

back at least to mid-July. The official line coming out of Washington is that if elections were held, “the Shi’ites” would take over, and the government would be nothing but the long arm of neighboring Iran, a Shi’ite nation. The scare story features the danger of an Iranian-style Islamic revolution taking over in Baghdad.

None of this corresponds to reality. In fact, none of the Shi’ite groups—not even the SCIRI—wants an Iranian-style government for Iraq. Inside Iran, virtually no one wants it either. The scare stories have been cooked up as a means of justifying the sabotage of an actually representative and independent government. As the leading Iraq expert in Germany, Aziz Alkazaz, told *EIR*, America must know it cannot eliminate Islam from the country, and should know that no one wants an Islamic republic in Iraq. The Iraqi Shi’ites cannot, and will not, function as the “long arm of Iran” inside Iraq. Furthermore, he said, one should know that the Iraqi

Shi’ites have an historical precedent—the fight against Britain, going back to 1920. That, and not the Iranian revolution of 1979, is the historical impulse now being felt.

The mess created by the U.S.-led aggression threatens to get worse, and to spread, unless order is restored. The occupying powers will try to use the new UN resolution to legitimize the war, and to make their presence permanent, although the resolution calls for a UN “review” after 12 months. The longer the foreign military remains, the greater the Iraqi resistance will be; recent incidents, including the killing of two U.S. soldiers in Baghdad, and the shooting on a military vehicle in Falluja on May 22, are signs of things to come.

The internal situation is characterized by the “Catch-22”—that the Iraqis will not accept occupation, and the occupiers will not allow an independent sovereign government.

What Middle East Leaders Can Do Now

The author had the opportunity on May 17, to deliver a lecture at the Center for Asian Studies at the Cairo University, on the post-war situation and the perspectives for changing American foreign policy. The fear that policy-makers in the region face, was apparent. The author’s main point was that the prevailing response in the region—to seek a compromise, to make concessions to the U.S. war party, or even to capitulate to it outright—is dangerous and wrong. Unless the fascist policy pursued by the current coup faction in Washington were defeated, it would bring global destruction.

The speech stressed that one should recognize that the war party represents a minority whose economic base is crumbling. There are forces both inside the United States and internationally, associated with Lyndon LaRouche, which are mobilizing to make a Constitutional “counter-coup” against the chicken-hawks, to reorient U.S. foreign policy along the lines of the best of the American tradition. Thus, the challenge is to organize politically with this counter-coup process.

The 13-year history of the “new” pre-emptive war doctrine (including its nuclear aspect) was presented, along with the personnel involved in “Cheney’s gang,” their common Straussian fascist philosophy, and their “new Roman Empire” project. All this was elaborated in the light of LaRouche’s Presidential campaign foreign policy paper, “A World of Sovereign Nation-States” (see *EIR*, May 16), as well as recent moves toward this

perspective among Eurasian nations.

Prof. Mohammed Selim, director of the Center for Asian Studies, emphasized the factor of deception involved in the war party’s operations, beginning with the Sept. 11, 2001 coup, which has remained shrouded in lies. Professor Selim raised other questions regarding U.S. foreign policy in the context of LaRouche’s approach to it; this was followed by hours of questions and answers by the conference participants.

The central issue of the discussion boiled down to the political choices before the American people in the 2004 elections: What will a change from a Republican to a Democratic administration mean, and can it be made? What does the future hold for Bush? The gathering of intellectuals, politicians, think-tankers, journalists, and military figures was remoralized by the knowledge, that an effective opposition does exist inside the United States. LaRouche’s current activities in orchestrating the “counter-coup” and also organizing international combinations around solutions to the underlying economic crisis, generated great interest.

Such a discussion encapsulates the dynamic at work now in the Middle East/Persian Gulf region. Although the shock of the war is still great, there is a readiness to look reality in the face. This involves grasping the grave dangers posed by the continuing hegemony of the monster in Washington; but, precisely for this reason, it also involves taking up the alternatives available, and working with them to effect a fundamental shift. If Middle East political figures and organizations help effect such a fundamental shift through LaRouche’s leadership, then, ironically, it may turn out that the illegal war against Iraq will have led to the final defeat of its perpetrators, and their imperial policy.

—Muriel Mirak-Weissbach