There will be few updates today, my friend Angela is visiting.

Well, it's starting. The United Nations is planning to vote today on whether or not to place sanctions against Iran over its nuclear programme, after months of wrangling between Russia and China on one hand and the United States and Israel on the other. The resolution is expected to be politically weak, placing a ban on parts for Uranium enrichment, nuclear development and ballistic missiles. According to the United States, the fact that they even have a resolution will be enough to send a message to Teheran that they can't defy the international community. But it seems to me that the UN is just closing the door after the horse has bolted...

Quote: *""The nature of this resolution is not capable of pressuring Iran and Iran will give an appropriate response to it," Ali Larijani, secretary of Iran 's Supreme National Security Council, was quoted as saying by the ISNA students news agency. "This behaviour will just create more problems," He said. "If they ratify the resolution Iran will be in a new situation. In this situation Iran will review its cooperation with the agency (International Atomic Energy Agency) and review other political, economic and cultural fields."*

...in other words, you can say goodbye to your Non-Proliferation Pact. The reason the UN resolution is so weak is because Russia and China would lose quite a lot of money if real sanctions were placed against Iran. The UK would also lose quite a bit of money. So both the UK and US are sending aircraft carriers to the Gulf, to send a message to Iran that they mean business.

Quote: *"To display their determination regarding the matter, the US and Britain have also authorized steps to apply psychological pressure on Tehran in announcing their intent to launch aircraft carriers and warplanes to the Persian Gulf. The New York Times reports that US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates is expected to authorize a request by military commanders to deploy a second aircraft carrier to the region which will join the 'Eisenhower' already in the Gulf. US military officials clarified that the increase of military force in the region was not be seen as preparations for an attack on Iran, but to make clear that US commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan will not prevent the country from being able to take military action should diplomatic efforts prove unsuccessful. Boosting naval presence in the area would also serve as a means to ensure that Iran won't try to block oil shipments in retaliation for the sanctions.*

I remember when the British Prime Minister Tony Blair started sending troops to the Gulf in preparation for the invasion of Iraq. The situation is much the same now as it was then, the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Now I'm not taking one side or the other here in regards to the war being started, just pointing out the similarities. It was claimed back then that this was being done in order to persuade Saddam to open up his facilities to the UN inspectors. But I remember thinking, there is no way you send tens of thousands of troops, hundreds of aircraft and a few aircraft carriers into the Gulf, if you are not preparing to use them. It costs too much money. That manoeuvre took three months to complete and then the war began. Iran will have completed its Bushehr plant around three months from now, and as has been said before, there are some speculating that March is the month on which an Iranian strike has been agreed. My own suspicions are that world leaders are trying to ensure they have enough firepower in the region to prevent whatever Iran might be contemplating, rather than attempting to change Ahmadinejad's mind on the matter.

Source YNet News , YNet News