



IRAN TODAY & TOMORROW

WEEKLY NEWS BULLETIN

The Committee in Support of Referendum in Iran (CSRI), a 501(c)(3), non-profit and independent group, is committed to advance change in Iran through an internationally monitored referendum as the only peaceful means to bring democracy and establish a secular and representative government in Iran.

October 8, 2004

No. 125

Nuclear proliferation

Iran Says It Has Missile with 1,250-Mile Range



Reuters Oct 5- Iran can launch a missile as far as 2,000 km (1,250 miles), a senior official was quoted as saying Tuesday, substantially increasing the announced range of the Islamic state's military capabilities. Such a missile would be capable of hitting Israel or parts of southeastern Europe. Iran says its missiles are for purely defensive purposes and would be used to counter a possible Israeli strike against its nuclear facilities. "Now we have the power to launch a missile with a 2,000 km range,"

IRNA quoted influential former President Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani as saying. "Iran is determined to improve its military capabilities." Iran fiercely denies U.S. and Israeli accusations that it is building nuclear weapons. But Iranian officials have trumpeted their ability to strike back at any aggressor many times in recent months and in August announced they had successfully tested an upgraded version of Iran's medium-range Shahab-3 missile. Military experts say the unmodified Shahab-3 had a range of 810 miles which would allow it to strike anywhere in Israel. Shahab means meteor in Persian. Rafsanjani was speaking at an exhibition on "Space and Stable National Security." Iran has also recently announced plans to launch its own satellite into space next year. Military experts say a satellite launch rocket could easily be adapted for military purposes.

Getting it wrong on Iran

The Washington Times **Washington Times Oct 4-** The mullahcrats in Tehran made it official yesterday: John Kerry's grand alternative to the Bush approach for dealing with the Iranian nuclear threat is dead in the water. At Thursday night's debate, Mr. Kerry suggested that Iran be supplied with nuclear fuel for power reactors if the regime agreed to forego its existing nuclear program. Yesterday, a spokesman for the Iranian Foreign Ministry rejected the Kerry proposal, saying it would be "irrational" for Tehran to rely on nuclear supplies from abroad. But don't expect Mr. Kerry to be chastened by the contemptuous response from Iran. If recent history is any guide, the senator will soon be out with some new spin explaining why President Bush, and not the Islamist regime, is to blame for the Iranian nuclear-weapons program. Indeed, at Thursday's debate, that's what Mr. Kerry tried to do: rewrite history in an effort to blame Mr. Bush for a pattern of hostile behavior that began with the Iranian Revolution in 1979 and has continued ever since. In an effort to show that Mr. Bush was asleep at the switch, Mr. Kerry claimed that the British, French and Germans initiated their effort to curb Iran's nuclear program "without the United States." Mr. Kerry failed to mention the fact that Mr. Bush agreed to support the Europeans going forward with their diplomatic effort despite serious misgivings --which have been borne out by the abysmal failure of the EU 3 to get Iran to change its behavior. Mr. Kerry said that the United States should have offered to provide Iran with nuclear fuel in order to "test them [and] see whether or not they were actually looking for it for peaceful purposes." But the

premise is delusional: No serious observer could possibly claim that Iran has been acting in good faith. The International Atomic Energy Agency has documented the fact that Iran has been misleading the world about its nuclear intentions since the 1980s. Tehran's refusal to cooperate with the EU 3 is simply a continuation of its efforts to cheat. Mr. Kerry also tried to rewrite history regarding North Korea's nuclear program. At one point during the debate, he suggested that the Clinton administration fixed the problem by negotiating a 1994 agreement with Pyongyang and that President Bush destroyed a promising U.S.-North Korean "dialogue" two years ago. In fact, the Communist regime has been going forward with a covert nuclear program for a decade after promising not to; Mr. Kerry's apparent solution would be an updated version of the failed Clinton approach. Two principles appear to underlie Mr. Kerry's approach to foreign policy: First, that anything done by Mr. Bush is by definition wrong, and second, that Mr. Kerry will be able to fix everything by holding summits and bilateral talks, at which he will use his unique persuasive powers to get foreign despots to behave themselves. Twenty-nine days from now, the American people will decide whether someone who lives in such a fantasy world is fit to lead the free world.

