PLRC *Pacific Life Research Center*

631 Kiely Boulevard * Santa Clara, CA 95051 * Phone 408/248-1815 * Fax 408/985-9716 * E-mail bob@plrc.org

PLRC-030528 This paper is current only to 28 May 2003

UNDERSTANDING THE "WAR ON TERRORISM":
PREEMPTIVE FORCE -- A SEQUEL[1]

Compiled by Bob Aldridge

With the major military operations in Iraq declared over, the world is waiting to see what comes next in the Bush administration's drive to form a large US footprint in the Middle East. Occupying Iraq has driven a wedge between the other two countries in the region designated by the White House as sponsors of terrorism -- Syria and Iran. (See Figure-1) The flow of arms and reinforcements from Iran, across Iraq and to Syria in support of the fight against Israel, has been broken. In addition, Syria will no longer earn up to $1 billion annually from selling bootleg oil purchased from Iraq at reduced rates.

FIGURE-1
SYRIA, IRAQ, AND IRAN

Information is now being promulgated that invading Iraq was part of a wider strategy by the Bush administration. We are now hearing about an extremely high priority to halting Iran's nuclear program and serious concern about chemical and biological weapons in Syria. Although the Bush administration advertises a plan of diplomacy with Syria and internal overthrow in Iran, it has never ruled out military action if other methods fail. Besides now being geographically separated, those countries are surrounded by US military bases. (See Appendix-A) Those bases are the "big stick" that give teeth to diplomacy and encouragement to internal rebels, and will be discussed later in this paper.

IRAN -- PART OF BUSH'S "AXIS OF EVIL."

On 31 March 2003, while the invasion of Iraq was still in progress, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security John Bolton, a staunch neo-conservative,[2] emphasized

---

[1]This paper is part of a series on understanding why we are fighting terrorism. There is nothing new in it that hasn't been published elsewhere, and of course the coverage is not comprehensive. The purpose of this paper is to compile some pertinent information together so that a pattern can be seen. BA

[2]Although the term "neo-conservative" may have a more specific meaning, I will use that term in this paper to designate those individuals who advocate that America be strong militarily and use that strength to control US interests throughout the world.

that the Bush administration would give "extremely high priority" to stopping Iran's nuclear weapons program.[3] He joined National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice in saying that the Bush administration viewed regime change in Iraq as an initial response to a series of threats.[4] Adding fuel to the fire, Iran states it will not recognize any government in Iraq that is installed by the US, and it seems to be aiding the Shiite majority in southern Iraq to gain control of government.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM.

In 1995 Iran signed an agreement with Russia to complete the dual 1,300 megawatt pressurized light water nuclear reactors for the Bushehr complex, which is scheduled for completion by 19 March 2004. Under the agreement, Russia is to provide the nuclear fuel for the life of the reactor and the spent fuel rods are to be shipped back to Russia for processing.

The US State Department claims that in August 2002 a local Iranian resistance group reported that Iran was building two underground nuclear processing facilities at Natanz and Arak.[5] Since this revelation, the US claims to have satellite evidence that Iran is attempting to hide and harden those installations by enclosing them in thick walls and building them underground. The US further claims that the Natanz facility will be a gas centrifuge uranium enrichment plant and that Arak will be a heavy water plant to support a reactor for producing weapons-grade plutonium -- and that neither of these facilities are needed for a civilian nuclear program.[6]

A month later, in September 2002, Iran went public about an ambitious nuclear power program that included mining and processing uranium. Although these facilities were not publicly declared until they were discovered, Iran claims they are part of that civilian program. Nevertheless, development of that capability combined with uranium reserves recently discovered in that country, would give Iran a self-contained capability to produce nuclear weapons.

President Mohammed Khatami said in February 2003 that the Natanz plant is one of the new facilities being built to process ore into nuclear powerplant fuel for peaceful purposes. Iran claims to be striving for a self-sufficient nuclear power program which covers the entire fuel cycle from mining uranium to disposal of spent fuel rods. The day after going public regarding its nuclear power program, Iran's nuclear energy chief for the first time announced two other plants associated with the program. One, for early processing of uranium ore, is nearing completion near Isfahan. The other is near Kashan but he gave no indication of its intended use.

The UN's International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said it knew of Iran's plans to mine and process uranium ore for several years. In February 2003, after being stalled and delayed for several months, a team from the IAEA paid a "technical visit" to the Natanz site. The team was also scheduled to visit the Arak site. The team was able to confirm that Iran has joined about 10 other nations in mastering gas centrifuge technology.

---

[3]Cited in Johnson.

[4]Cited in Johnson.

[5]This resistance group called the Mujaheddin-e Khalq, also known as the People's Mujaheddin (holy warriors), is on the US list of terrorist organizations. Their base in Iran, just across the border from Iraq, was bombed during the US invasion of Iraq. However, weapons experts and intelligence officials say past information from this group has been reliable because of their well-placed sources in the Iranian government.

[6]In May 2003 this same resistance group reported two additional previously-undisclosed uranium-enrichment facilities near Karaj, about 25 miles west of Tehran. These are, according to the group, satellite facilities for the main plant at Natanz -- backup in case the Natanz facility is bombed.

The Bush administration expressed concern over Iran's nuclear processing plans. It said that the Iranian opposition group claimed that the IAEA inspection had been delayed so equipment could be moved from the Natanz site in an attempt to deceive the UN inspectors, and that a centrifuge facility was being constructed near the town of Ab-Ali. The US remains adamant that Iran has a nuclear weapons program and is pressuring the IAEA to declare that Iran is violating the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Agency officials, however, say it is too early to declare Iran in violation of the NPT. In early May 2003, IAEA spokeswoman Melissa Fleming said: "We are at the moment in the process of conducting inspections in Iran and of doing analysis at IAEA headquarters, and at this point we are reserving judgment about the nature of Iran's nuclear program."[7]

Iran is a signatory to the original NPT agreement. But the original treaty had a loophole that allowed construction of a pilot nuclear fuel processing plant without declaring it for IAEA inspections until 180 days before nuclear fuel was introduced into the plant. Under those conditions, Iran did not violate the treaty by building the plants secretly. The secrecy does, however, show bad faith -- especially now that all signatories to the NPT, except Iran, have signed a supplemental agreement plugging that loophole.

Although Iran has now committed to signing that loophole-plugging agreement, it still refuses to sign another "advanced safeguards protocol," negotiated by NPT signatories during the mid-1990s, which gives IAEA inspectors more leeway to search for secret weapons programs. Without that leeway, weapons inspectors cannot adequately guarantee that undeclared parallel nuclear programs do not exist.

The Bush administration postulates that Iran will give the required 90-day notice that it is abrogating the NPT when its nuclear program reaches maturation, as North Korea did in 2002. Iran remains adamant that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes. Yet the secrecy, resistance to further transparency, and conflict in declared technical details raises strong suspicions that Iran may be pursuing a nuclear weapons program. If so, it would be especially dangerous combined with Iran's terrorist activities.

