

What Are Iran's Missiles For?

What are Iran's new long-range missiles for? Well, suppose that the Mad Mullahs were to paint the answer to that question in giant letters **on the missiles themselves**. Would anyone take any notice even then?

Meanwhile, Iran is **scaling back its "co-operation"** with the International Atomic Energy Agency's attempts to "verify" that Iran's nuclear program is peaceful. Has the IAEA considered checking whether anything is painted in large letters on Iran's nuclear installations? You never know.

By the way, let us take this opportunity to express our solidarity with **BlogIran** and with all those struggling for freedom in Iran.

Wed, 09/24/2003 - 07:22 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Iranian blogs

Here is a link where you can find links to almost all Iranian blogs, especially those from inside Iran (as a late response to a question in the comments' section of another post):
<http://hoder.com/weblog/>

And thanks for the solidarity. I'm still hoping to see a day when a free Iran and Israel are very close allies in the region. This could become the reality!

An Iranian Student

by a reader on Thu, 09/25/2003 - 07:59 | [reply](#)

Blog-Iran

Thank you for your strong support and solidarity - if you would like, please grab a BLOG-IRAN banner/logo from <http://www.activistchat.com/blogiran/join.html> and show it proudly :) take care and feel free to email..!

Haleh,
ActivistChat.com

by a reader on Fri, 09/26/2003 - 13:35 | [reply](#)

Iranian Blogs (continued)

Actually this is where you can find them all in one page, from the above given blog:
<http://blogsbyiranians.com/>

An Iranian Student

by a reader on Sat, 10/04/2003 - 07:17 | [reply](#)

Or alternatively what are the

Or alternatively what are the United States missiles for? Or Russia's or China's or Israel's? Deterrence probably. If you can hit us we are going to hit you. Next question.

by a reader on Thu, 03/17/2005 - 14:55 | [reply](#)

Re: Or alternatively what are the

Wrong. Iran's missiles are primarily for the purpose that is painted on them.

Not all governments have the same purpose. And so not all missiles do. Just like **not all armies do**.

by [Editor](#) on Thu, 03/17/2005 - 15:13 | [reply](#)

No. Iran is a titch compared

No. Iran is a titch compared to Israel. Israel has what? ..a hundred nuclear weapons..advanced aircraft provided by the US.. and God knows what else in their armoury. You must know that if Iran attacked Israel they would invite their own destruction. You mistake Iranian propaganda for their intent..which seems to be at the moment to survive...just like Syria - I don't want them to survive by the way, they are horrible regime...I think we can both agree on that at least.

by a reader on Fri, 03/18/2005 - 20:40 | [reply](#)

Agreed, but...

Yes, they want to survive. Most people want to survive, even most homicidal lunatics. But that is no guarantee that they will act reasonably and not attempt Holocausts at the risk of their own lives. Fear regimes, which are inherently unstable, have to do certain things in order to survive. Things which are inherently dangerous to themselves as well as others and which do not always result in survival. A common one is to wage wars of naked aggression against other countries. The history of the twentieth century has many examples – from World War 2 to the invasion of the Falkland Islands – of tyrannical regimes embarking on actions because of the logic of their ideology, which itself was essential to their remaining in power, and nevertheless failing to survive.

Moreover, the rulers of Iran believe that they *will* survive – in

paradise – if they die in the course of a holy war.

by **Editor** on Fri, 03/18/2005 - 21:16 | [reply](#)

Totally disagree. The Iranian

Totally disagree. The Iranians are rational planners - all that 'paradise' stuff is a lot of baloney and propaganda. All this is doing is ramping up the drums of war kind of thing. There is no evidence that they're planning anything as you kind of suggested.

The only reason they are being targeted by the US at the moment is because they are independent and the US wants them out. All the human rights stuff and links to terrorism is just used instrumentally to this end.

They are a fear regime at the moment..not in the way you suggested - although to reiterate they are horrible. The regime is frightened of what the US is going to do.

by a reader on Fri, 03/18/2005 - 23:08 | [reply](#)

The mullahs or anyone else in

The mullahs or anyone else in their shoes would do precisely the same. Need to remind you that in fact it was the Shah who started the nuclear research program. Besides, why is it that U.S.'s national interests always take priority over that of anyone else's?

I mean, as a concerned Iranian, just what tune of theirs do we have to dance to next? We had a perfectly democratically elected government in Mossadegh, then they go and topple him and bring back a despot who treats the country as his personal possession and buggers everything up to the inevitable miserable end of a revolution and a perfectly predictable power struggle creating the entity of an Islamic Republic.

Seems the needle has been stuck on the same tune for quite a while; look at Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait,.... all despotic regimes subjugating their people's will, finally something will have to give. Freedom is not the possession of the U.S to give, all humans aspire to it inately; such unjust regimes will fall, as they have done so in the past.

Most Iranians are sick to death of outside interference, starting with the Brits taking our oil for next to nothing and now the Americans selling us their brand of how we should think and live our lives.

