

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Series of Questions Addressed to Scholar Sheikh Ata Bin Khalil Abu Al-Rashtah,
Ameer of Hizb ut Tahrir through his "Fiqhi" Facebook Page

Answer to Question:
Iran's Role in the Region

To: Mais Bader
(Translated)

Question:

Assalamu alaikum wa Rahmatullah wa Barakatuhu. Dear respected Shaykh, may Allah (swt) protect and safeguard you. Why has the United States allowed Iran to escalate in its relatively rapid diverse military capabilities which has become one of the more important countries in the region in terms of playing influential roles on the course of events in both Iraq, Syria, the Gulf and the enflamed region in general? What is the American policy in containing this evasive role? May Allah (swt) reward you...

Answer:

1. To say that the role of Iran in the region is one of evasion is a misdirected saying. Whereas Iran is proceeding with America in all of the region's issues... And Iran is a central state in the US policy in the region, and America depends on it in Iraq and Syria, and in Yemen, Afghanistan, and in Lebanon and others... The one following Iran's actions with detailed analysis finds that apparent, as more than one of the Iranian leaders have expressed that Iran's cooperation with the United States is what enabled it to occupy Afghanistan and Iraq... and so is the case in the other issues.

2. We had published an Answer to Question on the 14th Shawwal 1434 AH, corresponding 21/8/2013 CE titled: *"Reality of Iran in relation to US Policy"*, in which we explained in detail the reality of Iran's relationship with America and Iran's cooperation with it in the region's issues, you can refer to it to find out what is in it, and I have cited the following for you:

"All of the political work in the region carried out by Iran is in congruence and accordance with American agendas:

A. In Lebanon, Iran founded and armed a party from the followers of its Madhab and, such that it became a special army separate from the Lebanese army, and the Lebanese regime acknowledged it and their weaponry, knowing that the Lebanese system is a secular regime that follows American politics. The Lebanese regime does not allow any other party to bear arms nor did it acknowledge the arming of any other party. The Party of Iran in Lebanon with the support of the Syrian regime associated with America as did Iran, and America did not prevent the Lebanese regime from allowing Iran's Hezb intervention in Syria to prop up the secular regime of Bashar al-Assad, rather there was an American implied consent to the intervention of this party in Syria without being hampered by the Lebanese army.

B. When America occupied Iraq it was met with an unexpected resistance, so it entered Iran into Iraq to help influence those belonging to its Madhab, to affect them and prevent their movement against the occupation, even to make them stand against the resistance, even confronting it and giving legitimacy to the occupation and to the established system. Especially after 2005 America allowed the ascension of a coalition of pro-Iranian parties into power, led by Ibrahim al-Jaafari and then al-Maliki, and these governments were installed by America and are linked to it. Maliki's government, backed by Iran, signed security and strategic agreements with the United States to maintain its influence after the official end of the occupation of Iraq, indicating American satisfaction with the role played by Iran whose officials admitted its cooperation with the United States in the occupation and its work to secure the stability of American influence in Iraq. Iran opened its embassy in Iraq immediately after the occupation, and al-Jaafari was not elected until the Iranian Foreign Minister Kamal Kharrazi visited Baghdad in 2005 at the height of the occupation. The two sides condemned the acts of resistance to the occupation under the pretext of condemning terrorism in Iraq. Jaafari's visit to Iran was used to sign several agreements, including a cooperation agreement in the field of intelligence between them to establish security and control of border crossings and linking Basra to Iran's electricity grid and the establishment of an oil pipeline between Basra and Abadan.

The relationship between Iran and the Syrian regime is an old one, dating back to the time of the first Intifada in the early 80's of the past century. Iran then supported the Syrian regime in suppressing the Muslims of Syria, so as to keep it within the American project in support of the regime led by its agents from the Assad family. Iran did this knowing that it is a secular nationalist Baathi system congruent with the regime of Saddam, which they were fighting although it had nothing to do with Islam, rather Saddam fought Islam and its people. Iran did this well aware that Saddam was linked to America, it did not defend the rights of the Muslims, they did just the opposite in declaring war against them and bringing victory to a criminal Kufr regime, and Iran continues to do so. The Iranian regime maintains close relations with the Syrian leadership, which includes military, economic and political ties. Iran transferred many weapons to support the Assad regime and provided it with oil and gas at discounted prices due to the lack of reserves of energy in Syria. These political relations can particularly be observed in the Iranian interference in the Syrian revolution when the Assad regime stood on the verge of collapse. Had it not been for Iranian interference by sending troops of the Revolutionary Guards, and troops from Iran's Hezb and Maliki's militias that follow Iran, Bashar and his regime would have collapsed. The massacres of Qusair, Homs and today's chemical massacres in al-Ghouta and others bear witness to this intervention.