Majlis signs for continuing nuclear activities



[Radio Farda, Oct. 4](#) – 238 deputies presented to the Majlis a plan that will oblige Khatami's government to continue nuclear activities. Ala'eddin Borujerdi, chairman of the Majlis Security Committee announced this, adding, "These many signatures have been unprecedented in the Majlis history." Borujerdi added, "The bill will be examined Tuesday in the Security Committee and will definitely be approved with many votes in the open session of Majlis."

Mullahs' leader wants nuke in 4 months

[World Net Daily, Oct. 2](#) - Iranian leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has urged his country's weapons developers to step up work on making a nuclear bomb, a U.S. official said, according to Geostrategy-Direct, the global intelligence news service. According to the official, an authoritative source in the Iranian exile community has stated that Khamenei met recently with senior government and military leaders on the nuclear weapons program. Khamenei told the gathering, "We must have two bombs ready to go in January or you are not Muslims," the official said.

Khatami will not back down on nukes

[IRNA, Oct. 3](#) – In an interview with Al-Jazeera satellite television, Khatami stressed on Iran's intent to continue its nuclear activities. He said, "We consider it our right to possess nuclear technology... and the IAEA must place the necessary facilities for having this technology at the disposal of its member states."

Assefi "not worried" about Security Council referral

[IRNA, Oct. 3](#) – The spokesman of the foreign ministry stressed on continuing the talks between Iran and the IAEA, adding, "I don't believe that Iran's case should go to the Security Council.

But even if it does go, we are not worried and the main loser would be the other party."

Meddling in Iraq

Dragging A Neighbour Into Anarchy

[National Post - Oct 7, By Nooredin Abedian](#) U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell recently told the International Herald Tribune that "Iran is providing support for the insurgency in Iraq." He added, however, that "the extent of its influence over insurgent forces is not clear." But it is very clear to Iraqis themselves -- including Iraq's Defence Minister, Hazem Shaalan. Being on the terrorists' hit-list himself, having recently lost a cousin to terrorism and having

had an uncle kidnapped during last month's unrest in the city of Najaf, Mr. Shaalan cannot be blamed for rejecting Mr. Powell's diplomatic formulations. He told The Washington Post in July that Iran remained "the first enemy of Iraq," charging it with sending spies and saboteurs into his country and infiltrating the new government, including his own ministry. Theoretically, the Iranians should have little motive for supporting Iraq's guerrillas and terrorists. Iran is largely a nation of Shiite Muslims. The same religious group constitutes a majority of Iraq's citizens, and so Shiites will likely get their way when expected elections are held next year. Moreover, the most influential and organized Iraqi Shiite parties are deeply influenced by Iran, ideologically as well as politically. During Saddam Hussein's rule, many of Iraq's Shiite leaders lived in Iran. Some Iraqi groups were even founded in Iran under direct Iranian influence, with their leaders publicly calling Iranian supreme leader Ali Khamenei their marja (religious guide). The wisest course for Tehran, one would think, would be to permit a smooth transition of power following elections, and then extend influence through friendly Shiite intermediaries in Baghdad's new government. Even if the United States military were still stationed in Iraq at that time, Washington would hardly be in a position to confront a nation designated an ally by a sovereign, democratically elected Iraqi government.

