



What Is To Be Done?

by Hedayat Mostowfi

4 August 2004

The clock is ticking. Iran can have its first atomic bomb in a few months and then can negotiate on its own terms.



In a historic speech in summer 1980 in Tehran, Iranian Resistance Leader Massoud Rajavi warned the nation against the growing danger of Islamic fundamentalism fueled and guided by Ayatollah Khomeini and his network of thugs. He asked the question, "What is to be done" to deal with this ogre, about to plunge the entire nation into the darkness of terror and fear.

The antagonism between the democratic movement and Khomeini's fundamentalist vision peaked in June 1981 when the Revolutionary Guards opened fire on a peaceful demonstration in Tehran and killed many people.

The choice was clear: Either surrender or resistance. Rajavi and his People's Mujahedeen chose the latter and paid a heavy price.

Now, twenty-three years later, the mullahs in Iran are desperately pursuing the atomic bomb. All negotiations to stop them from their clandestine program have failed. Iran's foreign minister bluntly rejected requests from Germany, France and England to end the nuclear program and insisted that Iran will continue to build centrifuges for enriching uranium.

On another front, the mullahs are trying to erect another Islamic republic, this time in Iraq. In an interview with the *Washington Post*, Iraq's defense minister said Iran was Iraq's main enemy and Secretary of State Colin Powell expressed the United States' deep concern about Iran's interference in Iraq.

The mullahs' confidence in spreading terror around the world is a result of years of appeasement policy pursued by European countries and the U.S. instead of holding Iran accountable for its

involvement in the deadly bombing attacks in Khobar and Buenos Aires, the Clinton administration blacklisted the Mujahedeen in 1997 as a goodwill gesture to Iranian President Mohammad Khatami. The *Los Angeles Times* reported on October 9, 1997, "One senior Clinton administration official said inclusion of the People's Mujahedeen was intended as a goodwill gesture to Tehran and its newly elected moderate president, Mohammad Khatami."

There was never a basis for this accusation. After seven years of appeasement policy with Tehran, The *New York Times* reported on July 27, 2004, "A 16-month review by the United States has found no basis to charge members of an Iranian opposition group in Iraq with violations of American law, according to senior American officials." However, Iran not only did not cease supporting terrorism, but used the opportunity to develop nuclear weapons.

We are now back again to Rajavi's question about Iran: What is to be done? The clock is ticking. Iran can have its first atomic bomb in a few months and then can negotiate on its own terms.

Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski offers "appeasement" and "dialogue" towards the Mullahs in Tehran, saying we should be "exploring areas of common interests with Iran, while continuing to contest objectionable policy." The same policy argues, "Do not pursue a regime change in Iran, but promote democracy within the existing regime." This policy, already tried unsuccessfully by the European countries, will lead to empowering the mullahs of Iran and quite possibly a nuclear disaster for the world.

The magnitude of uprisings and political arrests in Iran (more than 120,000 executions, and hundreds of thousands of arrests) by the Iranian government, should be a sign for Dr. Brzezinski that Iran is not reforming and the mullahs are not wanted in Iran. As the old Persian saying goes, a viper will never give birth to a dove.

Others argue that the right policy toward Iran is to stand firmly against the mullahs before it is too late.

A policy, already being considered, is to support the movement of Iranian people for democracy and freedom. This policy is supported by distinguished members of Congress such as Senators Sam Brownback (R-KS), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Jim Talent (R-MO), Evan Bayh (D-IN), Wayne Allard (R-CO), Richard Shelby (R-AL), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX), John Cornyn (R-TX), and

Representatives Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), Thomas Tancredo (R-CO), and Brad Sherman (D-CA). A recent Bill drafted by U.S. Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA), Chairman of the Senate Republican Conference, introduced legislation "promoting the sense of the Congress that it should be the policy of the United States to support regime change in Iran and that the U.S. government should promote the transition to a new democratic Iranian government."

A similar movement has begun in Iraq as well. More than 500,000 Iraqis supported the continuing presence of the People's Mujahedeen in Iraq. A new front against Islamic fundamentalism is forming by liberal, intellectual Muslims, who promote a democratic view of Islam and believe in a free and secular society. This unity between two nations to topple Islamic fundamentalism has to be supported.

The first step is to remove the Mujahedeen from the terrorist list. This will encourage and empower the movement of Iranian people for freedom, democracy and secularism. This would give a very clear message to Tehran. A stable and democratic Iran means peace and freedom in the region and a world free of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism armed by nuclear weapons.

*Hedayat Mostowfi is the Executive Director for nationwide
Committee in Support of Referendum in Iran.*

[Email Hedayat Mostowfi](#)