They may bomb us, kill and mame us, but the knowledge can never be destroyed. Any rational leader of a country surrounded by foes, some with nuclear weapons, including Pakistan and Israel, will have no option but to consider the ultimate deterrent. Our history is marred with foreign invaders for nothing more than our natural resources. It's time to put out people's interests first and not that of the American Stock Markets.

Freedom at last, freedom at last.....

by a reader on Sun, 09/25/2005 - 21:20 | [reply](#)

Yeah, right

Rational planners, purely defensive.

Not our enemies at all. Yeah, right.

by a reader on Wed, 09/28/2005 - 22:25 | [reply](#)

Iran and Democracy

I think that if we expect nations not to produce nuclear bombs (and surely that is desirable) we must include all nations, including those who have them at present. As for democracy Western style I think it's an illusion. It's a place where mafia's rule. You can't foist it on other more moral societies, Mr Bush. Free speech is an illusion. If I sign my name to this I'm liable to be targeted by one of the mafia's (even a young gang) so where is the free speech? As for Islam, it is obviously based on violence. The threat to kill unbelievers, critics of Mahommed, women whose behaviour deviates from the mullah's reading of the Koran etc. render it one of the great tyrannies of all time...I don't know if that can ever change..???

by a reader on Thu, 05/31/2007 - 17:26 | [reply](#)

Rationale of Tyranny

This piece was first published at my blog, [here](#). It was provoked by this thread's comments.

There is a great confusion in the way people think about a tyrannical regime like the Islamic Republic of Iran. Does the regime really mean all the hateful propaganda they spread about the West? Do they mean it when they express a desire to "wipe Israel off the map" or "crush America under their feet"? Or when they write them on the missiles paraded in the streets? Aren't they just trying to survive? Wouldn't everyone else in their shoes do the same? Shouldn't we separate the "intent" (survival) from propaganda? Isn't the Islamic regime just another rational player?

Some of the answers are "yes", and some "no". But the point is these questions miss the actual rationale of tyranny.

I don't have a problem with accepting the Islamic regime, as a whole, as a rational player. But so what? Even rational players have assumptions that go into their decision making. And there is always room for questioning the moral justifications of those assumptions. Yes, even a tyrant could be rational. But does that somehow make his tyranny okay?

Would anyone in a tyrant's shoes do the same under external pressure? No! Why should they? If the outsiders have reasonable demands, one could adequately assure them that their demands are

met. One doesn't *need* to be a violent and abrasive dictator even in an authoritarian system. Even a tyrant really does have options. In particular there is always the option of accepting to dismantle the dictatorship altogether. This has been demonstrated many times in recent history of non-violent revolutions, be it in Eastern Europe or in Chile.

But what about the intent and the propaganda? It is a major (and sometimes deliberate) confusion of logic to claim that the fact that a tyranny's intent is to survive would somehow make the propaganda it spreads less lethal and dangerous. It is the complete opposite. Tyrannies spread hateful and false propaganda *because* they want to survive. Survival is *why* they do what they do and **propaganda (and repression)** is *how*. And when the why demands that they actually act on the how they won't cringe. There is ample historical evidence for this. Here's one relevant to Iran:

In the second half of the Iran-Iraq war (more or less after Khorramshahr was liberated by the Iranian forces) when Iraq was in a defensive position and was seeking a ceasefire, the Islamic Republic continued the war and said it would not accept the UN resolution No. 598 for a ceasefire. So the war continued for another 4-5 years during which hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed and the economy was shattered even more.

How did they convince the people to do this? Propaganda, of course, besides a cycle of repression and fear. The walls of Tehran were covered with slogans such as: "War, War, Till Victory!" or "The Path to Quds Goes Through Karbala" or "War, War, Till Mahdi's Revolution!". The only two TV stations were filled with stories of martyrdom, etc. Saddam was *kafir* (nonbeliever) and the war was one against *kufr* (nonbelief). Classic tyrannical propaganda methods were practiced. Moreover, almost any voice of dissent was brutally silenced. Those who had differing ideas from the head of the power pyramid, from all stripes and colors even many early supporters, were silenced, jailed and/or executed.

Why did they do this? To survive. Did they believe in all they said? Probably not. In fact, after the intent for survival forced the weakening regime to finally accept the ceasefire in 1988 (or "drink the potion of death" in the words of Khomeini), it was suddenly as if Saddam was no longer *kafir* or the path to Quds did not go through Karbala.

In short, the strategy of tyranny is set by the intent for survival and its tactics by the propaganda. They go hand in hand. So the question of whether they believe in their own propaganda becomes irrelevant to what they would actually do. They'd do as they see fit for their survival and this could include acting on existing propaganda, or creating new ones. But what is for certain is that we on the outside should never dismiss or devalue the dangers of their propaganda.

-- Cyrus Ferdowsi, <http://libiran.blogspot.com>

by **Liberal Iranian** on Tue, 06/05/2007 - 09:55 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2008 Setting The World To Rights