Yet an overwhelming array of facts show Iran has embraced the opposite strategy. In September, Mr. Shaalan displayed an array of weapons with Iranian markings that had been captured from insurgents in Najaf after they were forced out of that city's Shiite shrines following days of bloody fighting. Dozens of Iranians captured during the clashes were shown on Iraqi television. According to Iran's official press, there are currently more than 1,200 Iranians in custody in Iraq. Iraqi media has recently reported that a truckload containing 1,800 82 mm-mortar rounds, three mortar launchers, 250 Katyusha rockets and large quantities of explosives was seized in transit from Iran to Iraq. Iranian independent opposition sources say 4,000 Shiite clerics from Iran have been sent to Iraq since the fall of Saddam's regime. According to the same sources, thousands of Revolutionary Guards disguised as religious pilgrims have also been dispatched. Why is Iran stirring up Iraq's guerrilla war when it might just as easily profit from a smooth transition to democracy? The answer lies in Iran's domestic affairs: If Iran, a dictatorship, were to permit a truly democratic political structure to take root next door, it would only provide encouragement to the millions of young Iranians who have been militating for similar reforms back home. Though Iran and Iraq fought a long and deadly war in the 1980s, the affairs of the two nations are heavily interrelated. Last year, more than five million people crossed the 750-mile-long unguarded Iran-Iraq border, many of them religious pilgrims (and this according to official figures, which are likely lower than the true numbers). Several hundred thousand Iraqis took refuge in Iran during Saddam's rule, married Iranians, and are now travelling back and forth. Two peoples with such a huge volume of religious, cultural, commercial and political ties cannot long be expected to live under totally political different regimes. For the clerics ruling Iran, the solution is clear. Ayatollah Ali Meshkini, speaker of Iran's Assembly of Experts, an exclusive body of clerics that appoints the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic, recently urged Iraqi leaders to "expel the occupiers and establish an Islamic government." And if that doesn't happen, Tehran would gladly accept ongoing bloodshed as a second choice. Iran's rulers loathed Saddam's regime, but they at least took comfort in the fact that his Baathist political model did not pose much threat to Iran's domestic order. The same cannot be said of a democratic Iraq. Thus is Iran using its violent proxies to help tear the country apart. In the long run, promoting stability in Iraq will require democratization in Iran -- for Tehran's theocrats will never accept a democracy on their western border. Until that day, the United States and other Western nations should hold Tehran to account for the violence and chaos it is deliberately fomenting. It is bad enough that 70 million Iranians must live under tyranny. Iraq's population must not be allowed to suffer the same fate.

Tens of thousands of Iranians enter Iraq as election hopefuls

Al-Itijah Al-Akher weekly, Oct. 3 - Iraq's Popular Campaign Movement revealed in a statement that a large number of Iranians have entered Iraq. This has been done with the consent of officials of the Iranian regime and in coordination with a number of Iraqi parties that have separationist tendencies. Based on this agreement, a large number of Iranians have entered Iraq in the past few weeks through the Iran-Iraq border. The dispatch of these individuals still continues. The number of people who have entered Iraq reaches tens of

thousands. They are scattered in southern and central regions of Iraq. The statement by Iraq's Popular Campaign Movement says the parties have made up records of Iraqi citizenship for these individuals in the birth registration offices in southern and central provinces to help them take part in the national elections Ayad Allawi intends to hold and guarantee them high positions in the Iraqi government.

Tehran hires agents in government offices in Iraq

Al-Watan daily, Oct. 3, Iraq – A security source condemned the Iranian regime's interventions in the internal affairs of Iraq, demanded that they be stopped, and issued warning against the consequences of the continuation of such policies. He said the Iranian Intelligence Ministry is active hiring agents working in Iraq's government agencies. Some agents collect information on the security of Iraq which help Iran and its intelligence Ministry advance their policy objectives and provides them with the opportunity to expand their influence in Iraq.

Iranian agents dressed as Badr

Al-Itijah al-Akher weekly, Oct. 2 – Three people were trying to set up a time bomb, when it exploded, killing one and injuring another. The police found the card of the injured man that shows he is a member of the Badr organization. Many members of the Iranian Intelligence ministry have a Badr ID card.



Secret government in Basra

Baghdad daily, Sep. 29 – The city of Basra has turned into a closed area run by the Iranian Intelligence Ministry while the government remains silent through British forces and local officials. High ranking employees of the city say they do not know which agency is giving them orders. One Police official told us that he receives orders from an officer in the Badr forces HQ who does not know Arabic. He is in the position of the commander and gives orders to our team to close down the theatres, clubs and shops. He is forced to carry out the orders out of fear, especially that he sees British forces' complicity with them. Another employee said many of the laws are broken and no body dares to protest because this city is run by a secret Iranian agency. The Brits and local officials are forced to submit to this situation. A bank employee said: The Iranian regime distributes exorbitant amounts of money among their supporters to attract them. They not only silence the people of Basra by creating fear and repression, but this secret government also pays millions of dollars to the tribe sheikhs in this area through intelligence officers of Iran and has even extended its hands outside Basra. An actor in Basra says the artistic and cultural life has stopped in Basra. Every evening, teams from the Iranian intelligence ministry roam the streets and attack any gathering, theatre or meeting of artists. He says hundreds of the city's intellectuals have been forced to go to Baghdad to stay away from the repressive atmosphere here.

