

The Middle East Theory of Relativity

Perplexity of Iran

2

$T_{\text{errorism}} = I_s \cdot S_w$

By
Sohrab ChamanAra

About this book (back of the cover):

Among many warmongering remarks, Prime Minister Tony Blair once made a sensible comment about Iran, stating he saw no end to the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, while the present Iranian regime is in power. If so, then we should ask ourselves: what should be done? Unfortunately, there has been nothing on “the table” except war as far as our memory will allow.

This book suggests an inexpensive and humane alternative.

The solution concludes this book after reviewing a brief history of the region.

The most significant point raised here is the rejection of the notion of existence of a historic violent conflict between Shi'a and Sunni Moslems. However, emphasis is made about a two hundred year-old hatred and animosity between Wahhabi and Shi'a.

In other words, a proxy war between Wahhabi and Shi'a has been going on in the region, while American troops could be regarded as bystander victims of this proxy war.

Table of Contents:

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 5 |
| Opening Comments | 9 |
| A Summary of History | 11 |
| Allah | 15 |
| Quran | 19 |
| Sharia Law | 25 |
| Moslem Invasion, Islamic Empire | 27 |
| Sunni, Shia | 33 |
| Coming of Mongol (End of Arab Domination)..... | 39 |
| Turks and Turkic Osman Empire | 43 |
| Wahhabism, Bahatism | 49 |
| Forbidden Comments | 53 |
| Iran after 1979 | 67 |
| Proxy War of Wahhabi and Shia | 69 |
| Right Policy | 73 |
| Shadow Government of Iran..... | 77 |

Introduction:

Iran is one the most important strategic locations in the World and will be a strategic treasure of China and Russia.

The World's three biggest conquests—those of Alexander the Great (330 BCE), Moslems (640 CE) and Mongols (1230 CE)--would not have happened without conquering Iran.

At the crossroads of the Silk Road, and as a “Bridge to Victory” for the Allied forces in the Second World War, as pointed out by Sir Winston Churchill, no other country in the world has been run by so many conquerors as Iran. These conquerors, after occupying and committing enormous massacres and genocide, stayed in Iran and became Iranian. Furthermore, no other country in the world, except perhaps, the United States of America, can claim to have so much ethnic diversity and so many immigrants as Iran, with one difference— Iran has held together this huge number of immigrants over the course of three thousand years, but America in three hundred years.

Four thousand years ago, when the Aryan people migrated South, one part went to India and other chose a fertile land to the southwest. They called their new home *Iran*, derived from *Aryan*. They formed the first government in history, and they aligned themselves in a peaceful process of the unification of Meds and Persians, and chose Cyrus the Great, the King of Kings, The Shahanshah of Persia. The Cyrus doctrine of governing became the cornerstone of the present Declaration of the Human Right, which is treasured as “The Cyrus Seal.” It was written on clay, is 2,600 years old, and in the United Nation with a poem from Sadi, the 13th Century Persian Poet:

*Human beings are members of a whole,
In creation of one essence and soul.
If one member is afflicted with pain,
Other members uneasy will remain.
If you've no sympathy for human pain,
The name of human you cannot retain!*

In 1979, the Iranian Revolution was described “as an earthquake” by Moshe Dian. Some called it a big flood or a hurricane or a revolution or a revolt. Whatever it was, it changed the geopolitics of the Middle East. One can connect anything happening in the Middle East, one way or another to Iran, since the event of 1979.

Iran, an unknown name to many ordinary people before 1979, has since become associated with any terrorist activity in the world, and has gained attention as a major threat to world security for its nuclear ambitions. Iran is deemed an undefeated member of the “Axis of Evil,” and has conducted an eight year war by herself against another “Evil” who had the support of the whole world. Iran is a record holder worldwide for political prisoners and executions, with a highly corrupt and brutal government, with only 10% popularity against the rest of the country who demonstrate three million strong. Perhaps the greatest enemy of the United States and Israel, according to the media, but according to popular surveys conducted by both Iran and the U.S.-- popularity of the U.S. and Israel among people on the street in Iran is the highest in the world.

This great enemy is part of the “Axis of Evil,” and accused of any terrorist activities against the United States, but on September 12, 2001, more than one hundred thousand spectators at a football game stood up and observed one minute of silence. That night they gathered in Mohseni Square in Tehran with vigilant candles in their hands. Smaller gatherings happened all over Iran in spite of the government crackdown. The Iranian sympathy for America following 9/11 was second only to the grief within the U.S.

How it is possible, one asks?

Because of the perplexity of Iran.