IRAN'S TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

The HizbAllah (Party of God) is the name of a Shiite terrorist organization sponsored and controlled by Iran.[8] They started off as regional terrorist groups such as the Lebanese HizbAllah and the Persian Gulf HizbAllah. It was these groups that formed a coalition with the Sunni Islamists (then based in Sudan) to plan the deadly Mogadishu ambush of 5 June 1993 that caused the US to withdraw from Somalia. Osama bin Laden was not yet the main figure amongst Sunni Islamists but he was in the inner planning circle and in charge of logistics for that Somalia operation. In early 1998 bin Laden formed an umbrella organization for all Sunni terrorists -- The World Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders.

This alliance of convenience between Shiite and Sunni Muslims continued until early 1996 when Iran started planning the next phase of the Islamic jihad. From this emerged as the HizbAllah International which formally united all the Iran-sponsored Shiite terrorist organizations with bin Laden's Sunni Islamists. They agreed on a common financial system and on the unification and standardization of training so that terrorist organizations from more than 30 countries could become

---

[7]Cited by Associated Press, 9 May 2003.

[8]HizbAllah means Party of God -- there are many spellings used of which Hezbollah and Hizballah are common.

interoperable. HizbAllah International has been described as "the most profound change in Iranian intelligence since Khomeini's Islamic Revolution," and a "new direction in state-sponsored international terrorism."[9]

Mahdi Chamran, Chief of External Intelligence and a senior official in the Iranian General Command Headquarters, was chosen to lead HizbAllah International. Under him was a Committee of Three responsible for coordination, planning, and attacks. Since the HizbAllah leader, Chamran, was a Shiite, two of the Committee of Three were Sunni. One of these was Osama bin Laden. Although the Sunni had a majority in this committee, Shiite Iran retained overall command. This brief description should give some idea of Iran's role as a state sponsor of international terrorism.[10]

All of this terrorist activity is not being lost on US foreign policy planners. They have not only placed Iran on the list of seven states that sponsor global terrorism, but President Bush has also dubbed that country as one of the tripartite "axis of evil."

OIL RESERVES AND OIL PIPELINES.

Media reports today are replete with information about Iran's nuclear program and Iran's terrorist activities. But what is not being publicly emphasized is Iran's wealth in oil and gas. That, along with the fact that Iran is a blockade to the most efficient and least costly means of exporting oil and gas from the Caspian Basin and Central Asia.

Petroleum and natural gas top Iran's list of natural resources, and oil accounts for 80 percent of the country's export earnings. Iran is OPEC's second largest oil producer. It holds 9 percent of the world's oil reserves and 15 percent of its natural gas reserves.. Proven oil and gas reserves are 89.7 billion barrels and 812 trillion cubic feet, respectively.

An August 1953 coup, planned by the CIA and Britain's M-16,[11] toppled Iran's nationalist government of Musaddig and installed the regime of Shah. During the early 1950s, oil was controlled by the Anglo Iranian Oil Company (AIOC -- later renamed British Petroleum and now conglomerated to become BP-Amoco-Arco). Unrest soon surfaced because America and Britain took such a huge share of the profits and dominated Iranian economics. Mohammed Musaddig became Iran's prime minister in April 1951 and the following month he nationalized the country's oil industry. A dispute followed and a satisfactory agreement could not be reached with AIOC.

Britain started planning a coup and the CIA was brought in during November 1952. Musaddig was overthrown in August of the following year and Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi was installed to head the government. What followed was a brutal dictatorship which kept the country "stable" for the oil companies.

Repression of the Shiite majority in a secular government for a quarter century eventually came to a head with the Islamic Revolution of1979. US and British oil companies were expelled, the Shah was sent into exile, and on 1 April 1979 the Islamic Republic of Iran was proclaimed under the supreme rule of an Ayatollah. Then followed the bloody and indecisive 8-year war with Iraq.[12] By the mid-1990s, despite huge oil export revenues, some 53 percent of the Iranian population still lived in poverty.

---

[9]See Bodansky, page 153.

[10]For a more complete description of HizbAllah International see Bodansky, Chapter 6.

[11]M-16 is Britain's counterpart to the CIA.

[12]Of course, after being expelled from Iran, the US sided with Iraq.

Iran's nuclear program and support for terrorists could very well be an excuse for the Bush administration to start a war that would regain control of Iran's oil. In addition, Iran is the optimal route for a pipeline to market oil from Central Asia and the Caspian Basin.[13] Having control of that country would also open Central Asia to oil exploitation for American companies. Perhaps that is why the US shows little interest in rebuilding Afghanistan. Maybe the main purpose of the Afghanistan war was to gain access to military bases in Central Asia.

REGIME CHANGE IN IRAN.

To understand how the Bush administration might approach the overthrow of a hostile government in Iran it would be instructive to understand a Rand Corp. study completed in 2001, just before the 9-11 attack. Authored by Stephen T. Hosmer, it is entitled "Operations Against Enemy Leaders."[14] (Hereafter referred to in the text of this paper as the "Rand Report.")

The Rand Report addresses three means of removing an enemy leader -- regime change, if you will. They are (1) a direct personal attack (assassination plot) on the leader; (2) inciting an internal coup or rebellion; and (3) taking the leader down by military force. The Report points out that there have been very poor successes with the first two. In the case of Iran, the Bush administration appears to be trying the second but has not ruled out the third.

Direct Attack on The Leader.

This course of action has not been particularly effective in accomplishing a desirable regime change for numerous reasons. It would probably not be a viable approach for Iran because even if the supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei were assassinated, a similar ruler would undoubtedly be appointed by the Expediency Discernment Council. Muslim fundamentalism is too deeply entrenched in the ruling elite to be changed by the assassination of one leader.

Inciting an Internal Coup or Rebellion.

This second course of action against an enemy leadership is also viewed with some skepticism in the Rand Report. Nevertheless, it is sometimes viable. I have mentioned above the local Iranian resistance group that allegedly blew the whistle on Iran's secret nuclear fuel processing plant. In an early May speech before the neo-conservative American Enterprise Institute, Senator Sam Brownback pointed out that 70 percent of the Iranian population is under the age of 35, and that the overwhelming majority are pro-American. He said: "What we are seeing in Iran is truly historic -- the people are resisting the regime through nonviolent means and they are successfully weakening it from the inside."[15] Brownback said he is introducing legislation to back the Iranian dissidents to support American-based private radio and television programs that broadcast directly into Iran. Less than a week later, the US State Department announced that it had added a Persian language translation to its website that "will provide information about the United States to Iranians in their own language."[16]

---

[13]See PLRC-021016 for a full description of the oil and gas interests in Central Asia and the Caspian Basin.

[14]See Hosmer.

[15]Cited in *Washington File*, "Brownback: US Must Support Iranian Dissidents' Quest For Democracy," 6 May 2003.

[16]*Washington File*, "Text: State Department Launches Persian Language Website," 12 May 2003.