Deteriorating conditions of human rights

Young man hanged as wife and child look on

Iran Focus Oct 5- Tehran, Oct. 5 – A young man was publicly hanged yesterday afternoon in the Robat square of Isfahan (central Iran) as his wife and child were forced to watch. Mehrzad Vajebal-Hoghough, a 33 year old resident in Isfahan was accused of armed robbery and possession of 7 Kilograms of marijuana. The judge who had sentenced Mehrzad asked him if he had any final comments as he was being led to the gallows, according to witnesses. Mehrzad did not reply and was silent, they said. Some 3 thousand people had crowded in the square to witness the hanging. One eye-witness stated that State Security Forces (SSF) forced the victim's son to stay and watch his father execution while tormenting him by swearing at him and calling him the son of an infidel. He added that the crowd became 'violent and vocal' upon seeing the young boy crying, and that the regime's agents, fearing 'a furious reaction' from the crowd, were forced to quickly bring down the dead corpse within 10

minutes. The regime's state-run press has confirmed over 125 public executions since March 2004. The actual figure is believed to be much higher.

Protest in Iran

More than 650 female students stage protest in Tehran



Iran Focus Oct 7- Tehran, Oct. 7 - More than 650 female students of Allameh Tabatabai University in Tehran staged a demonstration late Monday afternoon in protest against the dire state of their boarding houses. Students complained of a lack of basic commodities such as drinkable water and telephone facilities as well as unhygienic meals, according to eye-witnesses. Many of the young women mostly in their late teens complained about the 'dysfunctional transport system'. Anti-riot police had been dispatched to the gates of the university 'to

bring about an atmosphere of fear and to arrest anyone who might dare to shout slogans against the regime itself', according to one eye-witness. Iran's new academic year started 2 weeks ago near the end September. It has also been reported that students from the Teachers Training College in the town of Sabzevar, northeastern Iran, staged a demonstration against the government's failure to see to their welfare requirements.

Feature

Iran, When?

NRO, October 05 by Michael Ledeen- The war on terror cannot be won without addressing Iran. Months before the liberation of Iraq I wrote that we were about to have our great national debate on the war against the terror masters, and it was going to be the wrong debate. Wrong because it was going to focus obsessively on Iraq, thereby making it impossible to raise the fundamental strategic issues. Alas, that forecast was correct, and we're still stuck in the strategic quagmire we created. Up to our throats. So let's try again to get it right. Like Afghanistan before it, Iraq is only one theater in a regional war. We were attacked by a network of terrorist organizations supported by several countries, of whom the most important were Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. President Bush's original analysis was correct, as was his strategy: We must not distinguish between the terrorists and their national supporters. Hence we need different strategies for different enemies, but we need to defeat all of them. Afghanistan was the classic example, because the Taliban regime was at once home to, and sponsor of, al Qaeda. Al Qaeda attacked us on 9/11, and we responded against the terrorist organization and against the regime that supported it. Once the Taliban had been destroyed, and al Qaeda had been shattered, President Bush launched a political strategy: support the creation of a free Afghanistan, implant the basic institutions of democratic civil society, work toward free elections so that Afghans could freely govern themselves. Call it democratic revolution. That was supposed to be the model for the rest of the war, and it was the right strategy. Use military force where necessary, against both the terrorists and the sponsoring regimes, and support democratic revolution. The whole region understood that strategy, and you could see the consequences. There were pro-democracy demonstrations, even in the most unexpected places, such as Damascus and Riyadh, where none had been seen in human memory. In Iran, where the democratic opposition had shown its passion for several years, the tempo increased. And all the terror masters, in Baghdad, Tehran, Damascus, and Riyadh, trembled, fearing that their moment of power and glory was about to pass. The president clearly understood both the stakes and the opportunity. The "Axis of Evil" was — and is — very real, as the tyrants of Iran, Iraq, and North Korea knew full well. There is now abundant evidence of the close cooperation among them, and with their Libyan, Syrian and Pakistani friends, ranging from nuclear projects to other weapons of mass destruction, and to vital support (sometimes in tandem, sometimes separately) to the