If one understands a basic history of the region, where Iran has always been a major player, the situation becomes clear and solutions could be found for the problems in the Middle East.

Otherwise if one goes there with a cowboy mentality, we end up where we are now.

Americans grow up seeing too many John Wayne movies, where a good and powerful sheriff goes to a town full of criminals, with his fast gun and strong fists, kills all the bad guys, and then the movie ends with emotional march music and everybody feels good when they leave the theater. If this applies to our behavior with the rest of the world, it results in the troubles that we have now.

The British ruled the world from a tiny island in the corner of Europe, without depending on their military and naval might alone. Rather, it depended

on egregious politicians and their relation to the elite of the “commonwealth” countries. They were sending their intelligent servicemen abroad, studying the history and mentality of the people and letting local politicians do the work for them.

How does one expect successes in Iraq and Afghanistan, when many of our people don't even understand the basic differences between Sunni, Shia, and Wahhabi?

The military might of the United States and bravery of its personnel can defeat anybody on the ground of any country with the speed that a tank moves. That is about 30 miles an hour. Nothing can stop this military might.

But what should be done next?

Our military did an extraordinary job a decade ago, in Afghanistan and Iraq. But the politicians have been arguing with each other about what to do next ever since.

After almost ten years occupying Iraq and Afghanistan, only one statesman has said something which made sense. It was Tony Blair who said—our war in Iraq and Afghanistan would never end until we solve the problem of Iran.

In the next few pages, we will briefly go through some historical events and will conclude that a regime change in Iran, *without* military intervention, is the only solution. This will be a long process that may take years, after everyone is in agreement and starts taking action.

Opening Comments:

After the Second World War, the ideological world was divided into two blocs—Communism and Capitalism. Each of these two blocs threatened the other one by advancing their military technology, economy and standard of living. The Third World countries, in a state between wakefulness and sleep, with their eyes half open and with no incentive to stand up, only watched the

warlords. Very small minorities in the Third World knew the developed countries had centuries of Enlightenment, Industrial Revolution and two World Wars behind them as why they are called “Developed Countries”. As winners of the Second World War, they got together and established the United Nations, and others happily joined them as if they were equal partners. They also embraced each other and signed the Declaration of Human Right.

Countries who had three centuries of enlightenment, industrial revolution and wars behind them were ready and capable to advance towards Modernity and a better life for their citizens, while the Third World, frustrated from being so behind, and not having the strength to catch up with the advancement of the industrial world, looked at their back, perhaps to find a vehicle or a flying machine to catch up with those who were far ahead of them.

The Third World countries in the last century included those of South America, Southeast Asia, Africa and the Middle East. South America and Southeast Asia looked at their back and didn't find anything but invasion of Europe, and couldn't see anything further. So with a slow pace, they started walking. This slow and consistent walk resulted in a 21st Century they could see, at the horizon, just behind the advanced nations, and they decided to continue running. In Africa, the destruction of slavery, poverty, and neglect has been so deep that they gave up running, but continued waking, and perhaps by some luck, they could catch up in the future.

But the situation in the Third World of the Middle East, in the past century and now, is a perplex situation. The advanced nations, after World War II, divided the Middle East among themselves not as colony, but as a mixture of colony and territories of influence. They paid them from oil revenue, constructing modern buildings, and given fancy cars and machines aimed at keeping them happy. They were happy and half asleep, half awake and with no desire or muscle to run. They started walking, but looked at their backs, hoping to find something.

By looking back, there is nothing but Islam.

In the past century, some Middle Eastern leaders, believing Islam is nothing but running backward, decided to use nationalist pride and history as a tool for advancement in this vast territory from Pakistan to Morocco that is dominated by Islam.

A Summary of History

Before the rise of Islam, fourteen centuries ago, the Middle East was the Persian Empire of Iran, with a piece of desert land called Arabia, smaller than present Saudi Arabia, where neither Iranian nor Roman had any interest in occupation. However, they were collecting taxes, with Jewish tribes in Medina collecting taxes for Iran, and Abu Sufyan in Makkah collecting taxes for Rome.

The Arabian Peninsula was largely arid and volcanic, making agriculture difficult, except near oases or springs. Thus the Arabian landscape was dotted with towns and cities near those oases, two prominent of which were Makkah and Medina (then known as Yathrib). Communal life was essential for survival in desert conditions, as people needed support against the harsh environment and lifestyle. The tribal grouping was thus encouraged by the need to act as a unit. This unity was based on the bond of kinship by blood. People of Arabia were either nomadic or sedentary, the former constantly traveling from one place to another seeking water and pasture for their flocks, while the latter settled and focused on trade and agriculture. The survival of nomads was also partially dependent on raiding caravans or oases; therefore they didn't see this as a crime.