President Mohammed Khatami was elected in August 1997 and reelected in June 2001 on a reformist ticket. But the liberal president can only go so far in reforming the theocratic republic because the supreme and spiritual leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has the final say in everything, and to buck his decisions can have fatal consequences. He can even dismiss the president, according to the Iranian Constitution. As liberal opposition leader Ebrahim Yazdi commented after the 1997 election: "Khatami won only the presidential election, that's all. The extreme right lost the election but they control all the powers: parliament, radio and television, the security forces, the supreme leader's institutions, the Friday prayers preachers."[17]

That comment came before the February 2000 parliamentary election which was another stunning victory for reformists when they captured a majority of the 290-seat legislative body. Nevertheless, even when the parliament disagrees with the Ayatollah's Guidance Council, his Expediency Discernment Council arbitrates the conflict and the result is always in favor of the Ayatollah -- the supreme leader.

In the power struggle with a reform-minded president, the Ayatollah controls the armed forces, the judiciary, the intelligence ministry, and the Iranian counterpart of "big business." President Khatami has on his side the parliament and support from the masses -- particularly the young voters who do not remember the Islamic Revolution of 1979 and are fed up with rising prices and high unemployment. The polls favor better relations with the United States.

Ayatollah Khamenei, though not a charismatic person, is politically wise enough to see trouble brewing. He may see that it is in the interest of fundamentalist Islam to allow some reforms rather than face total rebellion. The opening shots in this "controlled reform" may have come from former Iranian president, Hashemi Rafsanjani, who now heads the powerful Expediency Discernment Council. Those shots may have also been strongly influenced by watching the US take over neighboring Iraq, by the US hard line against North Korea's nuclear weapons program, and by fearing that Iran may be the next target on Bush's "axis of evil" list. On 29 March 2003, Rafsanjani told the Expediency Council that relations with the US should be resolved either by a referendum or by the Council. Whichever path may be taken, if taken at all, the final decision will lie with the Ayatollah.

That is the scenario the Bush administration faces in supporting rebellion in Iran. The Rand Report lists four consequences US decisionmakers should anticipate when providing military or other support for a rebellion:

- US assistance should be enough to make sure a rebellion is successful.
- US should be assured that the successor government will favor US interests.
- Even if the hostile regime is not overthrown, the threat of rebellion with US backing should cause that government to adopt policies more in line with US interests.
- If a direct attack by the US is eventually needed, the hostile government's defense against the rebellion should have already used up much of that government's resources and munitions.

However, the Rand Report warns that, although supporting a coup or rebellion has been successful against a few weak governments, most attempts to oust entrenched leaders in this manner have failed. The Rand Report states that when an attempted coup or rebellion fails, the United States must be willing to escalate. That leads to the third course of action.

---

[17]CNN.com, 2001.

Taking Down Regimes With External Military Force.

The Rand Report used Operation Just Force against Panamanian President Manuel Noriega as an example of this course of action when supporting a coup or rebellion fails. After being indicted by two federal grand juries in the US, Noriega's Panama Defense Force seized control of government. The US then became determined to remove him from power. The next year Noriega stole the Panamanian election and the US began active efforts to promote a coup. A feeble attempt was made on 3 October 1989 and failed. This led to direct military action to forcibly remove Noriega from power.

Iran has similarities. There is an Iranian resistance movement which the US is apparently trying to support, just in case it might be successful. But the military option has never been off the table. As a matter of fact, the media campaign to prepare the American people and the world for an invasion of Iran has already begun, and it is intensifying. Information about Iran's stepped-up nuclear program became known to the US in August 2002. But it didn't get any real media coverage until about March or April 2003. Now there are more allegations against Iran which have striking familiarities to the official rhetoric preceding the invasion of Iraq.

In May 2003, two different stories hit the news. On May 14th, two days after the string of terrorist bombings in Saudi Arabia, which were blamed on Al Qaida, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice said: "We are concerned about Al Qaida operating in Iran."[18] Rice did not connect Iran with the Saudi bombings, and official statements carefully point out that there is no hard evidence that Al Qaida fugitives in Iran were involved with the bombings, but the disclaimer itself tends to implicate Iranian complicity. US spokespersons have also expressed belief that Al Qaida is responsible for the subsequent bombings in Morocco.

On 15 May 2003 the *Washington Post* reported that the Mujaheddin-e Khalq, the same Iranian resistance group that reported Iran's nuclear program, stated that informants inside the government say Iran has stepped up its biological weapons program on pathogens including anthrax, aflatoxin, typhus, smallpox, plague, and cholera. This program was initiated secretly in 2001. In 2003 the CIA had reported that Iran *probably* has a biological weapons program and *likely* "has capabilities to produce small quantities" of biological agents.[19] Now Alireza Jafarzadeh, spokesperson for the Mujaheddin, says: "We can say with certainty that the Iranian regime now has the capability of mass production of biological material for weapons use.[20, 21]

Talks between the US and Iran, sponsored by the UN, were stepped up after biological weapons were reported. The Bush administration is making three demands: (1) an end to Iran's suspected weapons of mass destruction programs, (2) a promise that Iran won't export its Islamic revolution to Iraq, and (3) an end to Iranian support for groups listed by the US State Department as terrorist organizations.

Does this give us a feeling of deja vu? Is this the first stage of a military takedown of Iran? The Rand Report points out that "Takedowns may also be required to insure a fundamental and

---

[18]Cited in Walcott.

[19]Cited in Warrick.

[20]Cited in Warrick.

[21]Jafarzadeh also reported that Iran's biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons program have progressed rapidly under President Khatami, who has been credited as a moderate and a reformer.

lasting change in a nation's policy."[22] According to the Rand Report, the potential of a military takedown can have a deterrent or coercive effect. As an example, it was the threat of a march on Baghdad that deterred Saddam from using chemical or biological weapons during the 1991 Gulf war. On 9 January 1991, then Secretary of State Baker told Iraq's foreign minister, Tariq Aziz that "this is not a threat, it is a promise. If there is any use of weapons like that, our objective won't just be the liberation of Kuwait, but the elimination of the current Iraq regime..."[23]

Under the present circumstances, the US may first employ the threat of invasion to force Iran to comply with its three demands, providing those demands are all that is sought. The Rand Report explains: "The prospect of an invasion and occupation by an external military power, however, may appear to these leaders to be a more serious and credible threat [than assassinations or coups] -- so long as they believe that the external power possesses the military capability, political will, and freedom of action to take down their regime."[24] The US has already demonstrated that capability, will, and freedom of action.

If however, the US goal is more than the three demands put forth in talks with Iran, if it is in fact the neo-conservative plan to insert a dominant US presence in the region, then an actual takeover of Iran must be in the planning. All of the prerequisites -- Iran does not yet have weapons of mass destruction to inflict massive US casualties, adequate and proximate bases are available, there doesn't seem to be a concern about long-term political and economic costs, adequate air lift capabilities, etc. -- all of these prerequisites are in place. All that is needed is a triggering event such as greater terrorist activity, exporting Islamic revolution to Iraq, or the like.

The triggering mechanism may have already begun. In April 2003, Bush repeated his past vows to confront "any outlaw regime that has ties to terrorist groups and seeks to posses weapons of mass destruction."[25] Shortly thereafter, senior Bush administration officials started the rhetoric with such statements as the US having "rock-hard intelligence" that at least a dozen Al Qaida members have been "directing some operations from Iran," while at the same time citing security reasons for not supplying the proof.[26] Deja vu.

