Iran, was portrayed as a global menace. A regional issue that would under other circumstances be dealt with by the usual political and diplomatic pressures and gestures was blown out of all proportions into a life and death challenge for the 'civilized world'. Continental Europe hesitantly fell in line. Kohl

and Mitterrand, figures of an assertive united bourgeois Europe, were pushed to the sidelines by Bush and Baker, symbols of American omnipotence. The Japanese giant was reduced to an obedient cashier. Europe was reminded of the indispensable 'leading role' of the US in the capitalist new world order.

While Iraq is the theatre of war, the central issues that are to be settled by this war lie primarily in the West. USA's show of force and 'leadership' in the Middle East to ensure it a commanding position vis-à-vis its allies, and rivals, in the post-Cold War West; a precondition, also, for a global US supremacy. But USA's endeavour runs against the political and economic logic of the present-day capitalism, which calls for a fundamental revision of the old balance and the emergence of a new bourgeois economic and political configuration. The fragile nature of the 'Coalition', in contrast to the cohesion displayed for decades by the Western alliance in their confrontation with the Eastern bloc, underlines the historical limits of the American endeavour.

To be Continued.

For a Better World
A Television Program by Ali
Javadi
Via Satellite, Channel 1
Tuesdays, In Persian
8:30pm Tehran time
Ali_Javadi@yahoo.com

Listen to
Radio International
In Persian, Daily
on 31 Metres, 9940 Kilohertz
8:00 - 8:45pm Tehran time
or on www.radio-international.org

WPI, Office of International Relations, BM Box 8927, London WC1N 3XX, England.

Tel: +44 (0) 07719166731. Fax: +44 (0) 870 1351338. www.wpiran.org/English. www.wpibriefing.com.
wpi.international.office@ukonline.co.uk. wpipr@ukonline.co.uk.