

British-Directed Coup in Iran Exposed; The Question Now Is: What Comes Next?

by Hussein Askary

June 26—The British Empire was caught in the act as its agents were working intensively to turn a legitimate protest against the official outcome of the June 12 Presidential elections in Iran, into a bloody “revolution.” *EIR* warned in its June 26 issue, in its analysis Iranian elections, that exactly this was likely to happen.

For the first time, since the mid-1990s, when *EIR* and Lyndon LaRouche launched an international investigation on the role of London as the center of global terrorism, has a government in Southwest Asia, in this case Iran, dared to attack the British directly for its attempt to create chaos throughout region.

Following several days of protests by supporters of Presidential candidate Mir Hossein Mousavi, who was reportedly defeated in the disputed elections by sitting President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Iranian supreme religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei addressed the nation during the June 19 Friday prayer, where he called on all parties to practice self restraint, to stop the protests, and to resort to legal channels to review the results of the elections. Khamenei seized the opportunity to attack the Iran’s historical enemy, Britain, as the “greatest evil” among all nations. He warned that agents of the empire were out to do the same thing as the British and George Soros—although not naming him by name—did in Georgia, Ukraine, and other countries in which frustrated youth were activated, through electronic channels, to rise against their government.

The days after Khamenei’s speech witnessed the emergence of exactly this force. As the huge peaceful demonstrations disappeared, violent rioters appeared in the streets of Tehran. Small groups of up to 100 persons started burning cars, buses, and attacking pro-government Baseej militia posts.

On Sunday, June 21, Foreign Minister Manushehr Mottaki, in the most direct and detailed attack yet on the British Empire by an Iranian official, charged the

British with: 1. training terrorists to launch attacks inside Iran; 2. being involved in the post-election destabilization; 3. spreading disinformation; and, 4. playing an historical role as the main enemy of the Iranian nation and its neighbors, including “leading” the U.S. to invade Iraq on false pretexts, and helping to increase the drug production in Afghanistan in the British-controlled areas. Mottaki was speaking in a briefing he gave at the Foreign Ministry to foreign diplomats.

Over the past few years, *EIR* has published documentation for all these charges. However, no government has yet taken these operations seriously, or dared to make them a point of discussion internationally in order to stop them.

Mottaki said, “The recent period witnessed the influx of persons from Britain to Iran to directly influence the course of events.” He added: “London trained specific individuals in Basrah [southern Iraq] to carry out bombings in Iran, and the British forces in Afghanistan supported the production of drugs, which led to the increase of production manifold.”

Britain Caused the Insurrection

The Foreign Minister stressed that “Britain was the cause of insurrection, disputes, and conflicts in Iran in the past decades. They also supported Saddam in his war against Iran, and led the United States to occupy Iraq without any legal justification.”

He also pointed to Britain’s threats against Iran concerning Iran’s nuclear program through Britain’s role in the 5+1 group. He also accused Britain of playing a key media, spying, and official role in the recent elections in Iran. He explained that the first step the British undertook was to encourage people to boycott the elections. Many people came from Britain to affect the course of events in the country. Britain has to realize that its interference in other nations’ affairs is con-

tributing to the increasing hostility against it.

Mottaki called on Britain to forget the slogan “the Empire on which the sun never sets.” He stated that France, Britain, and Germany are risking their nations’ interests by interfering in Iranian domestic affairs. The Westerners, he said, are trying to impose their conditions and descriptions of democracy on other countries, referring to the different colored revolutions.

One day before Mottaki made these statements, the Iranian Intelligence Ministry reported that it had identified and arrested a large number of Mujahedin Khalq Organization (MKO) members who were involved in recent riots in Iran’s capital. The website of Iranian Press TV reported that, according to the security officials, the arrested members had confessed that they were extensively trained in Iraq’s camp Ashraf to create post-election mayhem in Iran, and that they have been given directions by the MKO command post in London. Iranian national television aired telephone conversations between a woman in London, and some of the arrested rioters, in which the woman was giving commands on where, how, and when to attack and burn targets.

Although these reports have to be taken with a grain of salt, they cannot be ruled out completely, since the truth of MKO operations in London, and the steering of Islamic terrorist activities by their leaders based in that city, have been documented thoroughly.

