



War Without End

The global war against terror from a British perspective

[FAQ](#) [Popular Topics](#) [Search](#) [Memberlist](#) [Usergroups](#) [Register](#)
[Profile](#) [Log in to check your private messages](#) [Log in](#)
[UK and World News](#)

Israel First McCain Pushing Attack on Iran for Israel



[War Without End Forum Index -> Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

[View previous topic](#) :: [View next topic](#)

Author	Message
<p>Alpha</p> <p>Joined: 06 Jan 2003 Posts: 41811</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Posted: Mon Dec 11, 2006 12:56 pm Post subject: Israel First McCain Pushing Attack on Iran for Israel reply</p> <p>IRAN: THE NEXT WAR FOR ISRAEL:</p> <p>http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=49800</p> <p>A War for Israel: Colin Powell Seems to Think So:</p> <p>http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=61128</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Israel First McCain Pushing Attack on Iran for Israel:</p> <p>This McCain has been a hack for Israel for years (also keep in mind that the New York Post is a neocon vehicle owned by PNAC sponser and Fox Neocon News Channel owner Rupert Murdoch of Newscorp..):</p> <p>McCain is willing to have US attack Iran next for Israel as well (he is a favorite of the JINSA/PNAC Neocons up at AEI like Bill Kristol and company as well - Colin Powell conveyed that the 'JINSA crowd' is in control of the Pentagon for Washington Post editor Karen DeYoung's new bio book about him):</p> <p>http://www.nypost.com/seven/12112006/news/nationalnews/johnny_apple_nationalnews_maggie_haberman.htm</p> <p>JOHNNY APPLE</p>

By MAGGIE HABERMAN

December 11, 2006 -- Sen. John McCain swept onto the turf of potential rivals Hillary Rodham Clinton and Rudy Giuliani last night, vowing a strong defense of Israel and saying military action may be needed to prevent Iran from building nukes.

"The Iranian regime defines itself by hostility to Israel and the United States," McCain said in a convocation speech for Yeshiva University at the Waldorf-Astoria, adding, "We are dealing with a possibly deranged and surely dangerous regime."

"We have a long way to go diplomatically before we need to contemplate other measures," McCain said. "But it is a simple observation of reality that there is only one thing worse than a military solution, and that, my friends, is a nuclear-armed Iran.

"The regime must understand that it cannot win a showdown with the world," he said.

"And as Americans, we also need to reassure the reformers and the millions of Iranians who aspire to self-determination that we support their longing for freedom and democracy."

On Israel, he pledged that America will "defeat terrorism . . . and we will stand with Israel as she fights the same enemy."

He also promised the state of Israel will "always, always" exist.

McCain, who is slated to travel to the Mideast tomorrow, touched on Iraq briefly, saying that to "wash our hands of a messy situation . . . is to risk catastrophe . . . If U.S. forces begin a pullout, we risk all-out civil war and the emergence of a failed state in the heart of the Middle East."

It was McCain's first trip to New York since he formed his exploratory committee for a presidential run. Last year's keynote speaker at the Yeshiva event was Sen. Clinton, who is considered the front-runner among potential Democratic candidates for the 2008 nod.

McCain is viewed by insiders as the GOP 2008 front-runner, though Giuliani leads national polls.

McCain was slated to have a private dinner with Mayor Bloomberg later last night at Gracie Mansion after Bloomberg aides arranged the meeting.

The two have been friendly in the past, though Bloomberg, according to a New York magazine article, recently took jabs at McCain's 2008 candidacy.

McCain's trip to New York also features a string of political meetings, including a major campaign finance committee breakfast this morning in Midtown.

maggie.haberman@nypost.com

Attacking Iran would compound Iraq fiasco

Published: December 11 2006 02:00 | Last updated: December 11 2006 02:00

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/1625422e-88bc-11db-b485-0000779e2340.html>

No one who has read the Baker report's devastating if delicately worded indictment of US policy in Iraq could fail to understand that it spells failure. And that without wholesale changes of policy the US is staring at a humiliating defeat in the Middle East. No one, that is, except George W. Bush.

The president seems incapable of acknowledging the scale of the disaster in Iraq. He and his coterie blame the Iraqis, and Iran, for US failures. They persist in identifying the US national interest and Israeli hegemony in the Middle East as the same thing. For good measure, Mr Bush rejects a key finding of the Baker report: that, in pursuing policies to stabilise the region and get a grip on Iraq, the US

should talk to Syria and, above all, to Iran.

But it is not just that Mr Bush is petulantly spurning the lifeline thrown to him by his father's former secretary of state - more of interest to students of psychodrama than geopolitics.

There is a terrifying possibility this administration will raise the stakes and compound the Iraq misadventure into a regional and international catastrophe by attacking Iran - or by acquiescing in an attack by Israel.

True, Robert Gates, the new defence secretary confirmed last week to replace Donald Rumsfeld, the man most directly responsible for Iraq, has said there are no plans to attack Iran except as an "absolute last resort". That is not altogether reassuring.

