

Subject: In Pursuit of Two Fundamental Demands

Mr. President,

War consumes weapons — and weapons must be sold.

History teaches us that after the two World Wars, it became evident that major financial interests had funded multiple sides of the conflicts. War was not merely a clash of nations; it was also a marketplace.

Today, even before current tensions in the Middle East have fully subsided, we observe how instability quickly translates into new defense contracts. Each escalation appears to prepare the ground for expanded arms sales. This pattern is not accidental. It is structural.

In my 5,000-word booklet *Iran and the West*, I argue that the solution to the Iran question is neither military attack nor foreign intervention. The sustainable solution lies in convening a national Constituent Assembly and revising the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran through the will of the Iranian people themselves. This path requires no bombs, no invasion, and no American military involvement.

Why, then, is this solution rarely discussed?

There is a difficult but serious answer: for certain entrenched interests, war is not primarily about democracy, human rights, or even regime change. War sustains an economic ecosystem. A peaceful constitutional solution closes that market.

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned the nation about the “military-industrial complex,” he was cautioning against precisely this structural dynamic — one in which perpetual tension becomes profitable.

Let us recall the recent history of the region. Prior to the 1980–1988 Iran–Iraq War, both Iran and Iraq were among the largest arms purchasers in the Middle East. Excessive armament inevitably seeks consumption. That eight-year war consumed vast resources and cost more than a million lives. Yet it did not end instability; it institutionalized it.

Since 1979, one of the pillars sustaining the Islamic Republic has been the continuous reproduction of crisis — economic hardship for the Iranian people and geopolitical tension for the international community.

From that upheaval emerged non-state armed actors that further entrenched instability: Hezbollah, Al-Qaeda, Boko Haram, Popular Mobilization Forces, Hamas, and Houthis. Their existence sustains future crises, and future crises justify future weapons transfers.

But what of the Iranian people?

Nearly ninety million citizens inside Iran endure hardship with the hope that one day a legitimate Constituent Assembly will be formed and a parliamentary constitutional order established. They do not ask for invasion. They do not ask for bombs. They ask for lawful transformation.

Millions in the diaspora, however, often remain divided — rallying behind personalities rather than principles, factions rather than constitutional structure. Endless rivalry within opposition circles generates noise, but not reform. Instability persists, and instability serves those who benefit from it.

The alternative is clear and achievable:

- Support the Iranian people's right to convene a national Constituent Assembly.
- Focus international policy on constitutional reform rather than military escalation.
- Replace the logic of weapons with the logic of law.

If war is about the consumption of weapons, peace must be about the rule of law.

Mr. President, a constitutional strategy toward Iran would not only serve the Iranian people; it would serve American interests by reducing the structural incentives for perpetual conflict in the region.

Respectfully,  
Sohrab ChamanAra  
Cyrus Force