

LaRouche on Iran Radio: War Against Iran Is British Policy

This is a transcript of a taped interview with Lyndon LaRouche, conducted March 15, 2006, by Morteza Jabbari of the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB). IRIB is the state-owned radio and TV broadcasting network. The interview was translated into Farsi and broadcast.

Q: In one of your previous interviews, you mentioned that London is behind the idea of a possible strike on Iran. What is the basis of your argument?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, the policy is a British policy, which certain people in the United States are connected to. For example, take the case of Dick Cheney, the Vice President. The Vice President is very close to Liz Symons, to whom he was introduced by his own wife, Lynne Cheney. And during the period, for example, between the time he was head of the Defense Department, under George Bush the First, and the time that he became the Vice President—and the acting president, practically—he negotiated certain contracts.

So, the Liberal Imperialist crowd in London, which is the Blair-Jack Straw crowd, is actually the architect of this. But the architecture runs largely through international financial channels, such as George Shultz, who is a former Secretary of State, and who is the architect of the present Bush Administration: That is, the person who pulled it together to be elected.

So, this is the key point from which this comes. It's an Anglo-American operation, but the policy itself, which is the British policy of the Arab Bureau, the so-called "anti-Islam policy," is what the motivation is.

Q: Do you think that this Western hue and cry over Iran's peaceful use of nuclear energy is in line with the idea you just mentioned?

LaRouche: Yes. This is a pretext. The nuclear issue is not really the issue. And from Iran, you know that because you know what the negotiations are, particularly involving the Russians, involving also the Chinese interest in this, and the general Asian view of this matter.

The nuclear issue is not the cause of the problem. The

issue is, they want to *have* the problem. And therefore, they're using the nuclear negotiation as a pretext for an enlarged war in the entire region of Southwest Asia.

Q: According to the British *Daily Telegraph*, George W. Bush is to decide on the possibility of a military confrontation with Iran at the end of this year. What is your opinion about this?

LaRouche: Well, it's hard to say. It is not one of these things where you can predict exactly, it's going to go one way or the other. This is what we're trying to *stop*. Our view is to give Iran as much time to negotiate as they think necessary, because some of us understand what the issues are, and we don't want to create unnecessary complications for Iran internally, otherwise, at this time. So, let the negotiations proceed: I'm sure we'll come up with something, if we are patient. And that'll put the issue off the table.

Q: You talked about London's involvement in this issue, but Jack Straw has time and again talked about peaceful means and diplomacy, in dealing with Iran's nuclear issue, and has praised Iran's previous government, and criticized its incumbent President for their approach. You think he is not sincere?

LaRouche: I'm sure of it! After all, remember, you have in the history of Iran, you have things like the Sykes-Picot Treaty, which was authored by the British as a part of a process of getting World War I going.

No, these fellows are not exactly honest. We know them very well. In a case like this, one must deal with the facts, without discussing sincerity.

Q: Al Gore, in one of his recent speeches, said that America's political system moved toward decreasing the power of the Congress and the judicial system, and increasing the power of the Executive branch, that is, the President. Your comments in this regard, please?

LaRouche: Oh, this is absolutely true. This is precise. This is a group, which is the same group which brought Hitler to

power, among others, between 1922 and 1945; the same group which is represented by the Federalist Society inside the United States, which controls several Justices of the Supreme Court, has this policy. The point is they believe they can only go to a form of dictatorship, like that of the Hitler model or some similar model, as the only way they can govern in this period, and get their policies through. That is the policy of a group associated with Cheney, and with others in the United States and in London.

Q: How do you see the role of Cheney in this game? I mean, this—let’s say—creating wars? Is he the main guy behind the idea of, let’s say, neo-conservatism, or are there some other people?

LaRouche: No, Cheney is essentially a thug. He’s an administrator—not very intelligent, but very thuggish. He’s a brute, that is a person who tries to beat people into submission as an administrator. He does not have the ideas himself. He was brought into his present position, remember, earlier, during the 1970s as part of the Nixon Administration’s leftovers. He’s been in and out of politics ever since then. He is essentially dominated by his wife, Lynne Cheney, who is the controller, who actually “wears the pants in the family,” so to speak.


But this Administration was created by George Shultz. Now, you look at George Shultz, you’re looking at Halliburton, you’re looking at Bechtel, you’re looking at those kinds of international financier interests, which are very closely tied to the comparable interests in the British system, or the international system centered in London. And that’s where it comes from. Cheney is only an errand boy.

But, the reason he has not been dumped—remember, he’s down, about 15% popularity in the United States, right now—the only reason he’s not dumped so far, even though there’s an effort by various of us in the United States to dump him, the reason is, is that he’s got powerful backing from international financier interests, which are merely typified by George Shultz.

For example, look at the question of the Netanyahu election in Israel. The word is that there’s an attempt to make Netanyahu the virtual dictator of Israel, and therefore to use Israel as a weapon against its neighbors. Most factions in Israel won’t do that. Netanyahu would do that. Netanyahu is very close to Dick Cheney. But! The guy *behind* Netanyahu is really George Shultz. So, there’s where the danger lies there, and that’s typical of the situation.