Medina was a large flourishing agricultural settlement, while Makkah was an important financial center for many of the surrounding tribes. In pre-Islamic Arabia, gods or goddesses were viewed as protectors of individual tribes and their spirits were associated with sacred trees, stones, springs and wells.

There was an important shrine in Makkah (now called the Kaaba) that housed statues of 360 idols of tribal patron deities and was the site of an annual pilgrimage. Aside from these tribal gods, Arabs shared a common belief in a supreme deity Allah (literally "the God") who was, however, remote from their everyday concerns and thus not the object of cult or ritual. Three goddesses were associated with Allah as His daughters: al-Lat, Manat and al-Uzza.

Other monotheistic communities also existed in Arabia, including Christians and Jews. According to post-Islam tradition, Mohammad himself was a descendant of Ishmael, son of Abraham.

There was only one recognized Arabic kingdom as part of the Persian Empire in Hira. In fact Iranians formed this local Kingdom in Hira near the present city of Kufa, Iraq, to protect the Iranian cities from looting by some residents of the Arabian Desert.

Al Hira was a significant city in pre-Islamic Arab history. Originally a military encampment, in the 5th and 6th centuries, it became the capital of the Lakhmid kingdom. The Arabs were migrating into the Near East from the 9th century BCE. In the 3rd century BCE parts of southern Mesopotamia had a

substantial Arab population. Under the Persian Sassanid Empire, southern Mesopotamia was sometimes called Arabistan (Stan is a suffix meaning “province” in Persian, such as, Afghanistan meaning “Province of Afghan”). The first historical Arab kingdom outside Arabia, Hīra (4th-7th centuries), in southern Iraq, was a vassalage of the Sassanians, whom it helped in containing the nomadic Arabs to the south. The Lakhmid rulers of Hīra were recognized by Shapur II (337-358 CE).

Hīra was either Christian or strongly influenced by Christianity, and was a diocese of the Syriac Church of the East between the 5th and 7th centuries. The Sassanian Emperor Bahram V won the throne with support of Mundhir I, Lakhmid Prince of Hīra, in 420. In 531, the Sassanid Persians defeated the Byzantine general Belisarius at the Battle of Callinicum, south of Edessa (southeastern Turkey), with the help of Hīra. In 602, Khosrau II deposed Nu'man III of Hīra and annexed his kingdom. Many believe removal of this kingdom made the Persian Empire vulnerable at its southeastern borders, as late Arab Moslems overran the Sassanid Empire in the 7th century.

From about 527, Hīra was opposed by the Ghassanids, a Byzantine-sponsored Arab tribe residing in Syria and Palestine. The two Arab powers engaged in a long conflict of their own, which also functioned as a proxy war for their respective imperial suzerains.

It's worth knowing the power sharing in this area before the invasion of newly-Moslem Arabs to Iran, who occupied its government, located in present-day Iraq.

The word *Iraq*, derived from *Irānk*, means “Little Iran,” and although it became a center of Islamic empire later, it never missed its link to Iran. Persian Iraq (Iraq e Ajam), also spelled “Persian Irak,” is an obsolete term for the central region of Iran, including cities such as Isfahan, Ray, Qazvin, and Kashan. From the 11th to 16th centuries, the term *Iraq* referred to two distinct regions: Arabian Iraq corresponded with ancient Mesopotamia (roughly the current nation of Iraq), while Persian Iraq corresponded with ancient Media. The two regions were separated by the Zagros Mountains.

Later, until the beginning of the 20th century, the term *Iraq* in Iran was used to refer to a much smaller region south of Saveh and West of Qom. This region was centered by Sultanabad, which was renamed later as Arāk.

It is also worth mentioning the word *Baghdad* means “God given” in the old Persian language, and it was a suburb of the Iranian capital city of Tisfune

and subsequently named Madaen (meaning *cities* in Arabic) by Moslem occupiers. The city of Baghdad, which became the capital of the Islamic Empire, was built by materials taken from Tisfune (the ruins of Tisfune are historic site near Baghdad).

Arabia had two cities: Makkah and Medina. These two cities were located in the middle of a trading route from North to South. Tribes of cities and the desert used to keep their idols in “the House of Kaaba” in Makkah. Every year, for one month—exactly with the same ceremony that Moslems go to Makkah for “Hajj” now—they would gather and go around the House of Kaaba and worship their idols. The only difference between then and now is in the wording of their prayers.