The situation worsened after the May 12th suicide bombings in Saudi Arabia which killed 34 people. US intelligence suggests that Al Qaida cells inside Iran planned and coordinated the attack. The Bush adminstration cut off all contact with Iran.[27] The Pentagon is pushing for overt (such as anti-government broadcasts to Iranians) and covert (such as supporting the Mujaheddin-e Khalq

---

[22]Hosmer, page 118.

[23]See Hosmer, pages 119-120. Advocates of nuclear weapons as a deterrent have often pointed to the threat of their use as the reason Saddam did not use chemical and biological weapons during that war. This Rand study indicates that claim is not true. It was the threat of invasion by and overwhelming conventional force that supplied that deterrent function.

[24]Hosmer, page 119.

[25]Cited in Jehl and Schmitt.

[26]Cited in Jehl and Schmitt.

[27]Diplomatic ties were severed between the US and Iran after the 1979 Islamic revolution. However, since the Taliban was ousted from Afghanistan, top US and Iranian officials have met occasionally in Geneva to discuss various issues. These meetings have now been canceled.

subversives) actions to bring down the Iranian regime. The US State Department and Britain oppose the latter because it would undermine the moderates supporting the reformist Iranian president. Instead, they want a plan of diplomatic engagement which includes both the US and Europe. One of the proverbial "unidentified" senior official engaged in the debate said: "The military option is never off the table."[28] Another suggested an invasion while still other officials advocated bombing Iran's nuclear facilities.[29]

Relations are tense with Iran. With the replay of rhetoric and accusations that preceded the invasion of Iraq, the situation does not look promising. Hopefully, America's president will heed the words of Flynt Leverett, his former Middle East specialist on the National Security Council. Leverett says that policy based on regime change in Iran is based on false assumptions: "It's built on the belief that Iran is a house of cards waiting to be pushed over and if the US is smart enough, it could push the cards over, and I think that is not a very prudent way to proceed."[30]

WHAT ABOUT SYRIA?

Although not ranking as part of Bush's "axis of evil," Syria is high on the White House list of states that sponsor terrorism. It is true that Syrian President Bashar al-Assad has cooperated with the US as far as informing about Al Qaida, but he still supports terrorist organizations operating with the Palestinians and in Lebanon.[31] Assad claims these organizations are legitimate military forces engaged in a war against Israel. In addition, Syria essentially occupies Lebanon. Because of its support for terrorists, and its occupation of Lebanon, Syria is a key player in bringing an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In late March 2003, the Bush administration stepped up its drum beat against Syria when Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld accused Damascus of supplying night vision goggles and other military supplies to Iraq. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz charged on April 10th that "the Syrians have been shipping killers into Iraq to try to kill Americans ... We need to think about what our policy is toward a country that harbors terrorists or harbors war criminals."[32] US officials have also voiced concern about Syria having weapons of mass destruction -- those of its own and those which were allegedly moved into Syria from Iraq.

The Bush administration has given Syria an ultimatum. It wants Syria to (1) help in rounding up Saddam loyalists who it claims have fled across the border into Syria; (2) eliminate weapons of mass destruction, both its own and those which may have been moved in from Iraq; and (3) stop supporting Palestinian and Lebanese groups that the US classifies as terrorist organizations.

---

[28]Cited in Strobel.

[29]Strobel.

[30]Cited in Borger and De Luce.

[31]The Bush administration accuses Syrian of supporting nine Palestinian terrorist organization, which includes Hamas; the Islamic Resistance Movement; the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, General Command; and the Palestinian Islamic jihad. Syria also supports the HizbAllah operating in southern Lebanon on the Israeli border.

[32]Cited in Vulliamy.

SYRIA AS A SAFE HAVEN FOR SADDAM LOYALISTS.

There is considerable support for Syria from its neighbors. While stating they will not condone a long-term US occupation of Iraq, the foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Iran signed a joint resolution expressing "disagreement" with US "allegations" against Syria that it is harboring former Baath party members of Saddam's Iraqi regime, as well as disagreement with accusations that Syria is harboring terrorist groups and has weapons of mass destruction. Saudi Foreign Minister Saud al-Faisal declared: "We reject utterly any accusations and threats against Syria because this will lead to a vicious circle of wars." He added: "Our region has suffered more than its share of wars and turmoils over decades that have exhausted its resources and delayed its development. It cost a lot in material and human resources. We should try to make the war in Iraq the last of these turbulances."[33] Foreign ministers from Bahrain, Syria, Kuwait, Egypt, and Jordan also signed this resolution.

Such regional support apparently has no effect on the Bush administration. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld told reporters that "we have intelligence that indicates that some Iraqi people have been allowed into Syria, in some cases to stay, in some cases to transit."[34]

During his meeting with President Assad in Damascus during early May 2003, US Secretary of State Colin Powell brought up the issue of Syria harboring former Iraqi officials. Earlier, on 15 April 2003, Powell accused Syria of opening its borders to fleeing officials of Saddam's toppled government. He said: "We don't believe Syria should find it in their interest to give refuge, to give haven to these sorts of individuals who should be returned to Iraq to face the justice that will be meted out by the Iraqi people."[35]

SYRIA AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

In late March 2003, Undersecretary of State John Bolton pointed out that Syria is a state to be concerned about because of its biological and chemical weapons programs.

The CIA has been reporting since 2001 that Syria has "a stockpile of the nerve agent sarin, but apparently is trying to develop more toxic and persistent nerve agents."[36] The CIA also reported that Syria "remained dependent on foreign sources for key elements of its CW (chemical warfare) program." And the Agency believes it is "highly probable that Syria also is continuing to develop an offensive BW (biological warfare) capability." In addition, according to the CIA report, Syria has continued since the early 1990s to assemble, "probably with North Korean assistance," Scud-C missiles purchased from that government.[37]

Defense Secretary Rumsfeld adds that US intelligence officials "have seen the chemical weapons tests in Syria over the past 12 to 15 months."[38]

---

[33]Cited in Murphy.

[34]Cited in Hutcheson.

[35]Cited in Johnson and Montgomery.

[36]The most recent CIA report on Syria's weapons of mass destruction program, covering the first half of 2002, was presented to Congress that same year. In early 2003, when the anti-Syrian rhetoric began, it was released to the public.

[37]Quotations in this paragraph cited in Hulse.

[38]Cited in Hutcheson.

The joint statement signed by eight Middle East foreign ministers, mentioned above, also endorsed the resolution presented by Syria to the UN Security Council that will make the Middles East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction. According to *Los Angeles Times* correspondent Kim Murphy, this is "an implicit call for Israel to give up its nuclear weapons if Arab states are called upon to disarm."[39]

SYRIA, TERRORISM, AND LEBANON.

The US is also concerned about Syria's support for Palestinian terrorist, the HizbAllah terrorists in southern Lebanon, and Syria's occupation of Lebanon. During his early May 2003 meeting with President Assad, Secretary Powell made US demands crystal clear. On his way to that meeting Powell told reporters the United States would be looking for "specific action and performance" from Syria.[40]

Syrian Support For Terrorism.

