

## **EIR**SpecialReport

# **Iraq's nation-building versus Iran's Dark Ages**

by Criton Zoakos

President Saddam Hussein of Iraq has secured a place in history for himself as a result of the decisive strategic defeat that he inflicted upon Ayatollah Khomeini and, more significantly, upon the "Khomeini experiment." The extent of Khomeini's defeat is not by any means measurable by the relatively modest Iraqi military successes on the battlefield. These Iraqi military successes are significant not because of the tactical military situation that they have created but rather because of the profound political transformation which they have generated as a result.

No matter what else may realistically be expected to occur in the tumultuous domain of Middle Eastern politics, the British-intelligence-authored project of creating a string of jacobin-sacerdotal states in the 21st century has failed. The "Khomeini experiment" of bringing religious fundamentalism to state power has been defeated by Saddam Hussein. Iraq's military measures against the Islamic Republic of Iran have caused a reversal of the momentum with which religious fundamentalism was spreading throughout the Gulf region. No religious destabilization projects will be successfully launched in either Saudi Arabia, or Kuwait, or Iraq itself, nor, for that matter, in those Central Asian regions neighboring Afghanistan, for at least the next 20 years.

Regardless of how the present Iraq-Iran war is concluded, the great British intelligence project of subjugating the humanist-scientific tradition of Islam under the hideous cult of Khomeini's Asharism has failed resoundingly.

There are two sets of consequences to what Saddam Hussein's Iraq has successfully accomplished. The first is the aggregate of the strategic-political transformations occurring in the Middle East as a result of the Iraqi action, and the the second is the set of historical-theoretical implications that are now being debated in the rarefied heights of long-term policy making elites of certain countries.

Iraq's military action of over one month ago has forced the emergence of



Photo: Gamma/Liaison

*King Hussein of Jordan, in Baghdad Oct. 4-5, stated that Iraq's war is that of all Arabs.*

two exceptionally unusual coalitions of states in the Middle East. They can best be described as the "Coalition of Sacerdotal States" confronting the "Coalition of Nation-States." Ironically but lawfully, the sacerdotal coalition is composed of Israel, Libya, and Iran, on the basis of a strong, shared commitment to defend and rescue the theocratic regime in Teheran. They are supported in their endeavor by the Carter administration.

The "Coalition of Nation-States," on the other hand, is centered around the close military, economic, and political cooperation of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, with Egypt's Sadat increasingly being drawn into their orbit.

### **The strategic-political implications**

When one observes, as we have in recent weeks, Begin of Israel, joining hands with Qaddafi of Libya, and Khomeini, in calling for the overthrow of the governments of Iraq and Saudi Arabia, one draws the conclusion that the conflict between the "sacerdotal" and the "nation-state" tendencies in the Middle East is of such an overriding significance that it overshadows the more traditional conflicts, such as the one between Arabs and Israelis which had determined political processes in the area up until the Iraq-Iran war.

The objectives of the Iraq-Saudi-Jordan coalition are best characterized as a massive, 20-year-long nation-building program articulated earlier this year in the Iraq-authored Amman Resolution of the League of Arab States, a document approved by the majority of

Arab states. It outlines a twenty-billion-dollar a year investment program designed to transform the key states of the Fertile Crescent, *Arabia Deserta*, and *Arabia Felix*, into modern, nuclear-energy-based states by the year 2000. The Amman Resolution program envisions massive infusions of advanced technologies, large-scale education drives, the formation of a large, skilled industrial and engineering labor force, transfers of population from backward rural areas to prospering cities, and development of Middle East agriculture along the lines of a high-technology path directly inspired by the "American System."

Counterposed to this nation-building perspective of the Iraq-Saudi-Jordan coalition, is the "New Dark Ages" program jointly shared by Menachem Begin, Muammar Qaddafi, and Ruhollah Khomeini, the three principal spokesmen of Pol Potism and religious obscurantism in the Middle East. It is not coincidental that the economic planners of the Khomeini regime, from President Bani-Sadr on down, share the very same economic-doctrinal outlook as the principal economic policy makers of the Begin government in Israel who have successfully wrecked that nation's economy.

The shared perspective of economic and technological backwardness among Begin, Khomeini, and Qaddafi is not coincidental. Rather, it is the result of the fact that all three leadership groupings are in fact captive agent outposts of the same "mother" organization, British intelligence.

The top long-term policy-formulating groupings of

British intelligence, i.e. the British Crown's think tanks such as the Foreign Affairs section of the Anglican Church, the Arts Council of Great Britain, and the evolved corporate entities of the old Special Operations Executive of World War II including British Petroleum and the London and Canadian banks, had, since the mid-1960s at the latest, formulated the long-term strategic deployments that would eventually attempt the "sacerdotal" transformation of the Middle East. Eventually, this broad programmatic perspective became known in the world of intelligence as the "Bernard Lewis Plan," named after Princeton professor Dr. Bernard Lewis, an employee of Morgan Guaranty, who, as a British subject in the course of the Second World War, served as Middle East intelligence chief for Arnold Toynbee and there first acquired a solid reputation as the foremost Middle East intelligence expert and leading Arabist. The Bernard Lewis Plan, known in outline, called for the elimination of the existing national structures throughout the Middle East, and their replacement with religious states, such as Khomeini's Iran and Begin's Israel and tiny religious and sectarian enclaves such as those threatening to emerge now in Lebanon at the expense of the central government.

