

# **SOLEIMANI and TRUMP**

## **USA and Iran, two strategies compatible with each other**

January 5 2019

The news came in during the last few hours: the Iranian general in command of the al-Quds Forces (the elite corps of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard), Qassem Soleimani, was killed in Baghdad by an American drone attack. The "execution" took place after pro-Iranian militias, the same that previously assaulted unarmed demonstrations against the regime, besieged the US embassy in Baghdad and killed an American contractor. This was certainly not a revolutionary action, but it had the obvious purposes of splitting the Iraqi revolutionary movement, trying to create a fake anti-American front, and stealing consent from the ongoing revolt against the same regime that is protected by both the Islamic Republic and the US government. This action was conducted exactly when the Islamists of the al-Sadr movement (a force represented in the Iraqi parliament, but officially considered as joining the "protest") were close to withdraw their militants from the mobilization, allowing in this way the beginning of a further wave of fierce repression against the popular revolt.

Over the past 30 years, Soleimani has led Iranian military operations in the Middle East through a network of affiliated militias in several different country, such as in Iraq (after the 2003 American invasion), in Lebanon with Hezbollah, in Syria in support of Assad, in Gaza supporting Hamas, in Yemen through the Houthi factions, and in Afghanistan. He was closely linked to the Supreme Leader Khamenei and has always led the repression of the reformist opposition movements at home (as in 2009 thanks to the basij squads). The latest estimates of human rights organizations count 1500 people killed in the popular uprisings in Iran, at least 500 in Iraq and we do not know how many in Lebanon. Furthermore thousands were wounded and thousands arrested (how many of them subjected to torture?). These are all due to the "Soleimani model".

This criminal advocate of theocracy is hated by the populations that were humiliated by the political, economic and social oppression carried on by the Islamic Republic. This appears clear looking at the exultant crowds in the Iraqi squares following his death.

This shows the joy for the end of a powerful and sadistic enemy, it is not an endorsement of the assassin Trump who ordered his elimination: the Iraqis do not forget that the Iranian occupiers arrived in Iraq with American tanks.

The media does not give space to the voice of the revolt.

Nobody thinks that it is the duty of the media to bring to people's attention the fact that it was precisely the insurrectionary movement that broke the conflictual symmetry of a static balance between the Iranian regional power and the US superpower. This balance was precisely what allowed the United States to keep in check the ayatollahs while enabling them to stay in power, even if under sanctions, because of the ayatollah' economic dominance over another oppressed country. Certainly, Trump would welcome a change at the top of the Iranian government to establish a weaker one, but he would never want to see the regime (not the government) questioned by a popular revolution. Certainly, the Iranian regime would like to get rid of the US sanctions while maintaining control of the energy resources and the economy through the corrupt sectarian management system. A revolutionary movement that tries to subvert the system is dangerous for both. The loss of hegemony over Iraq could stop Iranian expansionism (and its gas pipelines) towards the

Mediterranean coasts and the Iraqi independence would force a military intervention of the United States to keep their influence in the Gulf.

The siege of the US embassy by the pro-Iranian Islamist aimed to split the unity of the revolutionary movement by proposing an old scheme of anti-American revanchism and thus reducing the anti-sectarianism unity. Trump's response may have taken advantage from this maneuver to increase the chances of changing the top of the Islamic Republic' government, saving the regime as a whole.

This could be the death of the revolution in the Middle East, it could come out as an unintended and unwanted scenario of open war. However, the success of the revolutionaries in overwhelming the sectarian regime and carrying out a real change, and consequently putting obstacles to the sectarian conflict and to the Islamic far right, would result in an attack towards the revolutionaries themselves conducted by both the western coalition and Iran... However, the outcome would also depend on the existence of a progressive, internationalist, and truly anti-imperialist movement in Western countries, especially those of the Mediterranean basin.