Syria's dictatorial Baath Party has always dealt harshly with Islamic extremists from its own Sunni Muslim majority. Nevertheless, since Syria still does not recognize the existence of Israel, it refuses to class as terrorist those organizations fighting against the presence of Israel, insisting that the violent activities of these groups constitute legitimate resistance. Since Powell's meeting with Assad, and Powell's demands regarding shutting down terrorism, Syria has presented some appearance of cooperation.

Syrian officials claim they are taking action against some militant groups. On 3 May 2003 Assad said there had been "some closures."[41] Following that, the US State Department announced that Syria had shut down the offices of three terrorist groups -- Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine - General Command, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.[42] But the next day militant Islamic groups denied that Syria had cracked down on them. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine broadcast over their Al-Quds radio station that "We are still working, as you can hear. Nothing new."[43] The Syrian government at first refused to comment but the US State Department later announced that Syrian officials claim the groups' offices are media outlets and none of them have been completely closed.[44]

Powell told ABCs "This Week" show on 4 May 2003 that the US will "be watching"to see whether or not Syria carries out its promises to shut down terrorist offices operating in its country and restrict the activities of terrorists in other ways. "I pointed out to President Bashar Assad that performance is important. Some in Congress are calling for a Syria Accountability Act. And, of course, the Patriot Act also provides some sanctions against countries that do not support our efforts

---

[39]Murphy.

[40]Cited in *Washington File*, "Powell Looks To Syria To Play 'helpful role' in Mideast," 2 May 2003.

[41]Cited in Wakin, 5 May 2003.

[42]Wakin, 4 May 2003.

[43]Cited in Wakin, 5 May 2003.

[44]*Washington File*, "Powell Says Lebanon Could Be Regional Model For Democracy, Free Trade," 6 May 2003.

with respect to freezing terrorist assets and finances. And President Bashar Assad and I talked about the kind of actions that might be forthcoming if he does not make new choices compared to the choices Syria has made in the past."[45]

Meanwhile, in early April 2003 Italian police arrested seven alleged Al Qaida operatives. *Toronto Star* journalist Linda Diebel relays a *Los Angeles Times* report that "Italian court documents indicate Syria has functioned as a hub for an Al Qaida network that moved Islamic extremists and funds from Italy to northeastern Iraq, where the recruits fought alongside the recently defeated Ansar al-Islam terrorist group..." The route from Italy to the Kurdish area of northern Iraq went through Syria. Diebel adds that "Italian investigators say they have no evidence the Syrian government was aware of the network or protected it ... Still, the activity raises questions because the Syrian government has aggressive security services that would likely be aware of extremists operating in their territory."[46]

Syria's Occupation Of Lebanon.

Syria has essentially occupied and controlled Lebanon since 1990. According to Abdulwahab Badrakhan, deputy news editor of *Al-Hayat*, a leading pan-Arab newspaper in London, the "presence of Syrian forces in Lebanon is under an Arab League mandate and is today in line with a treaty between Beirut [Lebanon] and Damascus [Syria], and thus the Syrian forces in Lebanon have a legal status."[47] That is also the official line from Syria.

Nevertheless, US Secretary Powell said in Lebanon on 3 May 2003 that "there is a new strategic situation" in the region, and that the United States is committed to a comprehensive peace in the Middle East that would include the interests of Lebanon and Syria. Alluding to Syria's occupation of Lebanon Powell added: "The United States supports an independent and prosperous Lebanon, free of all -- all -- foreign forces. Lebanon has great potential. It could be a model for democracy and free trade in the region."[48]

Powell also said in an interview with ABC that he had "a good conversation" with Syrian President Assad about the Middle East peace process. "I made it clear to him that we are committed to moving forward on this roadmap [for Middle East peace], and we are looking for a comprehensive settlement of all issues in the region -- not just between the Israelis and Palestinians -- but, ultimately, a solution that would include Syrian interest and Lebanese interest as well. And if he wants to see us move in that direction, then we are looking for a new attitude on the part of Syria, we are looking for changed behavior."[49]

WILL SYRIA AVOID REGIME CHANGE?

Syria has been given many veiled -- and sometimes not so veiled -- warnings by the US. On 14 April 2003 the White House called Syria a "rogue nation" and a "terrorist state." In a press

---

[45]*Cited in Washington File*, "Powell: US Watching Syria's Anti-Terrorist Actions," 4 May 2003.

[46]Diebel.

[47]Cited in Kahwaji.

[48]Cited in *Washington File*, "Powell Says Lebanon Could Be Regional Model For Democracy, Free Trade," 6 May 2003.

[49]Cited in *Washington File*, "Powell: US Watching Syria's Anti-Terrorist Actions," 4 May 2003.

briefing that same day, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer warned that "Syria needs to cooperate." In response to questions about whether the United States is now focused on Syria as the next stage in the war on terror, Fleischer responded with his own question: "Do you think the White House and President Bush should look the other way at the fact that Syria is taking in Iraqi leaders? Do you think we should just ignore it?"[50] The transcript of that press interview with Fleischer's blatantly outspoken remark was published on *Washington File*, the State Department's International Information Programs website, on 14 April 2003. The next day I could not find that transcript on the State Department's website.

Another warning of significance occurred on 11 May 2003. During his recent trip to the Middle East, Secretary Powell said on Israeli television that Syrian President Assad should have "every incentive to respond" to issues they had discussed a week earlier. "What I said to (Assad) very clearly," said Powell, "is that there are things we believe he should do if he wants a better relationship with the United States, if he wants to play a helpful role in solving the crisis in the region. So if President Assad chooses not to respond, if he chooses to dissemble, if he chooses to find excuses, then he will find that he is on the wrong side of history."[51]

Earlier, in May 2003, an Egyptian reporter asked Powell "who's next?" in the region, and whether the "US has a plan to spread a set of values at gunpoint." Powell responded: "There is no list. There is no plan ***right now*** ... to go attack someone else, either for the purpose of overthrowing their leadership or for the purpose of democratic values."[52] I have added emphasis to the "right now" to illustrate how tentative that assurance can be. In addition, the a plan may exist for other purposes, such as to destroy weapons of mass destruction or to end support for terrorists -- or to gain access to oil.

Regarding the US-backed roadmap for Middle East peace, Assad said on 10 May 2003 that reining in Palestinian militant groups was dependent on getting back the Golan Heights which Israel captured in 1967. He said he was prepared to negotiate on that and that Syria wants dialogue, not ultimatums from the US. Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon replied that he was willing to negotiate but made no promises.

If Syria does not voluntarily meet US demands, and become a government controlled by the US, a military takedown of the Assad regime seems inevitable. According the neo-conservative plan for dominating strategic areas of the world, which the Bush administration seems to be following to the letter, an invasion of Syria would be required.

US MILITARY BASES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND CENTRAL ASIA

Looking at the big picture -- the military bases in the Middle East that were in place before attacking Iraq, the bases in Central Asia established in conjunction with the war on Afghanistan, and the new bases in Iraq -- the United States has a huge military presence in the region. (See Appendix-A) All of them come under the control of the US Central Command (CENTCOM), which is commanded by General Tommy R. Franks. His headquarters is at Camp As-Sayliyah in Qatar. I will come back to that later.