The city of Medina (city of the prophet Mohammad) was more an agricultural city dominated primarily by four large Jewish tribes and two Arab tribes. The rest of Arabia was scattered with primitive Arab tribes scattered in the desert living in tents.

We should also know that Makkah was a place where everybody was free to practice his or her religion, and this society was the most pluralistic society in the history of mankind.

.....continue

Allah

In pre-Islamic times, Allah was not new to Arabs, and there were four people who were claiming they were the messengers of Allah. Even the idol worshipers believed in Allah as a supreme God and they were worshipping their other idols to connect to Allah.

Mohammad father’s name was Abdo Allah (meaning servant of Allah).

At the beginning of seventh century, before the rise of Islam, there were four people claiming to be the Messenger of Allah and inviting people to worship “One God,” Allah.

They were: Aswad Ansi from tribe of Mazhaj and Kandah, Talyheh from Tribe of Bani Asad, Musaylimah from Tribe of Bani Hanifeh and one woman called Saja from Tribe of Bani tamim. The number of followers of these four in Arabia was estimated to be more than two thousand, before the followers of Mohammad crashed them.

.....continue

Our'an

In that pluralistic environment of Makkah, Mohammad recorded 86 chapters of the Qur'an, which Moslems believe was revealed through the angel Gabriel from Allah. He advocated his new religion of Islam for 13 years, from 610 till 622 CE in Makkah.

Moslems believe that the Qur'an was precisely memorized, recited and written down exactly by Mohammad's companions (Sahaba) after each revelation was dictated by him. These 86 chapters of Qur'an sound more like the New Testament, a rewrite of stories from the Bible, with the most sublime Arabic poetry.

When Mohammad's uncle died at 622 CE, shortly after the death of his wife, he lost his financial and political supporters, and was forced to immigrate to Medina with his followers. According to the majority of historians their number was less than fifty individuals.

Year 622 CE marks the beginning of the Islamic calendar and is called the year of "Hijra," meaning "journey" or "immigration" in Arabic. The 86 Chapters written in thirteen years, includes many stories of the Bible. These stories were new and refreshing for the Jewish and Christian communities in Medina. These 86 Chapters made the Jewish tribes welcome Mohammad and give him all their support, but the situation changed after the first year.

.....continue

Sharia Law

Sharia Law is actually redundant, as Sharia itself means "law." Sharia is derived from two primary sources of Islamic law: the precepts set forth in the Qur'an, and the example set by the Islamic prophet Mohammad in the Sunnah (meaning behavior of the Prophet). Fiqh jurisprudence interprets and extends the application of sharia to questions not directly addressed in the primary sources by including secondary sources. These secondary sources usually include the consensus of the religious scholars embodied in Majority (ijma), and analogy from the Quran and Sunnah through Compare (qiyas). Shi'a jurists prefer to apply Reasoning ('aql, meaning intellectual reasoning) rather than analogy in order to address difficult questions.

.....continue

Arab Invasion, Islamic Empire

Mohammad, after thirteen years preaching Islam in Makkah by 86 Chapters of the Qur'an, finally immigrated to Medina, altogether with less than fifty people, who were later called "Mohajer," meaning "immigrants" in Arabic.

In Medina, those who joined him were called "Ansar," meaning "helpers" in Arabic.

One of these Ansar, who later became a member of the prophet Muhammad's household, a confidant and right-hand man, was an Iranian Mazdaki (Mazdaki was an Iranian religion), who escaped prosecution and found refuge among the Jewish tribes of Medina. His name was Salman Parsi. Salman, thirteen years later, became the first Governor of Tisfune, the fallen capital of Persia, after the defeat of the Persian Army by Arab Moslems.

Many stories have been said about Salman, even blasphemed words; "he wrote the Qur'an."

He was one of many of the people who recorded the Qur'an, called "Kateb," but he cannot be the writer of the Qur'an, since half the Qur'an was revealed to Mohammad before these two met in Medina.

Salman was a scholar and strategist. His social and military advice helped Moslems build an empire.

One credit given to Salman which all historians agree on is the victory of Moslems in the Battle of Khandag, where Salman led that battle, and dug a trench in front of the enemy forces, enabling Moslems to win that very crucial and important battle. This victory led to many other victories and the rise of Islam.

Change of tone in the Medini chapters are credited to Salman, as he was the one who advised Mohammad of the idea that they should encourage Moslems to attack non-Moslems and confiscate their wealth and women—and if the fighters or jihadists are killed, they will go to heaven. There was a distribution of wealth after plundering the defeated army, where one-fifth goes to the leader for the continuation of battle, and the rest distributed equally among fighters. Other rules and advice are credited to this Iranian right hand of Mohammad.

