

Iraq War 'Aimed Against The Eurasian Land-Bridge'

Speaking to the plenary of the Chamber of Deputies on April 11, Congressman Irapuan Teixeira, of the PRONA party, gave this briefing on the perpetual war strategy of those who launched war against Iraq.

... The Brazilian government did nothing at all against the unilateral war which the George W. Bush government, captive of a group of neo-fascist ideologues coordinated by Vice President Dick Cheney, launched against Iraq. . . . I celebrate the notable growth of the anti-war movement worldwide, even without sharing some of the analyses popular in it, the which disorient an understanding of the real cause of the bellicose obsession of Washington and London.

The war does not represent either the final phase of capitalism, nor a way of bringing about an economic recovery, for the simple reason that the United States no longer has the powerful industrial base upon which President Franklin Roosevelt could implement his famous New Deal and the economic mobilization for World War II, from which the country emerged as the greatest economic power in history.

On the contrary, throughout the last three decades, U.S. industry and economic infrastructure were ruined by the same liberal ideology inherited from Anglo-Dutch colonial practices, whose hegemony transformed the world economy into a speculative financial casino, provoking the systemic crisis which is today in the midst of its final death-rattle.

Similarly, we are not dealing with a simple war for the control of natural resources, such as the oil of the Middle East and the Caucasus, even if it is undeniable that the United States of America and its few allies—or better, only ally—could benefit from it in the short term.

These explanations minimize the global geopolitical interests of the Anglo-Americans and their allies in Israel. The Anglo-American assault against Iraq represents a watershed for all humanity, not only because of its openly unjust and illegitimate nature, but because of its destructive global effect on the very bases of international law and civilized coexistence among nations. The Anglo-American attack on Iraq could soon define a scenario of perpetual war, whose immediate consequence could be a conflict involving a desperate North Korea, and, later, other countries considered rebels—already even named by the Americans—against the imperialist designs of Washington and London.

Thus, the offensive against Iraq and the accusations against the regime of Saddam Hussein were merely pretexts to set in motion a Clash of Civilizations, a state of perpetual war, which would begin against the Islamic peoples, and would extend like a trail of gunpowder along the routes of Eurasian integration.

The destruction of the effort to establish a Eurasian Land-Bridge capable of triggering the urgent process of world economic recovery, is the primary objective of the imperial impulse.

In reality, the attack on Iraq has been planned for more than a decade by a group of supremacist ideologues and policymakers, such as Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Dick Cheney, Lewis Libby, and others who held various posts in the government of Bush's father, and returned under Bush, Jr. Keeping in mind that we could go on at length analyzing these writings—the which a very intelligent critic, the journalist Lorenzo Carrasco [*EIR's* correspondent—ed.] has at hand—the ease with which the United States took Iraq, surprises me. . . .

The Brazilian government must be alert not only on domestic, but also foreign policy, in order that we preserve the country for our children and grandchildren. The possibility that Brazil could be invaded as Iraq was, by bellicose governments that had not the least compassion for the people of that country, worries me.