---

[50]All quotations in this paragraph are cited in *Washington File*, "White House Warns 'Syria Needs To Cooperate'," 14 April 2003.

[51]Cited in Reuters, 11 May 2003.

[52]Cited in Diebel. Also cited in Johnson and Montgomery.

The current Pentagon strategy is to have "long-term access" to bases, as opposed to a "permanent military presence." In that way, forces can be shifted among numerous accessible points to meet various "threats," rather than have a full compliment of troops at a few permanent locations. This is in accordance with the neo-conservative plan for a smaller, lighter military that can be rapidly deployed to areas they are needed.[53] Along with this long-term access to actual bases, is the critical issue of having the right to fly over certain countries along with being able to stop temporarily to refuel. Without flyover and refueling rights, the US military force cannot be efficiently realigned and re-deployed to meet the various circumstances. With that short introductory comment, let me now describe the various military bases from which US and/or "coalition" military personnel plan to operate in the Middle East and Central Asia.

TURKEY, ROMANIA, AND BULGARIA.

Turkey is a long-time NATO ally with a secular government but it is also a Muslim nation. Since the 1991 Gulf war, US and British aircraft have been flying patrol missions over Iraq from the Incirlic Air Base in Turkey. These sorties were in support of the Northern Watch program -- to protect the Kurdish population from Saddam Hussein by enforcing the northern no-fly zone for Iraqi aircraft[54].

As the Bush administration was preparing for the invasion of Iraq, they assumed that Turkey would be supportive and allow bases for aircraft and troops to invade Iraq from the north. Five bases were planned for deployment sites and air support. But the Muslim population in Turkey put up stiff resistance to using their country to invade another Muslim country. The resistance was so strong that the Turkish government had to refuse access to the US-British coalition. Turkey did grant flyover rights, however.

Although the failure to use Turkish bases was considered the biggest disappointment of the war called Operation Iraqi Freedom, flyover rights were still extremely important[55]. In accordance with the realignment of US forces in the Eurasian region, troops and aircraft have been moved from Germany, where a huge US presence has been maintained since 1945, to other bases farther east. The new NATO countries are anxious to show their support. Poland and Hungary are new hosts for much of the military force. But two of the seven countries currently aspiring to NATO membership -- Romania and Bulgaria, on the western rim of the Black Sea -- became important for operations in the Middle East, especially since Turkey wouldn't allow troop deployment from within its borders. Romania gave the US access to an air base near Constanta and Bulgaria granted use of Burgas Airport. From these locations "coalition" aircraft could then fly over Turkey to reach Iraq. On 8 May 2003 the US Senate voted unanimously to ratify the addition of Romania and Bulgaria, along with the other five aspirants, as new NATO members.

---

[53]For a full description of the neo-conservative plan, and the Bush administration's national security strategy, see PLRC-030503.

[54]The northern no-fly zone for Iraqi aircraft is the area of Iraq north of the 36th parallel of latitude.

[55]In the post war Middle East, Turkey has a fading military influence. Not only have aircraft and personnel been removed from the Incirlik air base but Turkish troops have not been given a role in the northern Iraq stabilization force. The US feels it has to punish Turkey for not supporting the US war on Iraq. See Enginsoy and Bekdil.

PERSIAN GULF.

CENTCOM has moved from its headquarters in Florida to a portable headquarters and command center on Qatar, along the Persian Gulf.[56] As mentioned above, CENTCOM is commanded by General Tommy Franks. Under him are Vice Admiral Timothy Keating, Navy commander; Lt. Gen. Earl B. Hailston, Marine commandant; Lt. Gen. David D. McKiernan, Army commander; and Lt. Gen. T. Michael Moseley, Air Force commander.

Qatar.

Qatar and the United States signed bilateral defense cooperation agreements in 1992 and 1996. Those agreements provide bases for the US in return for US security assurance for Qatar in case of attack.

The 262-acre Army base known as Camp As-Sayliyah is the location of General Franks' headquarters and CENTCOM's portable command center. The portable units consist of about 20 large shipping containers and large tents. The containers unfold to about three times their transportable size and are equipped with air conditioners, computers, and the other requirements of a state-of-the-art command center. It is from this location that a war on Iraq has been directed.

Also on Qatar is the Al-Udeid Air Base which has now become Air Force Lt. Gen. Moseley's headquarters. This regional Air Force command center was recently moved from Prince Sultan Air Base in Saudi Arabia.[57] It should be noted that although Al-Udeid is about the same distance from Syria as Prince Sultan, It is much closer to Iran. Although the main publicly-announced reason for the move is Muslim unease with having a foreign military presence in the nation where Islam was born, this re-positioning certainly had a lot to do with planned operations in the future.

There is also a base for pre-positioned army equipment at the Doha airport, dubbed Camp Snoopy. The equipment was moved to Kuwait to support the war against Iraq, but it can certainly be assumed that Camp Snoopy has been re-stocked for future operations.

Kuwait .

Kuwait is the sponsor of four US military bases and is also the headquarters for Lt. Gen. David D. McKiernan, the top Army commander. The four bases are Camp Doha, Camp Arifjan, Ali al-Salem Air Base, and Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base.

Bahrain.

Bahrain is the headquarters for the Navy's 5th Fleet, located at Manama. Here are the command centers of Vice Admiral Timothy Keating and Lt. Gen. Earl B. Hailston, CENTCOM's top Navy and Marine Corps leaders, respectively.

Also on Bahrain is the Sheik Isa Air Base.

---

[56]CENTCOM controls US military activities in Central Asia, the Middle East, and Northeast Africa. Since its inception and until late 2002 it has been housed MacDill Air Force Base in Florida. The Persian Gulf war and the attack on Afghanistan were commanded from that location. A portable forward command post was developed and in late 2002 CENTCOM headquarters was moved to Qatar.

[57]The 96,000-acre Al Udeid Air Base has hardened aircraft shelters for aircraft and the longest runway in the Middle East. Built and operated by the Qatari government, it was the largest base supporting air refueling during the war on Afghanistan. It is one of four major air bases that participated in the recent war against Iraq.

Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia's Prince Sultan Air Base near Riyadh formerly housed the Air Force operations control center for air operations in patrolling the southern no-fly zone in Iraq to protect the Shiite polulation and the Marsh Arabs.[58] But this main Air Force command center has now moved to Qatar (see above). The Prince Sultan base is still available and now has a small sustaining staff of American soldiers, mainly to train members of the Saudi military. The move of Air Force headquarters from Saudi Arabia to Qatar exemplifies the new military strategy of rapid re-deployment to accessible bases.

It is unclear if another base in Saudi Arabia -- the Eskan Village Air Base -- is still kept available for US use.

UAE.

The United Arab Emirates sponsors three US military bases: the Al-Dhafra Air Base, the Jebel Ali Naval Base, and US Air Force use of the Fujairah International Airport.

Oman.

Oman allows the use of three bases by the US military: the Masirah Air Base, the Thumrait Naval Air Base for anti-submarine patrol planes, and US Air Force use of Seeb International Airport.

Iraq.

