

Brits beat drums for U.S. strike vs. Iran

by Muriel Mirak Weissbach

There is a very real danger, that the accelerating drumbeat for a military strike against Iran, may indeed end up ushering in American action. If the immense pressures being brought to bear against President Clinton, by a concert of British mouthpieces, were to succeed, a disaster of strategic dimensions would be the result.

Calls for punitive actions against Iran, on grounds that Teheran supports terrorism, have been issued for years, since the end of the anti-Iraq war in 1991 left Iran as the relative regional superpower. Sanctions against Iran in 1995 constituted concrete action; almost exactly one year later, in July 1996, on the initiative of Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.), legislation passed through the Congress extending those sanctions to third parties, punishing any firm anywhere in the world which engaged in deals with Iran worth over \$40 million, in the gas and oil sector. Precisely as President Clinton was signing it into law, the drumbeat for *military* action was stepped up.

It is of crucial significance, that every article, statement, or action soliciting U.S. military moves, has been issued by British or British-related sources. On Aug. 4, it was Ambrose Evans-Pritchard and Con Coughlin writing in the London *Sunday Telegraph*, who claimed, "the U.S. are making detailed plans for a missile and bombing strike against Iran, because they are convinced that Iran was involved in the bombing of the Saudi Arabia barracks." Evans-Pritchard went so far as to assert that U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry had "already briefed the British and the French in general terms" about the attack. Perry, who had been quoted widely days earlier, to the effect that he held Iran responsible for the Dhahran bombing, denied any such plans, saying such speculation was "just not warranted at all." Coughlin bragged in the same article, that the *Sunday Telegraph* had first run the story that CIA intelligence documents revealed the existence of 11 training camps in Iran for 5,000 terrorists. (He neglected to mention the fact that the same British press sources, and Israelis of the Netanyahu-Sharon camp, were the first to accuse Iran of responsibility for the TWA 800 crash, immediately after the fact.) Newt Gingrich, on cue, challenged Clinton: "Either you close those camps down, or we will. If the Iranians refuse to close them down, I think there are a number of military means capable of closing them down." Further, allegations were raised by columnists Rowland

Evans and Robert Novak, that Iran was importing mortar-bombs, and by *Jane's Defense Weekly*, that Iran was engaged in a military build-up in the Straits of Hormuz.

British geopolitics

The truth is that none of these allegations has anything remotely to do with the proposed strike against Iran. Lyndon LaRouche, in an interview with "EIR Talks" on Aug. 7, was asked for his view of the rumors of Iranian involvement in TWA 800. His answer was, "Nonsense."

The broader strategic issue behind the hysteria against Iran, was clarified by LaRouche in a campaign paper issued July 31, entitled, "International Terrorism Targets President Clinton's U.S.A." "The world history of the Twentieth Century," he wrote, "has been the history of Britain's geopolitical dogma: that the Eurasian mainland must never be permitted to enter into economic cooperation, based upon transcontinental railway links, as envisioned for it by the circles of U.S. President Abraham Lincoln. Britain's effort to prevent such a project, is called 'geopolitics.'" To the extent that Clinton has made commitments to Mideast peace, to a solution of the Korean conflict, to peace in the Balkans, and to improving relations with China, to that extent he has made himself enemy number one of the British geopoliticians. China is the crucial factor, the prime mover, in the Eurasian land-bridge project. British policy is to stop it.

Herein lies the significance of the witch-hunt against Iran, the key nation in the land-bridge, on the western side, which links the Central Asian Republics with Europe. The opening in May of the Mashhad-Sarakhs stretch of the Eurasian rail network, provided the final link in the chain stretching, as the old Silk Road did, from China to Europe. It is Iranian government policy, to build the Eurasian land-bridge. In his interview, LaRouche explained: "The Chinese are cooperating with Iran. . . . China and other forces are aware that in Iran there's a struggle going on. We can either have, as the Republicans and the British would seem to like to have it, we can have a fight, a catfight with Iran, blaming the Iranians for terrorist acts which the Iranian government is *not* responsible for, but rather the British and their friends, which would bring out into the open, into dominance in Iran, *precisely* the people who were our enemies, earlier. Or, we can find a road to cooperation with the viable representatives of the people of Iran in Iran, and try to strengthen good policy, good government, good direction and friendship, or at least cooperation, rather than having a crazy, insane, new element of destabilization on the international landscape."

By engineering a strike against Iran, the British would be killing several birds with one stone: They would sabotage the Eurasian infrastructure perspective, pit Clinton against its major protagonists, and alienate those European nations, particularly Germany, that are intent on pursuing a "critical dialogue" with Iran, and economic cooperation. "Geopolitics," precisely.