Even though the Bernard Lewis Plan started being gradually implemented with the onset of the Lebanese Civil War, its full-scale launching was supposed to take place with the overthrow of the shah of Iran. Its further implementation has now been checked by Iraq.

The Carter administration's Camp David venture was undertaken in 1978 as a subsidiary, parallel operation designed to facilitate the sectarian breakdown of the Middle East envisaged by the Bernard Lewis Plan. In fact, as it will be recalled, the unfolding of the Camp David agreements and the destabilization of the shah took place in parallel chronological order. Now, as the disintegration of the Khomeini experiment begins to loom on the horizon, we also see the first moves by Egypt to ultimately disengage from its tenuous partnership with Israel. President Sadat, whatever his other illusions respecting Camp David, has been very explicit in his opposition to Khomeini and vehement in his objection to Israel's collaborating with Khomeini. Sadat has in fact embarked on a course of covert and quasi-overt cooperation with Iraq against Iran. Egypt-Israel relations will continue to be strained and eventually will break as a result of Iraq's moves.

Over the next two years, the political evolution of the principal Arab states, and especially the Iraq-Saudi-Jordan (and increasingly Egypt) axis, will tend to swell into a large-scale "Gaullist" type of phenomenon, a tendency of asserting well-defined national economic, political, and cultural interests at the expense of the two "superpowers." The British "sacerdotal" intervention of the 1978-80 period was designed to remove the

overwhelming influence of the United States and the U.S.S.R. from the region and replace it with British influence, initially concealed as "Israeli" influence. This equation has now been scrapped as a result of the Iraqi action. Thus, even though superpower influence has been diminished, the vacuum thus generated has not been filled by "British-"inspired influence. Instead, as a result of the persistent Iraqi pursuit of nationalist development policies, a regional, sovereign "Gaullist" power is now emerging centered around the Iraq-Saudi-Jordan axis. If Sadat's Egypt eventually joins this axis, and if a France-led Western Europe lends its support, a forward-looking, progress-oriented Arab super power will emerge by the turn of the century, one based on the technological and industrial perspectives laid out in the "Amman Resolution."

### **The historical-theoretical implications**

The attempt to launch a series of theocratic states in the last two decades of the 20th century, a matter little understood by even the best-informed laymen, has been a constant commitment of a certain faction of British long-term policy makers since at least the 1830s. With varying degrees of intensity, with ups and downs, this policy commitment was kept alive until today, a period in world history filled with religion- and ideology-inspired movements, from Islamic fundamentalism to "liberation theology" in the Third World.

This long-term project, ordinarily invisible to the naked eye of even the most trained sort of political observer, has been shaped and gradually and skillfully pushed by the most rarefied sort of high-level policy makers within the British royal establishment in parallel cooperation with the ancient aristocratic families of Europe, the Genoese "black Guelphs," the Venice families, and the Wittelsbach-Hapsburg associated networks of the Jesuit Order.

Although very little of this long-term effort has seen the light of publicity, glimpses of the strategic thinking prevailing in those circles were published in some of the works of the British historian Arnold Joseph Toynbee, chief of the Arab Bureau of British intelligence during World War I and the subsequent Versailles Treaty negotiations, and later chief of Britain's combined intelligence services during World War II.

Toynbee was one of the most prominent popularizers of the doctrine that "in the long sweep of history," religious ideology, sacerdotal authority, and the "religious sense of identity" of the individual are historical forces far superior to currently prevailing forms of national identity and national authority. Hence, Toynbee repeatedly argued, if one is to ultimately construct and control a lasting, stable imperial world order in the "final analysis," and in the "long sweep of history," one must engineer the intelligence and subversion networks



Photo: Spengler/Sigma

*Fundamentalism in Teheran: off the drawing boards, 1979.*

which will be capable of imposing a sacerdotal authority and a religious sense of identity over populations that are currently ruled by secular authorities and national senses of identity.

A similar school of policy thinking was developed in the United States at Georgetown University, the school which trains the vast majority of the nation's foreign service officers. The principal architect of this school of thought in the United States was the late Carroll Quigley, the erstwhile dean of history at Georgetown, member of the most senior Jesuit family in the United States and cousin of General Joseph Carroll, the founder of the Defense Intelligence Agency. Quigley's theory, very influential in the "McGovernite" circles of the State Department, was best summarized in his monumental historical work on the 20th century, *Tragedy and Hope*. He there supplied the most coherent sort of argumentation about why the United States would eventually have to develop a long-term strategy of achieving an ultimately permanent and stable world order, a "Great Stability," by means of promoting the emergence of sacerdotal authority and the Chinese model on a worldwide scale. Quigley and his adherents in the foreign service also argued that the single most

potent obstacle to such a policy is the prevailing form of sovereign nation-state.