.....continue

Sunni & Shi'a

Sunni Islam is the largest branch of Islam. Sunni Moslems are referred to as "people of the tradition of Mohammad and the community."

Sunni Islam is sometimes referred to as the orthodox version of the

religion. The word "Sunni" comes from the term *Sunnah*, which refers to the sayings and actions of Mohammad that are recorded in hadiths (collections of narrations regarding Mohammad). Anyone claiming to follow the Sunnah, who can demonstrate that they have no action or belief against the prophetic Sunnah can consider themselves to be a Sunni Moslem. However, it should be noted that Shi'a Moslems also hold that they follow the Sunnah.

.....continue

Origin of the Shi'a

According to Encyclopedia Britannica and others, the Shi'a are believed to have started as a political party and developed into a religious movement, influencing Sunnis and producing a number of important sects. Early in the history of Islam, the Shi'as were a political faction that supported the power of Ali (the fourth caliph, successor of Mohammad) and, later, that of his descendants.

Disagreement broke out more than 100 years after the death of four successors of Mohammad, over who should have been successor of Mohammad as leader of the Moslem community. While the Sunnis followed the companions of Mohammad, the Shi'a argued that Ali should have been followed. This dispute eventually led to the "First Fitna" (mutiny), which was the first major civil war within the Islamic Caliphate.

Rise of Shi'a through History:

.....Continue

Mongols and Turks

At 1200 The Arab Moslem caliphate was limited to an area from Baghdad to Basra, where the Abbasid Dynasty ruled. The Kurds built their government of Ayyubid Sultanates and Iran was ruled independently by a different Iranian government. However, all these newly independent Moslem governments, because of the people's religious beliefs, regarded the caliphate as the descendant of the prophet Mohammad, and needed approval from the ruler of Baghdad for legitimacy and even for paying taxes to Baghdad.

The Mongol invasion of Iran and the subsequent annihilation of the Arab caliphate, although bringing Iranian territories much greater destruction and massacre than Arab invasion, had only one benefit. That was the end of Arab rule, and the end of paying taxes to the Arab caliphate, after 600 consecutive years.

.....continue

Turks and Turkic Othman Empire

It is premature to study the Osman (Othman) Turkic Empire without learning about other Turkic conquerors whose origins are from Central Asia, and not to remember that Mongol and Turks have originated from the same area.

.....continue

Wahhabism

Wahhabism (Salafi) is a religious movement or a branch of Islam.

It was developed by an 18th century Moslem theologian (Mohammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab) (1703–1792) from Najd, Saudi Arabia. Ibn Abdul Al-Wahhab advocated purging Islam of what he considered to be impurities and innovations.

Wahhabism is the dominant form of Islam in Saudi Arabia.

Ibn Abd-al-Wahhab was invited to settle in neighboring Diriyah by its ruler Mohammad ibn Saud in 1740, two of whose brothers had been students of Ibn Abdal-Wahhab. Upon arriving in Diriyya, a pact was made between Ibn Saud and Ibn Abd-al-Wahhab, by which Ibn Saud pledged to implement and enforce Ibn Abd-al-Wahhab's teachings, while Ibn Saud and his family would remain the temporal "leaders" of the movement. By eighteen hundred the British removed Hashemi Rulers of Arabia and giving them Hashemi Kingdom of Jordan and Saudi family was given the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with Wahhabi as their official religion.

.....continue

Forbidden Comments

So far, we have been copying facts from history books and have pasted some maps from the internet encyclopedia Wikipedia in order to not be accused of blasphemy, which might impose a death penalty by sharia judges!

However, using the above permitted information, we must very carefully go deeper into the Wahhabi and Shi'a belief to understand the hatred and differences between these two. Without understanding this, one will never understand one of the main conflicts in the Middle East!

We are not writing for those series of popular books “For Dummies.” But to understand the situation we must present a dummy analogy and ask for few minutes to imagine a hypothetical situation happening in the United States:

Imagine in San Francisco, a group of gay people gather and build a church for themselves and rewrite some parts of Bible and of the Hymns and say: “Jesus was gay. God Forgive me!” Imagine this new cult becomes very popular and half of the people in San Francisco become followers of this new church. In this case, fanatic Catholic suicide bombers blow up their church, and roadside bombs blow up their parades. The Federal Government will send National Guards to bring peace and order between Catholics and the Church of Gays. Snipers from both sides will kill some National Guards and conflict will escalate. The debates will start in Congress. The side that has more influence—congress will take their side. The endless debates and arguments and killing will go on and on until one day the elites and educated people of San Francisco come to their senses and resolve their differences.