- As for Afghanistan, Iran supported the U.S. occupation and the constitution laid down by the government created by America with Karzai as president, all of that was an Iranian service to America. Iran has secured the north of the country when America failed to defeat the Taliban. Former Iranian President Rafsanjani mentioned that: "If it were not for our troops fighting the Taliban, America would have sunk in the Afghan quagmire." (al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper, 2/9/2002). Mohammad Ali Abtahi, vice for the former Iranian President Khatami for legal affairs and parliamentary elections in the Gulf and the Challenges of the Future Congress, held in Abu Dhabi on the evening of 1/13/2004, said: "If it were not for Iranian cooperation, Kabul and Baghdad would have never fallen so easily. But we received a bonus and we are within the axis of evil!" (Islam Online Net, 1/13/2004) President Ahmadinejad has repeated the like on his visit to New York to attend the United Nations meetings in an interview with *The New York Times* on 9/26/2008 where he said, "Iran has provided a helping hand to the United States with regard to Afghanistan and the result of this assistance was the U.S. President's direct threat to launch a military attack against us. Our country has also provided assistance to America in the restoration of calmness and stability in Iraq." **(End).**

3. What testifies to all the above is the outcome of the nuclear negotiations and America's insistence on closing this file in order to improve public relations with Iran to implement the role America dictates for it in the region, under the pretext of common interests and without a cover, not even with a shroud as it was in the past! The American president delivered a speech in front of the White House to specifically talk about the latest nuclear agreement with Iran, in which he described the agreement as "good and meets our core goals", and he said, "for the Iranian people, we are ready to work for the common interests" (Source: Radio Sawa of America 2/4/2015)... It is clear from the US President's statements that he wants to work with Iran under so-called common interests! What could be the common interest with the big Shaytaan other than to accomplish America's projects in the region?!

4. Then what had happened and what is happening of harmonious plans between America, Iran and the Houthis in the Yemen events! As for the Houthi relationship with Iran, it needs no proof as it is more apparent than a flag lit with fire... As for America's support for the Houthis, then every person who has sight and insight is aware of that, as America is behaving in Yemen with its known arrogance, i.e. with armed power and brutality. Then the Houthis occupied Sanaa and other places other than Sanaa, arresting and killing under the excuse of "the People's Revolt and the People's Committees...", and America has been supporting these movements of the Houthis on both politically and security-wise:

Politically: America does not regard the Houthis as terrorists like Al-Qaeda, instead it regards them as a political movement. The US Ambassador Matthew Tauler said in his press conference on 18/9/2014 that: "We differentiate between those groups that participated in the political process, the Houthi movement participated in the National Dialogue Conference and many positive outcomes were achieved as a result, and they have political positions and legitimate ambitions... and therefore, we support the Houthis and their movement to do the same practices as those performed by the political movements and groups". (Source: Press Observers Website)

Security: Upon the entry of the Houthis to Sana'a, the army and police resisted them and killed seven of the Houthis on 9/9/2014, and Hadi was about to prevail until America rushed to sending Ibn Omar, the UN representative (or in reality America's representative), and he put pressure on Hadi, and floated the issue by calling for negotiations, and giving the green light to the Houthis to heat up their movement through the atmosphere of negotiation, backed by the US pressures on Ibn Omar Ali Hadi...

5. Moreover, the recent events confirm this support, and I cite some of what was mentioned for you from the Answer to Question dated 27/3/2015 on this matter: "America has extended support to the Houthis by way of Iran with various kinds of weapons and equipment so that they are able to dominate Yemen by force because it realizes that the political medium in Yemen is dominated by Britain's creations... Thus, the Houthis thought they had the power to dominate Yemen. Therefore, they besieged the president to force him to give them what they sought for the laws they had issued. He would agree, then delay in implementation...until they imposed house arrest on him but he escaped, moving to Aden. They pursued him there, but he escaped again... America realized that its Houthi followers found themselves in a shambles. They had extended themselves across the country, but were unable to either successfully dominate nor were they able to return to their stronghold in the north. therefore America saw to save them through limited military action, to strike two birds with one stone: to show them as being assaulted, after the people had begun to see them as aggressors; and to create the atmosphere for pressing negotiations for a compromise solution as this is its well-trodden path, when unable to take it alone... All of this has become clearer by following what took place, and what is taking place. Thereby Saudi Arabia consulted with America before the military action and those undertaking the active military role – especially the Saudi King Salman and Egyptian President Sisi – are American agents. As for the rest of the Gulf States, Jordan and Morocco, their role is more political, as per the British habit in countering America, such that it remains in the picture and has a share in the forthcoming negotiations, to take its piece of the cake in the distribution of influence. While pressing military action succeeds at times, in opening the door of negotiation, it also fails at times, destabilizing matters anew, engulfing Yemen in its fire – Yemen, who was content and happy a time not long ago...when its pure land was not desecrated by the agents and disbelieving colonialists". **(End).**

And reflecting on what happened and its results demonstrate the fact that America is the one in charge of the course of events, thus the focus of the Saudi attacks were on the weapons that the Muslims paid for, and most of the victims were civilians, while only a little were of the Houthis... Meanwhile, Iran did not interfere, but remained watching from afar although the voices were raised with the Decisive Storm military operation which is falling on the heads of the Houthis! This proves that the Maestro of the movements adjusts the rhythms to arrive to solutions which save the Houthis, not destroy them, and to give them a significant share, not eradicate them... and that Saudi Arabia is aware of this, and is driving the Storm of its decisiveness and hope in accordance with this rhythm...! In addition, Iran is aware of this and watches without military intervention, according to this rhythm...! Even further, it even agreed to the inspections of its ships carrying aid before reaching Yemen's shores, that is because it is what America had wanted, thus Iran succumbed..! Thus, just as Saudi Arabia is disciplined with its decisiveness and hope according to America's directions, so is Iran, as both of them realize the purpose of these intense actions which we have outlined. And there they are turning towards a heated ceasefire that precedes the cold solutions!

6. In conclusion, Iran is not "evading" from American policy, rather it did not even leave it, all under the pretext of common interest with the big Shaytaan!

**Your Brother,
Ata Bin Khalil Abu al-Rashtah**

15 Sha'ban 1436 AH
02/06/2015 CE

The link to the answer from the Ameer's Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/Ata.abualrashtah/photos/a.154439224724163.1073741827.154433208058098/453238908177525/?type=1&theater>