Q: I mean, who are the think-tanks for, PNAC, Project for a New American Century? Are they in Britain, or in the U.S.?

LaRouche: Both! You have a general policy—it’s called globalization. The general policy, which has emerged increasingly since Roosevelt died, has been first of all the conflict with the Soviet Union, which was created precisely to prevent Roosevelt’s policies from being carried out, which was an anti-colonialism policy.



Lyndon LaRouche: The policy of a strike on Iran “is a British policy, which certain people in the United States are connected to. For example . . . Dick Cheney.”

And this policy had been kicking around for a long time. And with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the idea was we could go to the elimination of the nation-state, or the virtual elimination of the nation-state, and have what’s called an *ultramontane* system, a globalized system in which an international financial interest runs the entire world. Every nation in Asia is targetted: for example, India is targetted, China is targetted, Russia’s targetted, all of the leading nations of Asia are, in particular, targetted for dissolution of their present form of government. This is the program.

Q: How do you see the difference between Democrats and Republicans, when it comes to Middle Eastern issues?

LaRouche: Well, this—it’s not quite that way. Let’s take the case of Bill Clinton. Now, Bill Clinton is Bill Clinton: He’s very intelligent. He represents a group of people in the United States, to which I generally turn out to be associated with in the Democratic Party. But we also work with Republicans, who are, shall we say, the sane Republicans who think pretty much as we do on most issues, particularly on war and peace. So, there is no simple U.S. policy on this question. There is something across party lines. Most Democrats would tend to agree with us on getting out of this Middle East mess. Clinton is a leading spokesman for that. There are people in the Senate, in particular, who are leading spokesmen for that. You have on the Republican—

Q: I’m sorry, Mr. LaRouche. I’m sorry to interrupt you. Some observers believe that American administrations, whether Republicans or Democrats, have the same objective



www.fco.gov.uk/

Baroness Liz Symons with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Symons is part of Tony Blair's inner circle, as well as the contact point to Dick and Lynne Cheney.

with regards to the Middle East, and just their approach differs. Do you agree?

LaRouche: No, there is not. It's more complicated. We're a nation which has many tendencies in it. Sometimes, certain combinations are on top. The top domination tends to be the financial community, the financial interest, which is sometimes the opponent of our government. And that's what it is.

For example, in the last year, I was able to change U.S. policy, as an individual, going into 2005. In 2005, we put up an excellent resistance to the worst of the Cheney-Bush policies and we were successful. Beginning this year, we've been a little less successful, and we're always fighting to get this thing under control. But on the main questions, the general American opinion is opposed to this war policy.

Q: You have been skeptical about the 9/11 incident from the very beginning. After you, people like Thierry Meyssan, von Bülow, and Chossudovsky, have been in line with your idea. Do you have any new documents showing something about the facts lying behind the 9/11 incident?

LaRouche: Well, I think some of your listeners who have ever done some hunting of animals would understand this better than most of our press people seem to understand it. What I said—before the inauguration of George Bush in January of 2001, I said, because of the financial crisis coming down, and the incompetence of a Bush Administration, we must expect soon, that there will be an incident like Hermann Göring setting fire to the Reichstag—in the attempt to establish a Bush dictatorship. Now, that happened. That's what 9/11 was. Somebody of the international forces which are controlled out of London and the U.S., these international forces decided to pull an attempt to establish a dictatorship in the United States. It did not succeed: But it came very

dangerously close to succeeding. And that's what the fact is.

Why not look in that direction? In looking at history, that's the way you look at things. That's the way a competent strategist looks at things, not many of these gossips, who keep trying to find little secret things that may not exist.

Q: Why is George W. Bush insisting on pursuing the policies, which not only most Americans, but also the world, opposes?

LaRouche: Well, this is not just George Bush. George Bush is not the most intelligent man that the United States has ever put into public office! And I wouldn't go too far in trying to attribute intention to George. He runs with various policies. He's very limited intellectually, and he's controlled by circles of people around him, by and large. That's the problem. So, I wouldn't put too much on his intentions.

What you have, the power in the world today, is the international financier power, not political power as such. For example, the German government can't even govern its own country, because of Maastricht, because of the European club. Italy's somewhat the same; France, to a lesser degree, but more or less the same.

So, governments around the world today are very weak, because they are led to be controlled by international financial institutions which actually, effectively, control them. And this is the way, I think, you should look at it.

Q: It is interesting that sometimes we see that George W. Bush says something, especially in his interviews with the media, and after a couple of days some other official in, for example, the American State Department, says something quite the contrary to what George W. Bush has said. What is the reason behind this contradiction?

LaRouche: Because it's a complicated situation. George W. Bush is not very intelligent. He does have certain sentimental reactions to things. And there's a big conflict within the Administration, now, on what the policy is. For example, most of the crowd around George Bush does not want to go to war. They would go to bluffing to get their way on an issue, but they do not actually want to go to a new war.

