

---

## THE GULF WAR

---

# Iraqi defeat would clear the way for Khomeini to take over Mideast

by Robert Dreyfuss, Middle East Editor, and Nancy Coker

Iran's victory against Iraq in the decisive battle for the city of Khorramshahr marks the start of a new phase of Great Britain's effort to impose a new Dark Ages on the Middle East and the Islamic world.

Like the Mongol hordes that swept out of central Asia in alliance with Venetian and Byzantine intelligence during the Middle Ages, the Khomeini mob threatens to destroy civilization in the entire Arab world and beyond.

At the start of the Khomeini era in Iran in 1979, quondam U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon H. La-Rouche warned that only a ruthless and uncompromising campaign of extermination could end the Khomeini plague. But Iraq, fearful of casualties and with few international allies, waged a half-hearted and inconclusive campaign that has now ended in disaster.

The fall of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, a pro-development nationalist who opposed Khomeini's fascists from the beginning, is now highly probable. Unless sufficient backing, including Arab military support, is rushed to Iraq's aid, the collapse of the Iraqi regime will, in turn, lead to the Iranization of the entire Persian Gulf, jeopardizing world oil supplies.

In a press conference May 26 in Mexico City, La-Rouche, now Advisory Board Chairman of the National Democratic Policy Committee, stated that despite the gravity of the situation in the Middle East in the wake of Iran's victory, the battle is not lost. What is required, he stated, is the launching of a full-scale mobilization by Iraqi nationalists and their allies to crush the Khomeini menace once and for all.

Egypt, Turkey, and India have a singular role to play in this fight. It is these three countries that have the strongest republican tradition in the region—a tradition that is now threatened head-on by the spread of Khomeinism. If Iraq is wiped out, the very future of the nation-state is at stake in the Middle East, bringing to fruition a centuries-long British intelligence commitment to prevent the consolidation of modern sovereign republics in the region. For it was Britain, along with its U.S. hangers-on, which installed Khomeini's regime in 1979, and which orchestrated international support for Iran in its

“human-wave” war against the Iraqis.”

### Oil blackmail

The threat of a Persian Gulf oil cutoff has been cleverly used to force Western Europe to capitulate to London on support for the British against Argentina. Failure to back the British war in the South Atlantic, the Europeans were told, would result in the cutoff of their oil supplies.

At the NATO foreign ministers' meeting May 17, Secretary of State Alexander Haig reportedly delivered a statement to the allies predicting spreading chaos and an immediate threat to oil supplies as a result of Iran's victory. Such a threat, Haig said, would require urgent NATO cooperation to secure the oilfields, through the establishment of an entirely new system of military bases, naval deployments, and construction of a Middle East Treaty Organization.

The core of that plan, first envisaged by the Carter administration, is the so-called Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force, whose assigned task is to secure the Persian Gulf from the Soviet threat.

As most insiders know, the Haig call to action is based on utter deception and lies, since the Iranian military victory against Iraq was made possible only by the massive arming of Iran, chiefly by the British, Israelis, and Americans. Despite some Soviet military support to Iran, the leading source of Khomeini's arms was British intelligence-allied in the West and the associated black-market arms dealers.

With his crocodile tears over Iraq's defeat—a defeat he himself helped to cause—Haig is trying to overcome NATO and Arab opposition to the Rapid Deployment Force concept and to the idea of installing a network of bases in the Middle East. West Germany, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and other states oppose, some vehemently, the extension of NATO into the Middle East.

The reality is that Haig's support for the spread of Iranian-style fundamentalism in the Gulf will mean the real winner is the Soviet Union. No RDF can secure the Gulf, as the Soviets know; Moscow can afford to wait

patiently, while encouraging the "Islamic fundamentalists" in order to weaken actual American interests in the area.

### **Fanatics on the move**

Inside Iraq, dissident and pro-Iran subversives, including communists, Kurdish tribesmen, and Shiite extremists, are poised to stage a rebellion against Saddam Hussein.

And in the rest of the Arab world, radical elements are foolishly celebrating Iran's defeat of Iraq. In Algiers, foreign ministers of the Steadfastness Front—Algeria, Syria, Libya, and the PLO—met and issued a communiqué welcoming Iran's victory and called upon other Arab states to "support the Iranian revolution." Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi personally called for the overthrow of the Saudi regime and the liberation of the holy sites in Saudi Arabia!

