


ATOMIC ISLAM

By Jerome R. Corsi, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

The repressive Iranian Islamic regime utilizes oil profits to support international terrorism. In the United States, the pro-Mullah lobby uses large campaign contributions to top Democratic Party politicians, including to John Kerry's 2004 presidential campaign, to influence America to endorse their anti-democratic agenda.



Specifically the pro-Iranian Islamic Regime lobby has three main goals:

- (1) to have normal diplomatic and economic relations established between the theocracy and the United States,
- (2) to allow the theocracy full status in the World Trade Organization, and
- (3) to provide Iran access to nuclear technology, including nuclear fuel.

One of John Kerry's top fund-raisers is **Hassan Nemazee**, a New York businessman who has served on the board of the American Iranian Council (AIC), a strong proponent of establishing full diplomatic and economic acceptance of Iran. On John Kerry's presidential campaign website, Nemazee is listed as one of the sixty people in the top tier of contributors, "Vice Chairs" who have contributed \$100,000 or more to John Kerry's campaign. According to his own admission, Nemazee has raised over \$500,000 for the Kerry presidential campaign.



During the first presidential debate, John Kerry restated his position that the United States should supply Iran with nuclear fuel. Kerry said, *"I think the United States should have offered the opportunity to provide the nuclear fuel, test them, see whether or not they were actually looking for it for peaceful purposes."*

On Monday, October 18, 2004, Mr. Nemazee was deposed in New York City. Under oath, he repudiated John Kerry's policy of trusting accommodation regarding the Mullahs currently ruling Iran, stating that Senator Kerry should be advised that the Iranian Islamic Regime cannot be trusted but to have any intention other than to build nuclear weapons. Mr. Nemazee originally sued Iranian freedom-advocate, Aryo Pirouznia, the leader of the Student Movement Coordination Committee for Democracy in Iran, charging Mr. Pirouznia with defamation for stating that Mr. Nemazee was an agent of the Iranian Islamic Republic. Mr. Pirouznia filed a counter suit, denying the charges.

Another activist linked with financing the Kerry campaign is **Susan Akbarpour**, an Iranian citizen who counter to US campaign finance laws has as a non-citizen made a campaign contribution to John Kerry's presidential campaign.



Akbarpour came to the United States in 1997 seeking political asylum. Yet, Akbarpour is on the record as being an outspoken proponent of the Mullahs and their repressive regime. Now married to Silicon Valley software executive Faraj Aalaie, Akbarpour has hosted conferences promoting venture capital investment by US firms in Iran, a development which would appear to violate the sanctions the US government has imposed on the Mullahs.

“IRAN-GATE” KERRY CAMPAIGN SCANDAL

According to investigative reporter Kenneth Timmerman, a campaign financing scandal is brewing for the Kerry presidential campaign. Mr. Timmerman writing in The Washington Times of October 15, 2004, sounded the alarm bell.



The Kerry-Edwards campaign is headed toward a campaign finance scandal involving contributions on behalf of a foreign power, similar to allegations that plagued Bill Clinton's re-election in 1996. Instead of Communist China, this time the foreign power seeking to influence a U.S. presidential campaign is the Islamic Republic of Iran, the world's premier state sponsor of international terror.

The Chinese sought U.S. military technology to enhance their nuclear missiles. The record shows the Clinton administration provided them key assistance in that area.

The so-called "Islamic" republic of Iran is seeking from Mr. Kerry a series of concessions that would allow them to become a nuclear weapons power and circumvent the restrictions of the USA Patriot act to infiltrate intelligence agents and potential terrorists into the United States.

IRAN: A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER TO THE WORLD

Iran's leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has urged his country to develop a nuclear weapon as a top priority. Reports quote Ayatollah Khamenei as exhorting his followers that, *"We must have two bombs ready to go in January or you are not Moslems."* The Financial Times reports that Iran's former president, Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, claims Iran has already developed a satellite-launching rocket with a range of 2,000 kilometers, more than enough to reach Israel.



The moment Iran has in its possession a nuclear weapon capable of being unleashed on Israel, the entire calculation in the Middle East changes. Israel will immediately fear for survival and millions of Christians all around the world will be rushing to their Bibles to reread the story of the Apocalypse.

PETROLEUM BLACKMAIL?

A nuclear-armed Iran, sitting on an estimated 40 percent of the world's known oil reserves might well adventure into petroleum blackmail, with the price of oil reaching \$100 or even \$200 a barrel.



Should John Kerry and the pro-Iran lobby in the US have its way and should we normalize diplomatic relations with Iran, instantly the terror-supporting regime will take advantage of relaxations in Patriot Act protections, using the diplomatic cover as an easy excuse to slip terrorists more readily across our borders.