Dick Cheney, on the other hand, the people behind him, *want* to go to a war! And they want to do anything possible to get to a war, right now. They are the ones trying to use Netanyahu as the alternative for an attack on Iran, whereas most forces in the United States are against getting into that kind of thing.

It's that kind of situation. We have a complicated situation inside our government. We do not have unanimity. We have fights constantly, on the interpretation of policy, on the interpretation of words—it's a daily fight, and there is no simple consistency in the process.

Q: And, one last question, Mr. LaRouche: Considering human and financial costs of the strike option against Iran, do you think the U.S. has the potential and ability to do that?

And if it does so, what would the consequences be for the region and for the world?

LaRouche: Well, I think most people would agree with me, who are specialists, that an attack on Iran, which is what's planned, of course, as an option by Cheney and Company, is an aerial attack with the aid of sending in Special Forces for special operations. Now, such an attack, if it were significant, in terms of its effect on Iran, would mean a consolidation of the thing that the British have been pushing for, from the Arab Bureau, which is a return to the spirit of the Crusades, to treat Islam throughout the world *as the enemy*, as a way of running the world. It's like the Crusaders did during the Middle Ages; as like was done between 1492-1648 in Europe: Religious warfare. That's what they want to start.

But, the significance is, if they go to it, my estimate is that the price of oil goes, first of all, goes to about \$150 a barrel. Similar kinds of problems erupt, general chaos. I don't think that the people who want this war, could win it, in any conventional sense. They could, however, create Hell on Earth. And I think anybody who understands this, wants to stop it, for that common understanding of why we have to stop it.

Q: Well, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, [former] U.S. Presidential candidate, and editor and columnist at *Executive Intelligence Review*, it's always interesting talking with you. Thank you very much for your time.

LaRouche: Thank you! Good to be with you.

Russia's Lavrov: There Is No 'Deal' Against Iran

Russia and Iran continued negotiations on March 13-14 in the effort to find a solution to the dispute over Iran's nuclear program. An Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman described the talks as successful, underlining that both sides agreed "on the necessity to abstain from hasty decisions."

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, in a March 13 interview with the Moscow daily *Vremya Novostei*, was asked about a reported effort of the Bush Administration to entice Russia to support confrontation with Iran, by offering it entry to the World Trade Organization (WTO). Lavrov vigorously denied this: "A deal—how would that work? What kind of deal could there possibly be? We join the WTO, then we let the Americans bomb Iran—is that it? . . . You know, we will never exchange what is rightfully ours for anything."

Lavrov insisted that there is no strategy to transfer the Iran issue from the International Atomic Energy Agency



(IAEA) to the UN Security Council, as the United States, Britain, and France are demanding. "We do not agree with those who, it seems to us, in their actions are trying to exploit the situation around Iran to solve political tasks in their dealings with the regime which is currently in Tehran. . . . Iran does not refuse to work on these questions. . . . As for a strategy of action in the Security Council, where the exhortations are, to refer the substance of the entire work on Iran, there is no such strategy."

"Our Western partners understand that without the IAEA, this problem . . . can't be solved," he said. "But there is some dichotomy observable among them. They are saying: Let us start working in the Security Council as well as continuing to work in the IAEA. It is not understandable to us, so far, how this can tactically be written into the very same strategy which we have not yet discussed. Therefore, we will explicitly proceed from the priority of agreeing upon a strategic line. . . . We insist that the IAEA should professionally continue working. But sometimes our Western partners suggest acting according to the following logic: 'Now that there is no clarity, let us step up pressure and impose sanctions as quickly as possible.'"

Lavrov emphasized that Russian policy is based on its national interests: "Exchanges are possible when there are objective reciprocal interests. And when you exchange with your partners a thing that does you no harm. That is, you give away something or agree with something that does not run counter to your interests. And an escalation of the situation around Iran does run counter to our interests in the most direct way. This is quite near our region, our borders, and we consider any military action inadmissible. We're having no exchanges on Iran. On Iran we're exchanging views as to what to do next. We are working out a strategy which would not permit exploding the situation, and which would not isolate Iran, and would not drive it into a corner. For he who is driven into a corner does not act quite rationally. And if the IAEA ceases working in Iran, then we will have no possibility to understand what is happening there. That's exactly what we want to avoid. Simultaneously, we want Iran to cease taking ill-considered steps in relations with the IAEA. This concerns . . . a resumption of the moratorium on all enrichment work for the period of the clarification of the questions about the nuclear program. So here we have two absolutely self-valuable questions in this regard. And each of them affects our national interests."

The Foreign Minister was asked about a "set of chessmen" he had given President George Bush when he was in Washington, and whether that contained a "hint" that Bush should study his next moves, as in a game of chess. Lavrov answered wryly that "there was no such hint. And even if we had wanted to do so, then that would not have been required; for George Bush himself, speaking of how to act towards Iran, said that it was necessary to show caution and, before making the first move, one ought to think out all the subsequent moves completely. But that's also Russian policy a full 100 percent!"