Iraq is now under US control and, in what *The Guardian* describes as "the latest episode in an extraordinary surge in America's projection of military muscle since September 11," will provide access to four bases.[59] *The New York Times* announced on 20 April 2003 that the US was planning "a long term military relationship" that would "grant the Pentagon access to military bases and project American influence into the heart of the unsettled region ..."[60]

The very next day Defense Secretary Rumsfeld tried to deny any implication of US imperialistic ambitions by switching adjectives. Calling *The New York Times* article "inaccurate and unfortunate," he dismissed any suggestion that the US seeks a *permanent* military presence in Iraq.[61] Rumsfeld stated: "I have never heard the subject of a permanent military base in Iraq discussed."[62] *The New York Times* article mentioned nothing about *permanent* bases. It referred to a "long-term military relationship" that would provide "access" to those bases -- an arrangement compatible with use of rapidly-deployed special forces for rapid conquest.

The four bases in Iraq to which the US plans access are (1) the Baghdad International Airport, (2) an airport at Tallil near Nasiriya in the south, (3) the Bashur airfield in the northern Kurdish area, and (4) a small airstrip in the western desert called H-1. The Baghdad International Airport is an Army base, Tallil and Bashur are Air Force bases, and the H-1 airstrip was a foothold for special forces which had been hiding in Jordan..

---

[58]The southern no-fly zone for Iraqi aircraft is the area of Iraq south of the 33rd parallel of latitude.

[59]Traynor.

[60]Shanker and Schmitt.

[61]Cited in Porth.

[62]Cited in Porth.

The Bashur airfield removes dependence on the Incirlik air base in Turkey. Most of the 50 aircraft and 1,400 US personnel at Incirlik have already departed.[63]

Djibouti.

Djibouti is actually part of the Horn of Africa but because of its proximity to the Middle East I will include it here. The US Central Command has set up the Combined Joint Task Force - Horn of Africa as a regional command under Marine Major General John F. Sattler. Some 900 personnel -- special operations troops, Marine expeditionary unit, airmen, and some civilians -- are based at Camp Lemonier in the tiny nation of Djibouti. Another 400 personnel --military, civilian, and coalition force representatives -- are aboard the assault ship *USS Mount Whitney* operating in the Gulf of Aden. (See Figure-2) This is also a command and control ship and is Major General Sattler's headquarters.

CENTRAL ASIA.

Some dozen military bases in Central Asia have been made available to US forces since the war against Afghanistan. (See Appendix-A) General Tommy Franks, commander-in-chief of CENTCOM, expressed it succinctly when he said there has been "a maturing of the military-to-military relationships" between the United States and countries in Central Asia.[64]

Georgia..

The Vaziani base[65] in Georgia will be the home for 150 special operations forces instructors for a current mandate of two years (from May 2002). This is under the Train and Equip program sponsored by the US for Georgian troops.

Turkmenistan.

Turkmenistan has given permission for flyover and refueling of US military planes. These rights are important in allowing US aircraft based in Uzbekistan to reach Iran with munitions and special forces troops.

Uzbekistan.

In Uzbekistan, some 1,500-1,800 US special forces troops can be stationed at a former Soviet base in Khanabad.

Kazakhstan.

US military activities in Kazakhstan are closely guarded in secrecy. It is publicly known that Kazak government allows military overflights, refueling, and landing rights in emergencies. Some sources say that Kazakhstan has also offered use of its bases.[66]

---

[63]There still remains another 1,400 soldiers in Turkey assigned to a NATO mission, who will remain in place for now.

[64]Cited in Washington File, "Franks Thanks Uzbekistan For Anti-Terror Efforts, Saving 'Many Lives'," 23 August 2002.

[65]Vaziani was formerly a Russian base. It was vacated in July 2001.

[66]Brown.

Kryrgystan.

The base at Manas Airport near Bishkek in Kryrgystan will eventually accommodate 3,000 troops and an unspecified number of aircraft.

Tajikistan.

It has been reported that Tajikistan allows US and British overflights and refueling, and that it allows military basing at its international airport.[67]

Afghanistan.

In Afghanistan, aircraft and some 8,000 US troops can be stationed at the Bagram Airfield near Kabul, and at the Kandahar Airfield.

Pakistan.

US troops can use three Pakistani air bases: Jacobobad, Dalbandin, and Pansi.

NAVAL FORCES AND LONG-RANGE BOMBERS.

At the height of the Iraq war there were five aircraft carrier groups stationed in the Mediterranean Sea, Persian Gulf, Gulf of Oman, and the Arabian Sea. (See Figure-2) Submarines and surface warships capable of launching Tomahawk cruise missiles also patrol these waters. Cargo ships carrying combat equipment are also pre-positioned in the area. The Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean is likewise important as a forward base.

Diego Garcia.

The island of Diego Garcia in the middle of the Indian Ocean has a large airstrip which accommodates the B-52 bombers stationed there. These bombers, in addition to carrying gravity bombs and smart munitions, can also launch tomahawk cruise missiles. Diego Garcia is also a pre-positioning point for large quantities of Army and Marine equipment.

FIGURE-2
WATERS SURROUNDING THE MIDDLE EAST
Source: National Geographic Society (1988)
Note: The two Yemen's shown have now united.

United States.

During the war on Iraq, and in previous Balkan wars, B-2 stealth bombers have made round-trip sorties from their Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri. B-2s presently can carry 16 precision bombs. But a new bomb rack is being designed which will allow B-2s to carry up to 80 smart bombs that can be precisely guided to as many targets with the GPS navigation system. It is a long flight from the United States but the Air Force apparently is not reluctant to fly it.

---

[67]Brown.

Mediterranean Sea.

Aircraft carriers, warships, and submarines reached northern Iraq with aircraft and Tomahawk missiles from the Mediterranean sea. Syria is even closer.

Persian Gulf, Gulf of Oman, Arabian Sea.

From these waters the aircraft and missiles from carriers, surface warships and submarines could reach much of Iraq. They will also be able to reach much of Iran. Landing ships carrying Marine amphibious ready groups and cargo ships carrying warfare equipment are also found in these waters.

CONCLUSION

Besides Iraq, Iran, and Syria there are four more countries on the Bush administration's list of states that sponsor terrorism. Libya is accused of having a chemical and biological weapons program. Sudan entered the news again lately as another place where terrorists may be planning and carrying out attacks. The rhetoric has been stepping up against Cuba. North Korea, besides being on the list of states that sponsor terrorism, is also one of Bush's tripartite "Axis of Evil" because it allegedly furnishes weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems to terrorist states. It has also been very defiant recently about its nuclear program.