terror network. The terror masters also knew that their greatest threat came from their own people, who were disgusted at the oppressive and corrupt dictatorships, and who saw the United States as the source of their imminent liberation. Again, the president described the situation well: Time was not on our side, for delay would enable our enemies to regroup and plan for the next challenge. I kept imploring "faster, please," because it was luminously clear that the terror masters were planning for the battle of Iraq. They publicly announced that they would attempt to do in post-liberation Iraq what they had previously accomplished in Lebanon in the 1980s and 1990s: Use a combination of terror, kidnapping, and political/religious agitation to break our will, drive us out, and expand their own power. The terror masters could not possibly stand by and permit an easy triumph in Iraq, for that would seal their own doom. For them, the battle of Iraq was an existential conflict, the ultimate zero-sum game. If we won, they died. But, blinded by our obsession with Iraq, we did not see it. For once, the president's intuition failed him. This failure to recognize the enormity of the stakes, and hence the intensity of the coming assault, was heartbreaking, for us and the other members of the Coalition, and for the Iraqi people. It was the ultimate intelligence failure, a pure failure of vision. Had we seen the war for what it was, we would not have started with Iraq, but with Iran, the mother of modern Islamic terrorism, the creator of Hezbollah, the ally of al Qaeda, the sponsor of Zarqawi, the longtime sponsor of Fatah, and the backbone of Hamas. So clear was Iran's major role in the terror universe that the Department of State, along with the CIA one of the most conflict-averse agencies of the American government, branded the Islamic Republic the world's number one terror sponsor. As it still does. Moreover, the Islamic Republic was uniquely vulnerable to democratic revolution, for, by the mullahs' own accounting, no less than seventy percent of the Iranian people hated the clerical fascist regime in Tehran, and hundreds of thousands of young Iranians had shown a disposition to challenge their oppressors in the streets of the major cities. Had we supported them then and there, in the immediate aftermath of Afghanistan, when the entire region was swept by political tremors of great magnitude, the evil regime might well have fallen, thereby delivering an enormous blow to the jihadis all over the world. I do not think we would have needed a single bomb or a single bullet. So be it. God created profoundly fallible creatures on this earth, and human history is mostly the story of error and accident. There are many battles ahead, and we may yet engage on the full battlefield. One thing is certain: There will be no peace in Iraq so long as the terror masters rule in Damascus, Riyadh, and Tehran. Those who attended closed discussions with the Iraqi defense minister a week ago heard a long list of evidence and cries of outrage against the murderous mullahcracy next door, and even though the leaders of the West — sadly including some of our own — continue to pretend that diplomacy may yet settle things in the Middle East, they cannot possibly believe it. This is a fight to the finish, still a zero-sum game. The main problem remains the failure of vision, never more evident than in the first presidential debate. The president dismissed the question about Iran by talking only about the nuclear "issue," while Senator Kerry, incredibly, restated his belief that the same policy that failed to deter North Korea would somehow work with the Iranians. The president knows who the Iranians are, while the senator is an active appeaser. But neither was inclined to deal with the central issue, which is that the Iranians, the Syrians, and the Saudis are killing our men and women in Iraq, and we are playing defense, which is a sucker's game. In the past week, the Iranian people have again taken to the streets in every major city in the country. The chatterers pay no heed, because there is only one zero-sum game that interests them, which is the election, and the election is about Iraq, or so they say. Except that it isn't, really. It's about the war. The real war, the regional war, the war they are waging against us even if we refuse to acknowledge it. Faster, damnit.

— *Michael Ledeen, an NRO contributing editor, is most recently the author of [The War Against the Terror Masters](#). Ledeen is Resident Scholar in the Freedom Chair at the [American Enterprise Institute](#).*

Copyright 2004 CSRI All Rights Reserved



www.referendum-iran.org