In his October 18, 2004 deposition in New York City, even Mr. Nemazee characterized the Islamic Iranian Regime as a terror-supporting regime. Under oath, Mr. Nemazee stated that the Islamic Iranian Regime represents a threat, stressing that he would be delighted to see a regime change in Iran so the Mullahs would lose their political power.



As we enter 2005, we must remain vigilant against the threat of Iranian regime-supported terror. Iran's record of supporting Hezbollah and Hamas, terrorist organizations dedicated to sending suicide bombers into Israel with the goal of destroying the Jewish State of Israel, along with Iran's funding of insurgents, who right now are crossing the border into Iraq to cause political instability and attack American troops, are dangers of the highest order.

The European nations John Kerry typically wants to count as our ally's favor, along with him, providing the Iranian Mullahs with access to nuclear fuel, supposedly for peaceful purposes. These are the same European nations that willingly cooperated with Saddam Hussein in the United Nation's oil-for-fuel scandal in which they readily accepted oil money bribes and lucrative contracts to provide Iraq with economic and military assistance.

Iran has announced that it will reject any proposal, whether from the European nations or from John Kerry, which demanded that Iran halt its own uranium enrichment proposal. Yes, the Mullahs are willing to take nuclear fuel from anyone who will offer it, John Kerry or the European nations, as long as they reserve their right to enrich to weapons-grade the lower-grade nuclear fuel provided for peaceful purposes.



CONCLUSION

Currently the Islamic Iranian Regime is under sanctions from the US government. Our future may well depend on holding firm these sanctions, while pursuing a resolve that America will never tolerate an Iran armed with nuclear weapons. Should these mad Mullahs obtain nuclear weapons, who would reasonably doubt that they would use them, if not outright, then certainly for the political leverage the weapons would provide? The alarm bell is now sounded on this brewing crisis. The world cannot afford to ignore the danger.

Dr. Jerome R. Corsi holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University. His last book, ***Unfit for Command.** Swift Boat Veterans Speak Out Against John Kerry*, co-authored with John O'Neill, has made a strong impact on the 2004 presidential campaign. Dr. Corsi is currently completing a new book, *Atomic Islam*, to be published by World Net Daily Press in early 2005.




Related Stories...

Just naive, or breathtakingly stupid? By Dr. Jerome Corsi

October 15, 2004, WorldNetDaily.com

In the first presidential debate, John Kerry made a little noticed statement affirming his intention to provide Iran with nuclear fuel. *"I think the United States should have offered the opportunity to provide the nuclear fuel, test them, see whether or not they were actually looking for it for peaceful purposes."*

For those with a short memory, this was essentially the same policy the Clinton administration adopted toward **North Korea** - provide them nuclear fuel under the ridiculous assumption that Kim Jong II would only use the nuclear fuel for electricity. Hence, the growing nuclear arsenal being amassed in North Korea, a threat John Kerry inappropriately sources to President Bush's watch.



Two analogies immediately jump to mind. Let's let the children play with dynamite to see if they've grown mature enough not to blow themselves up with it. Or, why not sell scrap metal to the Japanese? Surely Tojo won't use it to make battleships and aircraft carriers, and besides, the fleet's safe at Pearl Harbor.

The idea that a Kerry administration would willingly arm a rogue regime that supports terrorists with nuclear fuel is either so naive or breathtakingly stupid that we are driven to find a more reasonable explanation for the bizarre policy.


Look no farther than Hassan Nemazee, one of John Kerry's top fund-raisers. Mr. Nemazee - since the early days of the Clinton administration - has been a staunch proponent of the radical Islamic mullahs now ruling Iran. The list of prominent Democratic politicians who have received generous campaign contributions from Nemazee include Bill Clinton, Al Gore, John Edwards, Ted Kennedy, Robert Torricelli, Jon Corzine, Joseph Biden, Charles Schumer and Richard Gepardt, to name a few. The records of the Federal Election Commission show that Nemazee makes no attempt to be "fair and balanced" in that Republican politicians, with a few notable exceptions such as Jessie Helms, rarely show up as recipients of Nemazee's largess.

What about all the oil Iran is sitting on? Doesn't the oil work in Iran to fuel power plants, just like it does here?