The federal government should learn this—one cannot resolve emotional disputes between factions of societies with force. It may calm down the situation, but very soon the violence will erupt worse than before.
.....continue

IRAN after 1979

Once Henry Kissinger wrote: “Iran is the most natural ally of the United States.”

After the events of 1979 and the release of the devil from the bottle, the geopolitics of the Middle East changed completely.

The era of superpowers sending their intelligent servicemen to Arabia to create nations and draw lines on the maps to make borders, and giving Independence to their colonies or planning coup-d’ètat was over!

Since 1979, nothing could be predicted in this part of the world. We could only watch what happens and adjust our policies accordingly.

When President Bush (father) talked about “New World Order,” we didn’t know what he meant and still wondering what he had in mind.

In the decade after 1979, while the only concern of U.S. policy makers was the Soviet Union and the expansion of Communism, a silent and undeclared war started between the two “Devils”: Saudi Wahhabism and Khomeini Shiaism.

After the fall of communism, these two Devils were so strong politically that all the world's big players took sides according to their national interests. China and Russia took the side of the Islamic Republic of Khomeini and the U.S. took the side of the Saudis with Europe playing on both sides.

None of the events in the past 33 years have opened American eyes to see the dangers, which threaten our country. Even the 9/11 disasters did not wake up the policy makers; our friends are the cause of the problem. Even killing the mastermind of 9/11 in Pakistan will not make us ponder—who are our real allies?

The popular revolt of 1979 in Iran against the dictatorship had only one alternative, because the Shah, the American puppet dictator, had destroyed all the democratic institutions of Iran, and the parliamentary system, which had roots since 1900. When the people of Iran searched for a leader, they could not find anybody alive except Khomeini; Shah himself was superstitious and religious-minded.

People of Iran looked at this unknown white-bearded clergy sitting under a tree and preaching democracy, freedom and prosperity. They fell in love with what he was preaching.

Democracy and prosperity, this old Ayatollah was promising for the future of Iran. That excited everybody. Some people looking up believed they were seeing his face in the moon!

Ayatollah Khomeini preached and said he will not touch anything, and after an election, he will retire in Qom to read, pray and preach.

Communists, Christians, Jews, Baha’is, atheists, left wing, right wing, poor, rich—everybody loved him and would die for him.

It took only a few months after Khomeini was in control that people started wondering what was happening. When he was asked about discrepancies between what he was saying in Paris and what he is actually doing, he replied: “Prophet Mohammad changed his word for victory of Islam and my mission is to bring sharia laws. For that I will even give a holiday to the pillar of the religion to reach to that goal.”

It is a known fact that fascism survives with crises and by making imaginary enemies and war.

Hostage-taking, the Iran-Iraq war, which brought down Iranian dignity, wealth and pride—guaranteed the survival of the regime for another 33 years. And by that token, they pray for another war to further guarantee their survival.

Proxy War

There has been a proxy war going on for the last 33 years between Saudi Wahhabism and the Shi'a Islamic Regime of Iran.

Before 9/11, the popularity of these two ideologies among Moslem fanatics was measured with the degree of harm they could bring to Israel and the USA. Before 9/11, Wahhabism was well behind Shi'a fanatics after hostage-taking, an 8-year war, and Lebanon explosions. But 9/11 put Wahhabism and its heroes well ahead of Shi'a fanatics.

Harm to the US has come primarily from Wahhabis and harm to the US's true friend and ally, Israel, have come equally from Wahhabi and Shi'a ideologies.

Because of our thirst for oil, we cannot tell our Saudi & United Arab Emirates friends—“stop financing and supporting terrorism by spending billions of dollars every year in India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Chechnya, Iraq, and all the other countries in the Middle East.”

Even if we have the courage and make such a comment, Saudis would reply—“what about the spread of Shi'a in the Middle East and Central Asia?”

Recent events in Bahrain and Syria are a good example of such a complexity.

Since killing five Shi'a guarantees entrance to heaven for the Wahhabi believers, it leaves no alternative for Islamic Republic of Khomeini to defend themselves and expand, in order to counter Wahhabism. There is no solution to this problem, since it has been going on since creation of Wahhabism 220 years ago.

Among thousands of children who are studying Wahhabism in the madrasas, financed by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in India and Pakistan, there will be a few nuclear scientists or highly-educated men in the next decades, and these few individuals may cause greater harm to the U.S. than 9/11.

