

By Debra Sweet

I've been hearing, since Obama's remarks this week that, "The one thing we have not done is we have not launched a war" on Iran, that Barack Obama doesn't "want" a war. That could be true.

But every speech he has given on about Iran shows the one thing he won't give up on: domination of Iran, and the whole region. If that takes war, then, Obama says, he will wage it. He said to the AIPAC meeting a few days ago,

"Iran's leaders should understand that I do not have a policy of containment; I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. And as I have made clear time and again during the course of my presidency, I will not hesitate to use force when it is necessary to defend the United States and its interests."

Larry Everest, in [Threats, Aggression, War Preparations...and Lies—U.S. and Israel Accelerate Campaign Against Iran](#) writes,

A narrative is being created—with each spin of the news cycle—that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons. The New York Times routinely reports that "Western politicians believe Iran is building a nuclear weapons capability," or that "Iran's nuclear program has a military objective." In his interview with NBC's Matt Lauer broadcast during the Super Bowl, President Obama stated: "Iran has to stand down on its nuclear weapons program." He then threatened, "Until they do, I think Israel rightly is going to be very concerned, and we are as well."

This narrative is built on lies, half-truths, innuendos, and distortions. In reality, top Western politicians know there's no proof that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons, and that there is no definitive evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapons program.

Everest, and Nima Shirazi in [Hurting, Hanging, Suffocating & Starving: The Inhumanity of Iran Threat Rhetoric](#) detail the ways in which the U.S. is already making war on Iran. Shirazi covers the rhetoric used by Israeli and US media towards Iranians. Here he describes how a Democratic Senator who was against Bush's war on Iraq speaks of Iran,

The [lynching analogy](#) has become so [prevalent](#) in the political lexicon that it's even made its way into Congressional statements. On February 2, 2012, New Jersey Senator Robert Menendez posted a [press release](#) on his website that "hailed the Senate Banking committee's approval and bipartisan support for the Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Human Rights Act," which, according to Menendez, is designed to "further enhance pressure on the Iranian regime to halt its illicit nuclear weapons program." The statement quotes Menendez as declaring,

"This legislation will thwart the work-arounds that Iran has devised to circumvent the U.S., EU and UN sanctions regimes, tighten the noose on the Iranian government, and send a message to the world that there is a choice – you can either do business with Iran or the United States, but not both."

It may be that a majority of people living in the U.S. get roped into supporting war on Iran, whether or not Israel strikes first. But, WE can't be. Stay tuned for further action plans.

Just in from Chicago World Can't Wait, a report on March 3 Event on Iran:: [Teach-in Participants Focus on Building WIDESPREAD Resistance to Iran War.](#)

"In the course of a few hours, we reviewed results from an online survey we asked people to fill out before the event, discussed how we can address the opinions revealed in it, and how all that might inform our "No Iran War!" activism. Finally, we came up with next-step action plans."