Kerry's campaign is on record supporting all these goals, even though John Edwards took the contrary position in the vice presidential debate when he maintained that a Kerry administration would want to increase sanctions on Iran. Doesn't sound like Edwards conferred with Kerry, who told the Council on Foreign Relations in December 2003 that *"As president, I will be prepared early on to explore areas of mutual interest with Iran, just as I was prepared to normalize relations with Vietnam a decade ago."*

This was the same John Kerry that told Sen. Fulbright's committee in April 1971 that only a few thousand Vietnamese would be inconvenienced if the United States withdrew from Vietnam and abandoned our allies there. Even today, John Kerry refuses to accept responsibility for the half million or more South Vietnamese put in prison camps when the communists took over, for the countless hundreds of thousands who perished in the Cambodian killing fields after the Khmer Rouge communists took over, or to the over 2 million boat people who fled Vietnam in search of freedom, with thousands of women and children perishing in their frail boats sent out on perilous waters.

Now John Kerry wants to give nuclear fuel to the mullahs - this, despite the evidence these same Iranian mullahs are funding insurgents coming into Iraq seeking to fight and kill our American troops. Iran is a sworn enemy of Israel. How can Sen. Kerry court the votes of Jewish Americans while he is openly advocating providing nuclear fuel to Iran? Oh, right, that nuclear fuel is only going to be used by the Iranians to produce electricity.




No problem then in asking American voters to back Sen. Kerry. Should the Iranians follow the lead of the North Koreans and actually make nuclear weapons, then, according to Sen. Kerry's famous nuanced logic, we will only then really know their intentions were always bad and they were merely lying.

What would a nuclear Iran mean? Clearly the mullahs wouldn't like to see oil soar to \$100 a barrel or higher. Raking in those billions of windfall profits is clearly something the religious clerics of Iran would not seek, given their disdain for worldly gain. Nor would the Palestinians gain any negotiating leverage by pointing to a nuclear Iran as their regional power broker. As Nazi Germany gobbled up Europe and the Japanese rampaged across Asia, we in the United States did our best to put our collective head in the ground. Is this a mistake we want to repeat?

Maybe we should invite Sen. Kerry to tell us once again why nuclear proliferation is our No. 1 international concern, not terrorism, and how his Iran policy makes nuclear proliferation less likely. Or, in Sen. Kerry's world, maybe Iran also is not linked to terrorists, the same way that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with al-Qaida.

Before Sen. Kerry's position reduces to pretzel logic, perhaps the answer is to reference Mad Magazine and imagine Sen. Kerry summing up the whole nuclear-fuel-to-Iran issue with the famous disclaimer, "*What me worry?*"



Kerry Iranian fund-raiser repudiates him on Tehran

Under oath, warns Islamic regime can't be trusted with nuke material

October 18, 2004

By Art Moore © 2004 WorldNetDaily.com

Under oath, Sen. John Kerry's chief Iranian-American fund-raiser repudiated the presidential candidate's policy of accommodation toward Tehran, declaring the Islamic regime should not be trusted with nuclear materials.

Hassan Nemazee, 54, a New York investment banker and former board member of a pro-Tehran lobby, delivered a one-hour deposition today in New York City in a \$10 million defamation lawsuit against Aryo Pirouznia, leader of the Student Movement Coordination Committee for Democracy in Iraq.

Nemazee charges Pirouznia with defamation of character for accusing him of being an Iranian government agent. In a countersuit, Pirouznia contends that supporters of the cleric-led regime are funneling hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Kerry campaign.

In his deposition today, Nemazee acknowledged he has raised about \$500,000 for Kerry.

But he said if the Democratic nominee had asked him his view of the Iranian regime, he would have said it should be trusted with no other intention than to build nuclear weapons.

Jerome Corsi, a consultant to Pirouznia, attended the videotaped deposition and described it as "explosive."

"We should have a transcript and videotape of it soon; it will be very important for the American people to see this," said Corsi, who also is co-author of the best-seller challenging Kerry's Vietnam War record and post-war activism, "Unfit for Command."

Pirouznia will work closely with Corsi on a new book about the Iranian-Kerry connection, "Atomic Islam," to be published by WND Books in 2005.

Despite top Iranian officials openly calling for the development of nuclear weapons within the next four months and overwhelming confirmation from intelligence, Kerry has been insisting as president he would provide Tehran with nuclear fuel as long as it is used only for peaceful purposes.

During the first presidential debate, Kerry said, "I think the United States should have offered the opportunity to provide the nuclear fuel, test them, see whether or not they were actually looking for it for peaceful purposes."

The same policy of accommodation toward Iran's nuclear aspirations is outlined on Kerry's campaign website.

Today, when questioned about the nature of the Islamic regime, Nemazee admitted it was sympathetic to terrorism and presented a threat to the world and the United States.

Nemazee warned that Kerry should do nothing to lend credibility to the regime and that normalizing relations with Iran would be a mistake.

The Iranian-American banker said he would be delighted to see regime change in Tehran.

He said the half a million dollars raised for Kerry included contributions from people in his building at 770 Park Ave. in New York City and from personal friends.

