

# Letters to the Editor

## *Disappointed by Cooley interview*

I am totally amazed that *EIR* would publish the interview conducted by Bill Jones with ABC newsman and Middle East "expert" John Cooley in the Dec. 20 issue.

I will not go so far as to claim that Cooley—whose credentials with the Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment are cited without comment in the introduction—was intentionally disinformational. But what he elaborated in the course of the interview was little more than a rehash of assorted myths and falsehoods that *EIR* and Lyndon LaRouche's associates have been laboring to demolish for years.

First and foremost of these is the idea that the bumbling United States got caught off-guard by the Khomeini revolution in Iran, underestimating popular support for the Shi'ite mullahs. What buncombe!

As *EIR* has documented, the operation to topple the Shah was set in motion by no later than the 1976 meeting of the oligarchy's Aspen Institute, which formulated a scenario for a mass-based uprising against the westernizing "excesses" of the Pahlevi dynasty, such as the attempt to build up a nuclear energy capability for Iran. Moreover, that "people's revolt" could not possibly have succeeded without the active support of such Anglo-American assets as BBC (which broadcast Khomeini's ravings into the most remote areas of rural Iran), the U.S. Office of Naval Research (safehouse for top Khomeini espionage agent Siavash Setoudeh), and a host of other agencies and individuals in and around the Carter administration. *EIR*'s book-length *Hostage to Khomeini*, despite important secondary errors, remains a valuable antidote to the nonsense spread by Cooley and others on this subject.

Even more ludicrous is Cooley's contention that the unholy alliance that developed between Israel and Iran during the latter's war with Iraq had its roots in the efforts of the ancient Persians to rescue the Hebrews from the oppressive Kings of Baghdad (presumably, the ancestors of today's Great Satan, Saddam Hussein) in the period

of the Babylonian Captivity. Apart from small historical problems like the fact that the Biblical-era kingdom of Babylon was not Arabic at all, this whole concoction is transparently just another effort, in the style of the "British Israelite" cultists, to cloak Anglo-American colonial policy in the mantle of the Old Testament.

In reality, what drew the Anglo-American enforcement arm known as Zionism together with the Iranian Mullahcracy was the passionate desire shared by both parties to prevent at all costs the emergence of modern industrial nations in the Arab world, a "threat" very much posed at that time by Iraq. Rigging Metternichean power blocs to suppress economic development is the policy, not of God, but of Henry Kissinger, and it is indeed a grave error to confuse the two.

Cooley does no better in his effort to rationalize the simultaneous support given to Iran and Iraq by the U.S. during the 1980-88 war. Attributing this to "the left hand and the right hand doing different things" in the massive U.S. government foreign policy bureaucracy is very thin cover for the far more sinister reality: It has been the conscious Bertrand Russell-ite policy of the Anglo-American establishment to promote, where feasible, regional wars aimed at eliminating so-called excess population (and industrial potential) in key underdeveloped nations. As one State Department official candidly explained the "perpetual bloodletting" strategy to *EIR* several years ago: "We support the opposition. Then we support the opposition to the opposition," referring to Central America, but also quite an apt description of what these genocidalists in pin-stripes did with the Iran-Iraq conflict.

The only added wrinkle is that while the U.S. tilted officially toward Iraq, there was the little matter of the Reagan-Bush administration needing to repay its friends in Teheran for their cooperation on the "October Surprise" caper—but, of course, Cooley doesn't come anywhere near to touching that one.

Even at the point that he was insisting that George Bush simply "had to get Saddam out of Kuwait," Cooley's underlying assumptions were never fundamentally challenged by his interviewer. And the few

useful points he did make—for example, his grudging acknowledgment that former U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie just may have given Saddam the green light to invade Kuwait—were well known to *EIR* readers long before this sage deigned to bestow his wisdom upon us.

*Douglas Mallouk  
Baltimore, Maryland*

**The Editor replies:** We welcome your reiteration of our longstanding analysis for the benefit of newer readers, particularly since the pragmatism espoused by John Cooley could never lead to a positive solution in the Middle East, even were he more accurate in his analyses than he is. For the record, we ascribe no competence to either the New York Council on Foreign Relations nor the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, liberal "establishment" bodies whose entire policy is based on anti-scientific and anti-human, malthusian premises. It is of some interest, however, that a figure with Mr. Cooley's background and views, so contrary to our own, admits in his own equivocal way the longstanding Israeli alliance with the Iranian Islamic state; Henry Kissinger's taste for dealing with the Syrian butcher Assad; and the fact that April Glaspie had virtually invited Iraq to invade Kuwait. These points, which *EIR* has often stressed in contrast to prevailing media myths, are confirmed by Cooley on the basis of his field experience in the Middle East. In the full interview, of which only half was printed, Cooley evaded a series of questions on the "October Surprise" which were posed by Jones.

Needless to say, the statements of persons interviewed do not necessarily reflect the editors' views, any more than those expressed in signed articles do.

*EIR* welcomes comments and queries from readers. We also welcome clippings with intelligence our researchers might otherwise miss. Letters for publication must be signed and include the writer's address; names may be withheld on request. Mail to: *EIR* Letters to the Editor, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.