On June 21, Iranian authorities asked the British Broadcasting Corporation’s (BBC) correspondent John Leyne to leave the country within 24 hours. This came only hours after Mottaki attacked the British explicitly for destabilizing the country, including through the British media.

On the same day, Foreign Ministry spokesman Hassan Qashqavi, strongly condemned the British and their media, for running insurgency and psywar operations against the country.

“They [the BBC and the VOA] are the mouthpiece of their governments’ public diplomacy. . . . They have two guidelines regarding Iran. One is to intensify ethnic and racial rifts within Iran, and secondly, to disintegrate the Iranian territories.”

Qashqavi warned that “any contact with these channels, under any pretext or in any form, means contacting the enemy of the Iranian nation.”

The BBC has redesigned its website page on Iran as

a warroom. It addresses Iranians directly, under each story on the crisis:

“Are you in Iran? What do you think of the current situation? Are you taking part in the demonstrations? If you have any information you would like to share with the BBC you can do so using the form below: Send your pictures and video to yourpics@bbc.co.uk or text them to +44 7725 100 100. If you have a large file you can upload here. . . .”

The rioters use the BBC site to not only send coordinates of where and when riots are planned, they are also fed instructions on where and when to act. In addition, this gives the BBC direct control over the flow of information (or disinformation) to other European and American mass media.

After the expulsion of the BBC correspondent, both Britain and Iran expelled lower-level diplomats from each other’s embassies. Mottaki had a meeting with the Speaker of the Iranian Parliament (Majlis-e Shura) and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to discuss the “reviewing of diplomatic relations” with Britain. The British have maintained their proverbial one foot on each side, and have worked to keep its embassy in Tehran open, while the U.S. Embassy was occupied during the riots, and later closed.

Nota Bene!

In spite of this useful intervention by the Iranian government, it has to be noted here, that the Iranian leadership concept of what the British empire and its motivations are, differs in obvious ways from that of *EIR* and LaRouche. The Iranian leadership’s understanding of the role of Britain is plagued by a worldview typical of the propaganda of the Muslim Brotherhood, for example, or the Marxist movements in Europe that state that the British Empire as such ceased to exist after World War II, when the “U.S. Empire” took over that role. Every analysis of world events since then, is seen through the dark and thick glass of this view. The leader of the Islamic Revolution, Ayatollah Khomeini, made the slogan “America, the Great Satan” an integral part of the Iranian way of thinking. When Ayatollah Khamenei attacked the British in last week’s Friday prayers, the people attending the sermon automatically chanted: “Down with U.S.A.,” and “Down with Imperialism”!

The notion that the British have become the “tail” of “American imperialism” is so deeply rooted, that it is



Creative Commons/Shahram Sharif

A huge, peaceful campaign rally for Presidential candidate Mousavi (left), on June 9; by June 13, as the demonstrations dispersed, violent rioters appeared in the streets of Tehran (below), as the British attempt to mount a coup, in the form of a “color revolution.”



Creative Commons/Shahram Sharif

almost impossible for political leaders and analysts in the region to understand what is really going on in the world, in almost every case. There is almost no clear understanding, if any, of the distinction made by LaRouche, philosophically, culturally, and scientifically, between the American system and the British imperial system. Unfortunately, the Sun has *not* set on the British Empire. The British Empire, as has been made clear, time and again, in this magazine, is not the people of the British Isles. It is the private financial interests centered in the City of London, with tentacles in Europe’s oligarchical financial circles and Wall Street, and now, even in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf. It is they who have dominated world economic and political decision making under the name of globalization. As the system of globalization disintegrates, the Empire is resorting to “managed chaos” operations to prevent sovereign nations states from reorganizing the world financial and economic system for the benefit and welfare of the people of each nation, not some oligarchical private interests.

The British Reaction

The archenemy of the British Empire was, and still potentially is, a sovereign, anti-imperialist United States. For that reason, the main aim of the British has been to prevent America from returning to the legacy of the American Revolution and republican Constitution. At the same time, it does everything in its capability to create conflict between the U.S. and other nations.

