

Fabricating the case against Iran

By [Larry Chin](#)

Global Research, February 20, 2007

carolynbaker.org 20 February 2007

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [FAKE INTELLIGENCE, IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

The Bush administration will [attack Iran](#) as early as [spring 2007](#). The administration is on total [war footing](#).

Over the next few months, the administration and its allies and functionaries will create and provoke a pretext that forces a political consensus behind an attack on Iran. Any or all of the following may occur:

- *Violent resistance to US occupation within Iraq is blamed on Iran.* As [previously noted](#), the idea that Iran is arming Iraqi attacks against US forces is a central theme of new Bush administration propaganda. Paul Pillar, former CIA officer and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, is among many critics arguing that Iran is [not behind the attacks](#). This will not stop the Bush-Cheney apparatus from spewing lies to the contrary.
- *A major terror attack against US interests is blamed on Iran.* In recent testimony before the US Senate, Zbigniew Brzezinski warned that the Bush administration is headed on a “downhill track towards a head-on conflict with Iran and much of the world of Islam” — and that the conflict may begin with a major [terror attack, either domestically or overseas, against Americans](#) by Iran. (See also [here](#), and [here](#).)

In Brzezinski’s words, the Bush administration’s mismanagement of Iraq is an “historic, strategic and moral calamity,” “driven by Manichean impulses and imperial hubris” that “intensifies regional instability” and (of primary, if not sole concern to Brzezinski) “undermines America’s global legitimacy.” Brzezinski, a chief architect of the US “Grand Chessboard” geostrategy, which laid the foundation for the 9/11 attacks, has been an outspoken critic of the Bush administration’s “mishandling” of the war. The Bush administration has longed for the right moment to set off “[the next 9/11](#).”

- *Iraq-Iran diplomacy characterized as terrorist interference by Iran.*
- *Real and imaginary Iranian responses to Bush administration rhetoric or provocations will be characterized as war provocation by Tehran.*

- *New evidence of Iranian nuclear “intentions” will be “found,” and presented to the “international community,” in order to sanction punishment.*

Will the world fall for it again?

Gates lays the propaganda groundwork

In just completed [testimony](#) that may lay the official foundation for the coming Iran attack, Defense Secretary and Iran-Contra participant Robert Gates has asserted that Iran is “very much involved” in arming Iraqi “militants.”

This new assertion (which Gates has not backed with verifiable proof from a credible source) is based on serial numbers allegedly found on the remnants of bombs used against US forces in Iraq. Gates also stated that material seized during the (illegal and Bush-ordered) [raid of the Iranian liason office in Irbil, Iraq](#) is being included in the larger case of cooked and false intelligence against Tehran.

Gates, who skated into his post as Donald Rumsfeld’s replacement, posing as a critic of the Bush administration’s Iraq war policy, is now the Bush administration’s number one weapon of mass deception on Iran.

Covert operations

The Iran-Iraq region has been brimming with CIA activity for well over a year. It is already a known fact that George W. Bush personally ordered [provocative covert operations](#) several months ago, aimed at baiting Iran into a war.

Iran’s intelligence minister, Gholam Hossein Ejeli, claims that Iran has [uncovered a network of 100 CIA and Mossad agents](#). (Also see [here](#).)

This comes in the wake of a Bush [“shoot to kill” order](#): hunt down and kill Iranians in Iraq.

Militarily and politically encircled

Events are unfolding [exactly as warned](#) by former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter, whose book. *Target: Iran*, predicted every step the criminal Bush administration and its allies have taken.

In the view of John Pilger, [the war is already on](#).

As noted by [Dmitriy Sedov](#), preparations for devastation of Iran in the spring are well underway. Among the many clear signs:

- “The UN Security Council Resolution envisions that a further tightening of the sanctions imposed on Iran must take place after February 21, 2006. From the standpoint of international law, this is a pretext (essentially a poor one, but one that does exist) to legalize an aggression against a country.”
- “Two US aircraft carrier groups armed with nukes are moving into the region. The US aircraft carrier groups have been on missions 5 times over the past 15

years. In 4 cases out of 5, they launched military offensives. In March 2007, both groups are to take their combat positions.”

- “Additional ground forces are shifted to the border between Iraq and Iran. Preparations for a new phase of hostilities are underway.”
- “In February, Patriot missile defense systems will be ready to defend Israel and the aircraft carrier groups from enemy airstrikes.”
- “British combat engineers are entering the regions of the future fighting, clearly in order to operate in the Strait of Hormuz, where Iranians are most likely to lay mines.”
- “The US and Israel launched a powerful information and propaganda campaign preparing the global public opinion for aggression.”
- “CENTCOM’s Commander John Abizade, an opponent of the war with Iran, resigned. His position was taken over by Admiral W. Fallon, a veteran of the 1991 Iraq and 1995 Bosnia campaigns.”

The Bush administration is pushing for a “surge” of up to 50,000 troops to the Middle East. Although ostensibly for Iraq, but this force is clearly intended to coincide with action against Iran.

The murder and cover-up of an Iranian diplomacy effort

In 2003, Tehran sent a sweeping proposal to the Bush administration (via the Swiss Embassy) for dialogue and regional cooperation. Bush administration officials confirm that this memo was widely circulated and discussed — and flatly rejected by the White House.