On 21 May 2003, President Bush told the Coast Guard Academy graduates that "America will not relent in the war against terrorist." He asserted:

> We will hunt the terrorists in every dark corner of the earth. We will deny the terrorists the sanctuary and bases they need to plan and strike, as we have done in Afghanistan. We will not permit terrorist organizations or states to blackmail the world with weapons of mass destruction, as we have shown in the battle of Iraq.
>
> Our country has been attacked by treachery in our own cities -- and that treachery continues in places like Riyadh and Casablanca. We have seen the ruthless intentions of our enemies. And they have seen our intentions: we will press on until this danger to our country and to the world is ended.[68]

Bush offers no solution to terrorist activity other than to stomp them out with military might. He has not learned from Vietnam or Somalia. He still seems to believe that a superpower can subjugate an entire race of people and keep them in line. He has shown no willingness to sincerely seek a path on which everyone can live a fulfilling life. With this lack of vision and abuse of power we can expect more preemptive force in the quest for Pax Americana. That appears to be the plan of the current US administration, and it claims this is all in the name of democracy. Terrorism and fear of terrorism will continue unabated unless, of course, democracy becomes more evident here in the United States -- unless the citizens in our own country learn to live the principles on which this nation was founded.

# # # # #

[68] *Washington File*, "Bush: US Will Not Relent In War Against Terrorism," 21 May 2003.

REFERENCES

Albright, David and Hinderstein, Corey; "Furor Over Fuel," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, May/June 2003.

Allen, Mike; "Senate Backs Ex-Communist Nations' Entry Into NATO," *Washington Post*, 9 May 2003.

Associated Press, "US Moves On Iran," 9 May 2003. Available at http://informationclearinghouse.info/article3289.htm

Bodansky, Yossef; *Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War On America* (Roseville, CA; Prima Publishing, a division of Random House; 1999,2001).

Brown, Drew; "War's Effect On Rights In Central Asia Questioned," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 28 June 2002.

Borger, Julian and De Luce, Dan; "Pentagon Sets Sights On A New Tehran Regime," *The Guardian* (London), 24 May 2003.

CNN.com; "Ali Khamenei: The Hard-Liner," Revolutionary Journal, 2001. Available at http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/revolutionaryjourney/profiles/khamenei.profile.html

Dareini, Ali Akbar; "Iran Hard-Liner Seeks Vote On Restored US Ties," Associated Press dispatch published in San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 13 April 2003.

Diebel, Linda; "US Shuts Off 'Illegal' Oil Supply To Syria," *Toronto Star* (Canada), 16 April 2003.

Enginsoy, Umit and Bekdil, Burak Ege; "Turkey's Military Role Fading In Postwar Mideast," *Defense News*, 19 May 2003.

Gordon, Michael R. and Schmitt, Eric; "Military Center Moving To Qatar," *The New York Times* article published in the San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 28 April 2003.

Hosmer, Phillip T.; "Operations Against Enemy Leaders," a Rand Corp. report, 2001. This entire report may be downloaded for free at http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1385

Hulse, Carl; "Time To Get Tough With Syria," *The New York Times* article published in the San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 18 April 2003.

Hutcheson, Ron; "US Officials Turn Up Heat On Syria," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 15 April 2003.

Jehl, Douglas and Schmitt, Eric; "US Suggests A Qaida Cell In Iran Directed Saudi Bombings," *The New York Times*, 21 May 2003.

Johnson, Tim; "US Views Iran's Nuclear Program As Serious Threat," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 1 April 2003.

Johnson, Tim and Montgomery, David; "Syria Warned To Heed New Era," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 16 April 2003.

Kahwaji, Riad and Opall-Rome, Barbara; "New Balance of Power: Saddam's Ouster Redraws Mideast Political Map," *Defense News*, 5 May 2003.

Kahwaji, Riad; "Syria Likely To Meet Most US Demands," *Defense News*, 21 April 2003.

Montgomery, Dave; "In Shift of US Military, Troops to Quit Saudi Bases," the San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 30 April 2003.

Murphy, Kim; "Iraq's Neighbors Decry Role Of US In Region, Back Syria," *Los Angeles Times*, 19 April 2003.

PLRC-021016 -- *Understanding the "War on Terrorism": The Oil & Gas Interests -- Part 1*, 16 October 2002.

PLRC-030503 -- *Understanding the "War on Terrorism": "Pax Americana" and Preemptive Force*, Pacific Life Research Center paper dated 3 May 2003.

Porth, Jacquelyn S.; "Rumsfeld Says US Not Seeking Permanent Military Bases In Iraq," published in Washington File, US State Department International Information Programs, 21 April 2003, at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile/...

Reuters, "US To Syria: Don't Be On The Wrong Side Of History," 11 May 2003.

Reuters, "United States Cuts Off Contact With Iran - Report," 25 May 2003.

Shanker, Thom and Schmitt, Eric: "Pentagon Expects Long-Term Access To Four Key Bases In Iraq," *The New York Times*, 20 April 2003.

Steinberg, James; "America May Wield 'Fear Factor' Against North Korea, Syria, Iran," *The Mercury News*, 13 April 2003.

Stolberg, Sheryl Gay; "Group Says Iran Has 2 Undisclosed Nuclear Laboratories," *The New York Times*, 27 May 2003.

Strobel, Warren P.; "US Debates Need To Undermine Iran Leaders," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 23 May 2003.

Traynor, Ian; "How American Power Girds The Globe With A Ring Of Steel," *The Guardian* (London), 21 April 2003.

Vulliamy, Ed; "Syria Could Be Next, Warns Washington," *The Observer* (London), 13 April 2003.

Wakin, Daniel J.; "Powell Applauds Syria's Action," *The New York Times* dispatch published in San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 4 May 2003.

Wakin, Daniel J.; "Militant Crackdown In Syria Questioned," *The New York Times* dispatch published in San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 5 May 2003.

Walcott, john; "US Probes Iran Link To Saudi Bombings," San Jose (CA) *Mercury News*, 15 May 2003.

Warrick, Joby; "Iran Said To Be Producing Bioweapons," *Washington Post*, 15 May 2003.

Washington File; "Franks Thanks Uzbekistan For Anti-Terror Efforts, Saving 'Many Lives'," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 23 August 2002, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File, "White House Warns 'Syria Needs To Cooperate'," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 14 April 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File, "Powell Looks To Syria To Play 'helpful role' in Mideast," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 2 May 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File, "Powell: US Watching Syria's Anti-Terrorist Actions," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 4 May 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File; "Brownback: US Must Support Iranian Dissidents' Quest For Democracy," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 6 May 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File, "Powell Says Lebanon Could Be Regional Model For Democracy, Free Trade," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 6 May 2003. Search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File; "Text: State Department Launches Persian Language Website," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 12 May 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

Washington File; "Bush: US Will Not Relent In War Against Terrorism," press release by US State Department's International Information Programs, 21 May 2003, search at http://usinfo.state.gov/cgi-bin/washfile...

GLOSSARY

AIOC	Anglo Iranian Oil Company.
BBC	British Broadcasting Company.
CBW	Chemical-Biological Warfare.
CENTCOM	The US Central Command.
CIA	Central intelligence Agency.
CNN	Cable News Network.
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation.
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency.
Islamist	A follower of the extremist, fundamentalist form of Islam -- a militant Muslim terrorist.
Jihad	Islamic term for “Holy War.”
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
NPT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.
PBS	Public Broadcasting System.
UAE	United Arab Emirates.
UK	United Kingdom.
UN	United Nations.
US	United States.
USN	United States Navy.
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction -- nuclear, chemical, and biological.

APPENDIX-A
US BASES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND CENTRAL ASIA