Nemazee said, however, he could not explain the inconsistency of having been a board member of the American-Iranian Council, which is on record in support of normalizing relations with Tehran.

Nominated as U.S. ambassador to Argentina by President Clinton in 1999, Nemazee eventually withdrew after a former partner raised allegations of business improprieties, WND previously reported.

In addition to nuclear accommodation, Kerry has embraced other key positions held by wealthy Iranian-Americans lobbying for Tehran, including ending the finger printing of Iranian visitors to the U.S; expanding "family reunion" visas to allow more immigration; offering a "dialogue" with the cleric regime; and helping Iran join the World Trade Organization.

Pirouznia, noting "America is incredibly popular with the Iranian masses," says Kerry's policy is "a grave mistake for a short-term benefit."

PREPARING FOR THE THIRD GREAT JIHAD

BY CRAIG R. SMITH, CEO SWISS AMERICA

The U.S. dollar has never had as many enemies as it has today. Does it make sense to have all of your assets linked to the U.S. dollar right now -- OR -- to have a portion of your assets directly linked to gold? According to author and geopolitical expert, **Larry Abrahams ...**

This war [on Terror] is what the Jihadists themselves are calling the "Third Great Jihad." They are operating within the framework of a time line which reaches back to the very creation of Islam in the seventh century and are presently attempting to recreate the dynamics which gave rise to the religion in the first two hundred years of its existence.



The strategy for this "holy war" did not begin with the planning of the destruction of the World Trade Center. It began with the toppling of the Shah of Iran back in the late 1970's. With his plans and programs to "westernize" his country, along with his close ties to the U.S. and subdued acceptance of the State of Israel, the Shah was the soft target.

The Third Jihad now had a base of operations and the oil wealth to support its grand design or what they call the "Great Caliphate". What this design calls for is the replacement of all secular leadership in any country with Muslim majorities. This would include, Egypt, Turkey, Pakistan, Indonesia, all the Emirates, Sudan, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria, Morocco, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Malaysia, Indonesia and finally Israel.

As a part of this strategy, forces of the jihad will infiltrate governments and the military as a prelude to taking control, once the secular leadership is ousted or assassinated. Such was the case in Lebanon leading to the Syrian occupation and in Egypt with the murder of Anwar Sadat, along with the multiple attempts on the lives of Hussein in Jordan, Mubarak of Egypt and Musharraf in Pakistan. Pakistan is a particular prize because of its nuclear weapons.

The long-range strategy of the Third Jihad counts on three strategic goals.

- 1) The U.S. withdrawing from the region just as it did in Southeast Asia, following Vietnam.**
- 2) taking control of the oil wealth in Muslim countries, upwards to 75% of known reserves.**
- 3) Using nuclear weapons or other WMDs to annihilate Israel.** A further outcome of successfully achieving these objectives would be to place the United Nations as the sole arbiter in East/West negotiations and paralyze western resistance, leading to total withdrawal from all Islamic dominated countries.

We are in the battle of our lives, a battle which will go on for many years possibly even generations. If we fail to understand what we are facing or falter in the challenge of "knowing our enemy" the results will be catastrophic. Imagine a world where al Qaeda regimes control 75% of the world's oil, have at their disposal nuclear weapons, legions of willing suicide soldiers, and our national survival is dependent on the good graces of Kofi Annan and the United Nations. SOURCE: *THE CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS: The Third Great Jihad*

CONCLUSION

My recommendation is to understand that terrorism can take many forms, including currencies. The rapid decline of the U.S. dollar in the last two years should be telling us something which historians have long warned ... "*the destiny of a currency determines the destiny of a nation.*" Every paper currency without a gold/silver backing in history has ultimately fallen to it's true value ... ZERO!! Could it happen to the precious U.S. dollar? YES!

The U.S. Constitution demands a gold and silver-backed money system. Recently New Hampshire proposed moving to a gold/silver state currency (HB-1342) for that very reason. Other states are considering the same.

My advice is to get ahead of the curve by converting a reasonable portion of your assets into U.S. gold coins, thereby putting yourself on a "Personal Gold Standard." Your alternative is to wait for next attack upon the U.S. dollar, either from within, under the crushing weight of our national debt and deficits, or from without, under the weight of international competition from a gold-backed currency like the new Gold Dinar. For more information, please contact: www.swissamerica.com or call Swiss America **1(800) 289-2646**. P.S. Request a free copy of our new DVD/CD, "*A Citizen's Guide to Counter-Terrorism*"



DISCLAIMER: All of the information in this story is believed to be true, however errors are possible. Past performance is no guarantee of future performance. All investments have risk.