New charges of possible criminal cover-up have emerged regarding the sudden “[memory lapse](#)” of top Bush administration figures regarding this proposal.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice confirmed the memo in a recent interview on National Public Radio (“what the Iranians wanted earlier was to be one-on-one with the United States”), but suddenly reversed course. She now claims “I don’t remember ever seeing any such thing.” According to the *Washington Post*, Flynt Leverett, Rice’s staff member at the National Security Council, the Iranian proposal was received, and discussed.

In an interesting twist, Leverett claims that it was not his responsibility to “put it on Rice’s desk” because Iran-Contra co-conspirator Elliot Abrams was in charge of Middle East policy. Like Rice, Abrams, who now serves as the deputy national security adviser in charge of Middle East “democracy promotion,” also claims “no memory of any such fax and never saw

or heard any such thing.

Former State Department officials also claim to have seen the Iranian offer, and note that it was incorporated into a 2003 memo to then-Secretary of State Colin Powell, proposing a “grand bargain” with Iran. According to the officials, Powell did not forward the memo to the White House.

Worldwide “terrorism” resurgence

The Bush administration’s buildup comes simultaneously with new and resurfacing threats from “terrorists” working covertly on behalf of Anglo-American interests. Bush-Cheney’s “war on terrorism” criminal network is ramping up for a new phase of violence that it will connect to Iran.

According to unnamed US and British intelligence officials, [“Al-Qaeda” has regrouped](#), and are once again “capable and intent on launching mass attacks around the globe.”

In Afghanistan, under US occupation (and, not surprisingly, in the middle of a [once again mushrooming heroin industry](#)), the Taliban and Al-Qaeda, both of which serve as military-intelligence fronts for the US, are “back.” *New York Times* reporter [Carlotta Gall](#) reports that the new Taliban surge in Afghanistan is connected to Pakistan and Pakistan’s ISI. In the course of her investigation, Gall was [assaulted by ISI agents](#).

Gall has clearly hit a major nerve. Pakistani civilians [“fear the ISI”](#), and for good reason. The activities of the ISI (a virtual branch of the CIA), the connection between the CIA and the ISI, cuts directly to the heart of ongoing Anglo-American military-intelligence operations across the Middle East and Central Asia. *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl was murdered in 2002 during his investigation of the ISI, and connections between the ISI and “Al-Qaeda,” and 9/11.

Even as Tehran has attempted repeatedly to assist the Bush administration in hunting down terrorists, the Bush administration continues to blame terrorism on Tehran. A report that Osama bin Laden’s son was located [in Iran](#) will no doubt be used as fodder by the Bush propaganda apparatus.

Wag the dog

In addition to its many long-term geostrategic agendas behind an attack on Iran, the publicly despised Bush administration is facing political fallout domestically, and competition from the neoliberal faction (the Democrats) positioning for new political gains.

In another black eye for the administration, a recently released [report from the Pentagon’s Inspector General](#) blasts Office of Special Planning, headed by neocon (Project for a New American Century) stalwart [Douglas Feith](#), for manufacturing “dubious” intelligence leading up to the Iraq war, including a “predisposition” to link Iraq with Al-Qaeda.

The greater the damage to the Bush administration, the greater the odds of a new “wag the dog” distraction — [“the next 9/11”](#) — orchestrated by the Bush administration and Karl Rove.

Washington virtually silent on Iran

The “mismanagement” of the [Iraq](#) occupation, and feeble attempts to wrestle control of the Iraq political agenda, remains the focus of endless Washington political posturing and procedural wrangling.

Iran and Bush-Cheney’s provocations have not been major topics of argument. Based on what little discussion there has been on Iran, the leading Democrats are reportedly [split over the issue](#).

But they are uniformly behind the Bush administration’s “war on terrorism,” which seals Iran’s fate. A convincing pretext [would easily bring the Democrats in line](#) to support an attack.

Iran’s oil

According to Michael Klare, [conflict with Iran must be viewed as a chapter of resource war](#). According to some Iranian estimates, there is enough energy to last [many decades](#). The Bush administration must also be infuriated that Tehran has shown [intense interest in doing energy business with foreign investors](#) (not American ones), and maintains good ties with both China and Russia.

As Peak Oil and Gas makes itself known in earnest, and the lifeblood of the Anglo-American empire disappears drop by drop, Iran’s geostrategic importance (as a target) looms.

The gates of hell open wider

Some skeptics have maintained for years that the Bush administration will not attack Iran, based on the rational concept that not even the Bush administration and its neocons would be insane enough risk a full-blown superpower nuclear war.

But in a testimony before Congress, Robert Gates declared that the Pentagon, indeed, has plans for [full-scale war against Iran, Russia and China](#). This statement, a virtual promise of world war, suggests that the Anglo-American establishment is prepared to wage the [endless war](#). So much for sanity.

In his strongest criticism yet, Russian President Vladimir Putin [blasted the Bush administration](#) for its “almost uncontained use of military force” and “unilateral, illegitimate actions.” Said Putin, “One state, the United States, has overstepped its national borders in every way.”

The original source of this article is [carolynbaker.org](#)
Copyright © [Larry Chin](#), [carolynbaker.org](#), 2007

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca