

Iran-Iraq-Syria and China

Frank Dodd (Tony) Smith, Jr. - 23 February 2012

The motto "Don't Iraq Iran" is interesting.

If it refers to strike on nuclear facilities, then the Iraq analog would be the 1981 Israeli strike on the Osiraq reactor which did in fact get rid of a nuclear weapon threat.

If it refers to the 1991 and 2003 USA invasions of Iraq both of which defeated the Iraqi military with small USA casualties with 1991 securing Kuwaiti oil resources for the USA and 2003 having mixed results with respect to oil resources because of the Iraqi Shia majority having ties to the neighboring part of Iran, then the analog would be to seize and occupy the major oil production region of Iran which is the part of Iran neighboring Iraq. That region would be fairly easy to seize militarily because it is small geographically and not the most rugged terrain in Iran.

Seizure of the Iranian oil region would give the USA military control over Kuwait and Iraq and Iran oil, thus making the war a profitable business venture (like the recent seizing of Libya and its oil and expelling China from Libya).

Without that oil revenue, the Tehran government would not be able to finance reconstruction of nuclear facilities. In fact, if the attack were designed to kill the present Iranian leaders (as the Libyan attack killed Gaddafi) a subsequent Iranian government might turn out to be as pliable as the new Libyan government.

Of course, the above scenario (possibly the line of thought in USA) only works if Iran is to be defeated militarily.

My guess is that the USA can indeed carry out the above scenario to military victory (and that reports of USA trying to hold back Israel are propaganda trying to use Israel as a "bad guy" puppet to take the blame for starting the war). However, the USA military victory might not be as casualty-free (for the USA, which does not care about the death of many innocents in the war zone) as was Iraq, because China has supplied Iran with a lot of advanced weapons that can be used against invasions (China has great fear of USA invasion). Those weapons may sink aircraft carriers and destroy ground bases in the area, thus killing thousands of USA military and destroying material and facilities.

So, in some respects, an Iran war may be like the Spanish Civil War as a practice war to determine the effectiveness of Hitler's war machine. In this case, China may view it as a practice war for a USA-China war, allowing it to evaluate its weapons and optimize them for effectiveness against USA military systems.

It is interesting that the financial motive for war with Iran is to seize Gulf oil resources, which may not last more than a decade or so, thus high-lighting the USA short-term profit mode of thought.

From the Chinese long-term point of view, the military data evaluating Chinese weaponry against USA invasion forces might be far more useful than a few years of oil profit.

It seems that the USA may, in addition to taking Iran's oil area and damaging its nuclear facilities and killing its leadership, take Syria and kill its leadership (as with Gaddafi).

It seems to me that is a reversion of USA policy to Imperial NeoColonial policy that led Bush to the 2003 invasion of Iraq. However, Bush, like his father who in 1991 took Kuwait but did not take Baghdad, did NOT follow up taking Baghdad by also taking Damascus and Iran oil fields (which would have been much easier then than now).

Bush substantially abandoned Imperial NeoColonial policy with removal of Rumsfeld in 2006.

Now, Obama seems to have reinstated the full NeoColonial agenda of taking Syria and Iranian oil fields (plus attacks on Iranian nuclear facilities and leadership) thus giving the USA control of all Persian Gulf oil.

Russia (by removing its aircraft carrier from Syrian waters) seems to be avoiding military conflict with the USA, so the only military opposition will be Chinese weapons used by Iran and therefore the USA should win the short-term war but the Chinese will get long-term useful information about their weapon effectiveness.

An interesting question is:

After Bush backed off from the full Syria-Iran Imperial NeoColonial policy why has Obama decided to implement it ?

Could it be that the Big Five Banks that run the USA Global Hegemon now see that their Quadrillion Dollar Derivative Ponzi Scheme is falling apart, and that the only way (short of World War III) to prevent China from replacing the USA as the Global Financial KingPin is to seize absolute control of some commodity on which China is dependent, and that commodity (in the short term future) is Persian Gulf Oil ?

Flaws in that plan might be:

- 1 - Persian Gulf Oil might run out in 10 years so any USA leverage might be only for that short term.
- 2 - China may nullify the leverage by converting its coal etc into oil (Germany had that technology prior to World War II).
- 3 - China may prefer World War III to being subservient to the USA (compare USA efforts to limit Japan just prior to World War II).

It is interesting that the Mayan Calendar End Year 2012 is the year when these things might play out, leading to a new era beyond (or maybe a continuation of) the USA Global Hegemon Era.