The mobilization of Arab radicals in support of Khomeini means that Iraq may find itself in severe difficulty if it tries to get Arab League members to abide by their commitments to defend a fellow Arab nation. Although Iran has succeeded in driving out Iraq from occupied territory, there is a strong likelihood that Khomeini's hordes will not stop at the border but will continue into Iraqi territory. Both Iran and Syria have pledged to overthrow Saddam Hussein and will receive support from Israel.

In the wake of the Iraqi announcement that it had lost Khorramshahr, the Khomeini regime announced that its demands included the ouster of Saddam Hussein, the payment of \$50 billion in war reparations to Iran from the Arabs, and the establishment of Khomeini-style "Islamic regimes" in Iraq and all the states of the Gulf.

Despite the claims of Khomeini's sympathizers in the U.S. State Department that Iran would cool down after Iraqi troops left Iran, Khomeini's demands signal no moderation on Iran's part.

### **Iraq invokes treaty**

With the fall of Khorramshahr on May 25, Baghdad called upon its Arab neighbors to remember their obligations under the 1950 Arab League defense treaty to come to Iraq's aid. However, of all the Arab states, only Egypt has the capability to support the Iraqi war effort substantially. Immediately necessary is a full-scale mobilization by Egypt to send its air force and several divisions of troops to join Iraq's fight and to carry the battle against Iran into Teheran itself, and if necessary, to topple Khomeini's regime. President Mubarak reportedly favors such action, but he is being threatened with "the Sadat treatment" from terrorist sympathizers of the Khomeini group allied with London and Israel's Defense Minister Ariel Sharon should he decide to join

the war on Iraq's side.

Saudi Arabia, caught in between, is in a serious crisis. With both Khomeini and Qaddafi threatening to join in supporting the overthrow of the Saudi royal family, and with the Israelis threatening an attack on the Saudi oil fields, the Saudis are concerned with propitiating the source of danger rather than with confronting the Iran threat aggressively.

In mid-May, when Iraq requested that Saudi Arabia lead a boycott of Syria because of Syria's support for Iran, the Saudis refused. Following the fall of Khorramshahr, the Saudi Foreign Minister, Prince Saud, flew to Damascus to discuss with the Syrians a "compromise solution"—despite the fact that a compromise with the Khomeini regime is impossible.

### **The Israel-Iran axis**

Israel is not concealing which side it is on in the Iran-Iraq war. Sharon wound up a visit to Washington on May 25 defending Israel's alliance with Iran and attacking those moderate Arabs supporting Iraq. Describing Iraq as "one of the most radical countries of the region," Sharon called the Arab coalition of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan that has taken a position against Khomeini's Iran "a threat to peace."

Sharon's statements were seconded by Prime Minister Begin, who rejected the idea that Jordan is being "squeezed" by a hostile Syria and Iran, and therefore must be supported. "Jordan is not squeezed," said Begin. "Jordan by its own choice decided to join Iraq in its war of aggression against Iran."

Thus, Begin and Sharon have placed Israel in the camp of the radical, pro-terrorist, pro-Khomeini Arab countries of Syria and Libya—Israel's so-called sworn enemies—and against Egypt.

Despite Sharon's strange bedfellows, Secretary of State Haig and Defense Secretary Weinberger tripped over themselves to accommodate Sharon by reactivating the strategic Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Israel. The MOU is expected to be ratified in June when Begin visits the United States.

Although the contents of the MOU are under tight wraps, insiders reveal that the essence of the agreement is to make Israel the centerpiece of an expanded NATO into the Middle East and Africa. Specifically, Haig, Weinberger, and Sharon are using their support for Iran to force the Arabs, terrified by Iran's ascendancy, to come crawling for a deal. The price: dropping their resistance to Camp David and an Israel-centered regional strategic consensus.

Haig and Weinberger are not the only top figures involved with Sharon in this operation. On May 23, Sharon met with Henry Kissinger, at the latter's request, to coordinate Israel's enlarged regional—and super-regional—role in the aftermath of the Iranian victory.