This school of thought designed and promulgated instruments whose purpose was and is the gradual, long-term systematic weakening of the authority, power, and prerogatives of the sovereign nation-state, such as the various agencies of the United Nations, the various One World government schemes, the jesuitical "human rights campaigns," fabian movements, liberation and "liberation theology" movements.

This Anglo-American, or more accurately, Anglo-American-Canadian school of strategic thought, has exerted an extraordinary influence in shaping Anglo-American policy over the recent years, principally because it has acted as the most advanced theoretical instrument of a very powerful corporate coalition centered on banking, insurance, real estate, and high technology with a cumulative financial clout of over one trillion dollars.

Working out of the advanced studies centers of the most prestigious universities of the English-speaking world, Oxford, Cambridge, Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, and so forth, and based on the accumulated traditions of long-term policy making of their aristo-

cratic patron families, this school of thought views its policy-making function in the context of an ancient tradition which goes back at least 3,000 years.

From this point of view, the evolution of human political practice over the millenia is primarily a continuous struggle between two ultimate, irreconcilable, rival principles of authority: the authority of sacerdotal rulers against the secular authority of human reason, organized in the form of a secular state, be it a monarchy, a republic, or a constitutional monarchic order.

The historical factional opponents of this sacerdotal faction, opponents whose historical interests Iraq's Saddam Hussein has, perhaps unwittingly, so effectively championed in the last six weeks, is the Neoplatonic humanist faction. It traces its origins back to the dawn of recorded history when the great Mesopotamian kings, such as the lawgiver Hammurabi, fought against the rule of the Babylonian priesthood, and in the momentous historical events of the fourth century B.C. in the Eastern Mediterranean whose memory has come down to our days as the "classical era," in which the great Plato articulated the underlying theoretical necessity of the "Politeia," the well-ordered Republic, for the continued survival and progress of the human species.

This Platonic theory of statecraft has been preserved, in its modern form, in the doctrine both political and legal, of the sovereign nation-state, as initially shaped by Dante Alighieri in his celebrated *De Monarchia*. The sovereign nation-state from its inception as a political concept, has been conceived as the "second-best" form of organization of human beings around a long-term, lasting moral purpose. The political enemies of the humanist movement learned from an early stage that the most effective way of subverting the morality of a population is to undermine the authority of the sovereign nation-state.

The conflict between the secular authority of reason and sacerdotal authority was the central issue around which the Thirty Years War was fought between the Holy Roman Empire of the Hapsburgs and the French kingdom, the best approximation during that time of Dante's *Monarchia* embodying the legal principle of the sovereign nation-state.

The Thirty Years War ended with a landmark victory for mankind, the signing of the Peace of Westphalia, the first diplomatic and legal document ever in history to recognize and sanctify the absolute sovereignty of the Platonic program of the nation-state. The second such landmark turning point was the founding of the United States, inaugurating the constitutionally defined sovereign nation-state.

Subsequently, the American model of political organization, the nation-state in which the *nation* is defined not by common ethnic roots, or racial roots, but

exclusively by a commonly shared moral purpose, became the hegemonic form of political organization among human societies. What then emerged in history is what shallow observers call as the "Era of Nationalism." With all its internal problems and inadequacies, its ups and downs, the last two centuries of human history have been ordered around the organizing principle of the sovereign nation-state. From Napoleon's final defeat, from the Treaty of Vienna of 1815 onward, world history has been the continuous struggle between the sacerdotal-oriented British oligarchy and the American-inspired *nation-state*.

In the context of this sweep of history, the British decision in the mid-1960s to go with the Khomeini experiment represents a very significant shift in the terms of the fight and indeed a very large investment. What Khomeini had started in Iran was supposed to spread throughout the one and a half billion population of the Islamic world. Islamic fundamentalism was then supposed to be cultivated and manipulated in parallel with Christian Marxism and liberation theology movements throughout the Christian portions of the developing world, especially Latin America and the Philippines. Africa was eventually to be shared between Islamic fundamentalism and liberation theology.

The economics of this imagined world order are the economics of Pol Pot's Cambodia. According to the International Monetary Fund's "austerity programs" and "credit conditionalities," world population must be reduced by one and a half billion by the year 2000. Khomeini and his cothinkers among the Jesuits of the Nicaraguan revolution were programmed to fire the opening shots of this worldwide Pot Pot program.

Pitted against this context, the present, otherwise-modest achievement of Saddam Hussein's Iraqi leadership acquires a new, greater significance.

Saddam Hussein and his co-leaders have not yet developed themselves to the depth of historical leadership of the historical nation-building tradition of Dante, Al-Farrabi, Leibniz. Hussein has, however, demonstrated the resiliency and potency of the nation-state form of organization beyond the wildest suspicions of the gamemasters at Oxford and Cambridge. Once the sovereign nation-state has identified to itself the tasks for the scientific, economic, and moral development of its population as Saddam Hussein's Iraq has successfully done since 1968, then such a nation-republic is capable of generating from within itself the resources and leadership required to counter every sort of challenge and threat.

In short, in the current Gulf war, the odds are long in favor of Saddam Hussein's nation-state and against the painstakingly and artificially constructed pseudo-sacerdotal order of Iran's Mullarchy.