Under such circumstances, the British actually would not want to have the moderates in Iran to come to power. The British, through their direct involvement against the government, meant to create kneejerk reaction by the Iranian hardliners by pushing them against the wall, making them become more violent and fanatic. A more hardened President Ahmadinejad

and a fanatic government in Tehran would be more closed to the Western world, including the United States, and vice-versa. Under those conditions, any potential cooperation between Iran and the U.S. to stabilize the situation in Iraq and Pakistan, fight the drug flow from Afghanistan, and, most of all, establish a dialogue on the Iranian nuclear program, would not see the light of day.

The British succeeded in producing the reaction they wanted: On June 25, the Iranian government decided to boycott a G-8 foreign ministers meeting to be held the following day in Italy. Iran was invited to participate in a discuss with the Western nations regarding cooperation on Afghanistan and Pakistan. The G-8, in its turn, issued a statement condemning the violence that followed the elections, and a new spiral of verbal attacks and counter-attacks was launched.

A good illustration of the British Iago-role (as in “Othello”) in this crisis was presented by former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, otherwise known as “the Butcher of Baghdad.” Blair threw himself into the fray in defense of the Empire, and to divert attention from the Iranian attack on Britain onto the U.S. In an interview with CBS’s Katie Couric, broadcast on June 25, war criminal Blair claimed that the Iranians were actually attacking Britain as a proxy for the U.S.! Answering a question on the Iranian protests against Britain, Blair said: “[It] may be possible as well that they feel going head-on against America is maybe too—too tough, so they—they—they use Britain as a proxy. But I mean, you know, what does it mean? It means nothing. I mean, it’s got no credibility. And the idea that Britain’s trying to foment this, or that anyone actually could—never mind Britain, America could foment it, nobody could foment it.”

Unfortunately, many do believe such sophistry, both in the Southwest Asia and Europe, and in the U.S. itself. Unless such lies and manipulations are exposed, and the empire destroyed, there will be neither peace nor development in the world. When people allow themselves to be sacrificed for the sake of lies and misguided beliefs, they destroy themselves and those around them, as did Othello, in William Shakespeare’s great history lesson.

The Debate in Iran: What Kind of State?

Internally, in Iran, there is a dispute over the election results, but more importantly, over what form the

state should take. However, this is a rift within the ranks of the “Islamic Revolution,” not by newly hatched “revolutionaries,” educated at Oxford or Harvard, against the government. Mousavi, and his allies, former President Mohammad Khatami and Ali Hashemi Rafsanjani, were all part of Imam Khomeini’s revolution and Islamic Republic that followed. There has been a widespread discussion in Iran on the powers of the supreme leader over the elected institutions of government, and the parallel government, which functions basically under a clergy, and exercises power that often clashes with the legitimately elected government. The Baseej militias, the Revolutionary Guards, and the Bunyad organizations maintain enormous power in the social and economic affairs of the country, including coercive practices against the civil rights of the citizens. They also consume huge portions of the nation’s oil revenues.

However, to change this reality, the “reformists” intended to use a victory in the elections to put the question of changing the institutions of government through political reform, nor violence or coups.

There is no doubt that brutal suppression of the legitimate protests of candidate Mousavi and his supporters, by the clearly unconstitutional forces of the Baseej militia and Islamic Republican Guard, opened the relevant back door for the British operations.

The British intervention, following the declared victory of hardline President Ahmadinejad, is intended to create the circumstances to turn this legitimate, but peaceful aspiration, into one more violent and bloody revolution, as the imperialists did against Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh in 1952 (wrongly blamed on the CIA alone), and against the Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi in 1979, whose purpose was to throw the nation and the region into a new round of geopolitical, “managed-chaos” and wars.

The situation in Iran will remain highly fluctuating and complex, as the different factions engage in negotiations, closed door disputes, and sometimes, open quarrels. Two things are certain, however: 1. The form of rule and division of power according to the Vilayeti Fagih arrangement, which established an unelected cleric and various religious groups on top of the power structure, is now in question; 2. If this is not solved peacefully, and through dialogue, very soon, the situation in Iran will spin out of control, as the dispute between the reformists and the conservatives becomes irreconcilable.