To prevent such a disaster and to find a solution for this problem, we must start with the idea of a **“change of regime in Iran.”** Not by invading or bombing Iran, the way the neocons of the Bush era had in mind.

It is frightening that the fight against terrorism is as an endless one and its prospects do not seem to be encouraging.

Tony Blair once said: “the fight against terrorism with the present regime in Iran is meaningless.”

If the regime is changed in Iran, the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq will be “Iranianize,” naturally (Just like good old days)!

Regime in Iran must be changed, not for the security of the United States or Israel, but for the sake of Humanity!

We should first recognize that the Islamic Government of Iran is as fanatic as the Taliban of Afghanistan, and is as brutal as the Saddam Regime of Iraq and it is twice bigger than the combination of those two in wealth and size.

The only way that we can stop, control, suppress and eliminate Wahhabi Terror is by changing the Shi'a Regime in Iran.

This can be done with no financial cost or military involvement by the US if we have a plan and strategy and let the people of Iran do the job with no foreign involvement.

The up-rise of 2009 in Iran, which was a trigger for Arab Spring, is not dead in Iran. As a matter of fact, it is like a fire under ash.

The change of regime in Iran will happen by those Iranians who live in Iran (internal oppositions) and leaders of the future regime are those who live in Iran.

There are approximately 5 million Iranians living outside Iran. We must remember these people have neither influence nor acceptability by the people who live in Iran for the leadership in the future regime of Iran.

Statistics and polls taken, even by the Islamic Regime in 1999, indicate the following:

75% of the Iranian livings in Iran have favorable thoughts about America, which is higher than Europe, while this percentage among Arab countries is as low as 10%.

90% of Iranians living outside Iran (external opposition) are in favor of “Regime Change.” The remaining 10% are the recent immigrants who have business ties with the regime.

Popularity of the Islamic Regime is less than 20% in Iran, which includes some religious people who are more or less neutral. But the 5% “hard core” who rule Iran have the military, intelligence, wealth and the Government of the country in their hands.

The number of female graduates from universities in Iran is higher than that of males. Percentage of internet users is the highest in the region. The number of bloggers is among highest in the world. According to the Commander of Sepah, the number face-book users in Iran are seventeen million and growing.

This army of a dissatisfied 80% of people who oppose the regime in Iran will change the Islamic Regime if the American administration only sympathizes with them.

The 5 million Iranian who live outside Iran, having freedom of speech must be the voice for Iran, and give those who live there a direction.

What could be the US policy?

Rather than bombing or invading Iran for a few months and scarifying the lives of thousands of innocent people and spending billions of dollars for

decades, there is a more humane and intelligent way, which may take only a few years with no sacrifice of human life or financial loss.

The American administration doing “nothing except sympathizing” means the following:

In Sympathy with the Iranian people, the administration should increase sanctions, and extend that to sanctioning the top Iranian leaders and their **families and business partners**. A partial blockade of oil sale, which is a primary source of income for terrorism.

Press for human rights and bring those who are doing crimes against humanity to the world's attention.

Use the intelligence agencies to show the corruption of Ayatollahs and their families.

For example, when 2 billion pounds in the account belonging to the son of Ayatollah Khamenai was frozen in England, it should have been publicized over and over.

Or when \$18 billion belonging to Ayatollah Khamenai was confiscated in Turkey on its way to Syria, the U.S. should have intervened and frozen this money for a future regime of Iran.

There is also the most obvious and popular embezzlement of \$3 billion, which even every kid in Iran knows about (who could be the primary link to this theft).

All the Ayatollahs and top administrators and their families have big bank accounts outside Iran.

How is it everybody knows about the existence of these accounts and intelligence services cannot find the names of these account holders to introduce them to the ordinary people of Iran?

Let us only sympathize with the Iranians by introducing their atrocities, and keeping that in the record for the future prosecutions.

The ideal case would be helping to indict Khamenai and his sons and top Iranian administration with crimes against humanity in the International Court of Justice.

These actions mean sympathy for Iran, while being aware that the leaders of the present regime pray that the U.S. take a military action towards Iran to solidify and strengthen their position and their nuclear ambitions.

External opposition living outside Iran should only be a voice to give them direction, NOT claiming the leadership.

That means:

The Iranian Opposition outside Iran consists of many Iranian political factions, from old communist (Tudeh) to the Monarchist, National Front, Mujahideen (Iranian Jihadists, MKO), Pan-Iranist, and National-Religious. The resent immigrants and many Iranians who have no ideology except regime-change and freeing Iran from dictatorship.

These groups have one idea in common: change of regime. But, they dislike each other, and people living in Iran have not any regard for them either. Their attitudes towards each other are like right-wingers in the Tea Party and left-wingers in the Democratic Party or the religious and atheist group of the United States.

There might be a lot of differences among these opposite sides in the US, but they are united in one thing: to believe in and protect the constitution of the United States.

The opposition outside Iran cannot be the voice or give direction to the people of Iran unless they draft an agreement or constitution for the future of Iran here in the US, where they are free to do so, and under this constitution, become united for acting as the voice of Iran, to give direction to the people living in Iran.

This agreement, or constitution, or Bill of Rights could be a draft and as short as one page!

Let us consider the following draft and one will see that most of those mentioned groups of Iranians, who want to be the future leaders, after freeing Iran, cannot even agree on these few words.

If they could not agree on these, how can they expect, by any chance, this dictatorship to be removed? How can these people put in place a civil society in Iran?

Here is that draft of an agreement:

We The People of Iran, in order to form a more perfect country, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for Iran so that all of its articles never ever contradict with the “Declaration of the Human Right” and Religion to be separate from the Government forever and all

the people of Iran, man and women with any religion of ideology to be equal and have the same right.

There must be the following six articles in our future constitution that will never change:

1-All the articles of the constitution should be according to the Declaration of the Human Right.

2-All the people of Iran—men and women, with any religion or ideology or any belief have equal right.

3-Religion must be separate from government forever.

4-President of the country cannot serve for more than two terms.

5-The highest ceremonial figure of the country, which could be called Shah or Leader or The Chosen One or any other name, will be introduced by the elected Presided to the elected Parliament and with 2/3 parliament majority will be selected for 10 years with no executive power and acts only in ceremonies, similar to the European Monarchs.

6-Top members of the Executive Branch, Speaker of the Majles, Shah, Leader and Chief Justice should have been a resident of Iran more than two-thirds of their life.

If the Iranian oppositions could agree on these few principals, then they could be recognized as The Iranian Opposition, and voices of the deprived and depressed residents of Iran.

These few words may seem very simple and one might assume that all of those 5 million Iranians outside Iran and all the Iranians at home agree with it. But one will be surprised how these people whom the U.S. administration was counting on them as possible future leaders of Iran disagree with these six points.

Remember Chalabi in Iraq? The majority of those people, whom the U.S. counts on for the future of Iran and have free access to the Congress, are very similar to Chalabi. To avoid any future embarrassment, first of all we must not interfere with the uprising in Iran and only sympathize with the people and let them do the job themselves.

We should also let the Iranian opposition outside Iran know that U.S. administration will only listen to those who believe and agree with the above articles of the Iranian Draft Constitution.

Shadow Government of Iran

The experience in Afghanistan and Iraq showed that the U.S. military might and bravery of its troops toppled the Taliban and Saddam in no time.

It is a proven fact that the U.S. military can invade and occupy any territory in this century with the speed that a tank moves and an Army alongside.

But what about after the fall of the enemy?

It may take years or forever to replace dictatorship with a democratic regime. Because a constitution for a government, which should replace a dictatorship, was not drafted before the fall of the dictators.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, it took several years until there were elections, and they wrote a constitution, which the fanatics put holes in, so they could enter from that hole and gradually establish their sharia laws.

Perhaps what is happening in Egypt nowadays would be another example. The Salafis (Wahhabis) with false pretenses show their democratic face at the beginning. As soon as they are elected, they will show their true face and will try establishing sharia law in Egypt.

Remember Ayatollah sitting under tree, saying nice words at first, and then what he did few months after he grabbed power?

This has happened over and over, again and again.

Remember how Moslem immigrants came to France. They, as a deprived minority used the French constitution and established themselves as French citizens at first. A few years later they burned Paris to establish Sharia Laws.

With these experiences behind us, what should be done in Iran?

Very simple: these five million literate Iranians outside Iran should write a constitution with those six principals mentioned before.

Present that to the people who live in Iran until a majority agreement is reached. This time, people should come out speaking with one voice, and have a roadmap, or, a constitution, in their hand.

This time when they come out in millions, like last time, they don't need to be shouting: "where is my vote?" or "down with the leader!"

This time they will shout: "Viva Constitution!"

If this slogan is coordinated with civil disobedient and superpowers pressure, we will have a non-violent removal of the regime.

New Iranian regime will not punish the old regime leaders by killing or putting them in person. Making them pay back stolen national wealth and community service is a better option.

We want an Iran where the clergies go back to the mosques and they should not have any governing duties.

We want a military to be for the service of the people instead of serving the corrupt clergies.

We want people to obey by the law and respect the new Constitution.