The problem goes beyond the well-founded suspicions about Iran's nuclear ambitions. The US has been viscerally incapable of dealing with Iran ever since the 1979 Islamist revolution, the 1980-81 Tehran hostages crisis and the 1983-84 bombings of US marines and diplomats in Beirut. That hostility has only been deepened by the bitter paradox that the US invasion of Iraq has greatly expanded Shia Iran's influence throughout the Middle East.

Washington rages against the mullahs and their proxies but has become dependent on Iran to hold together western Afghanistan and prevent total implosion in Iraq. Israel, meanwhile, has convinced the Bush administration Iran is a threat to its existence rather than its hegemony - a claim helped by President Mahmoud Ahmadi-Nejad's outrageous Holocaust denials.

But Iran is, nonetheless, as big a challenge in the Middle East as the Soviet Union was in Europe. It requires a similarly robust but reasoned policy response. Attacking it would trigger a wave of reprisals and a long war of attrition across and beyond the region, and might not even seriously set back Iran's well-concealed nuclear programme. That leaves engagement.

The goal, as the Baker report indicates, is to get workable mutual security arrangements with Iran: to steer it away from the nuclear path and towards co-operation in a region where its role would be recognised. That is not appeasement but hard-nosed diplomacy and it is obviously worth trying.

Look at how General Zinni conveyed (below) that the Iraq war was for Israel in accordance with the neoconservative agenda (as a follow-up segment to this with you asking Colin Powell about the 'JINSA crowd' controlling the Pentagon backs up what Powell's good friend, General Zinni, already conveyed prior on 'Sixty Minutes' below.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/05/21/60minutes/main618896.shtml>

May 21, 2004

Ret. Gen. Anthony Zinni once commanded America's troops in the Middle East (CBS)

Quote

"Regardless of whose responsibility I think it is, somebody has screwed up. ... it should be evident to everybody that they've screwed up. And whose heads are rolling on this?"

Gen. Anthony Zinni

(CBS) Retired General Anthony Zinni is one of the most respected and outspoken military leaders of the past two decades.

From 1997 to 2000, he was commander-in-chief of the United States Central Command, in charge of all American troops in the Middle East. That was the same job held by Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf before him, and Gen. Tommy Franks after.

Following his retirement from the Marine Corps, the Bush administration thought so highly of Zinni that it appointed him to one of its highest diplomatic posts -- special envoy to the Middle East.

But Zinni broke ranks with the administration over the war in Iraq, and now, in his harshest criticism yet, he says senior officials at the Pentagon are guilty of dereliction of duty -- and that the time has come for heads to roll. Correspondent Steve Kroft reports.

"There has been poor strategic thinking in this," says Zinni. "There has been poor operational planning and execution on the ground. And to think that we are going to 'stay the course,' the course is headed over Niagara Falls. I think it's time to change course a little bit, or at least hold somebody responsible for putting you on this course. Because it's been a failure."

Zinni spent more than 40 years serving his country as a warrior and diplomat, rising from a young lieutenant in Vietnam to four-star general with a reputation for candor.

Now, in a new book about his career, co-written with Tom Clancy, called "Battle Ready," Zinni has handed up a scathing indictment of the Pentagon and its conduct of the war in Iraq.

In the book, Zinni writes: "In the lead up to the Iraq war and its later conduct, I saw at a minimum, true dereliction, negligence and irresponsibility, at worse, lying, incompetence and corruption."

"I think there was dereliction in insufficient forces being put on the ground and fully understanding the military dimensions of the plan. I think there was dereliction in lack of planning," says Zinni. "The president is owed the finest strategic thinking. He is owed the finest operational planning. He is owed the finest tactical execution on the ground. ... He got the latter. He didn't get the first two."

Zinni says Iraq was the wrong war at the wrong time - with the wrong strategy. And he was saying it before the U.S. invasion. In the months leading up to the war, while still Middle East envoy, Zinni carried the message to Congress: "This is, in my view, the worst time to take this on. And I don't feel it needs to be done now."

But he wasn't the only former military leader with doubts about the invasion of Iraq. Former General and National Security Advisor Brent

Scowcroft, former Centcom Commander Norman Schwarzkopf, former NATO Commander Wesley Clark, and former Army Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki all voiced their reservations.

Zinni believes this was a war the generals didn't want – but it was a war the civilians wanted.

"I can't speak for all generals, certainly. But I know we felt that this situation was contained. Saddam was effectively contained. The no-fly, no-drive zones. The sanctions that were imposed on him," says Zinni.

"Now, at the same time, we had this war on terrorism. We were fighting al Qaeda. We were engaged in Afghanistan. We were looking at 'cells' in 60 countries. We were looking at threats that we were receiving information on and intelligence on. And I think most of the generals felt, let's deal with this one at a time. Let's deal with this threat from terrorism, from al Qaeda."

One of Zinni's responsibilities while commander-in-chief at Centcom was to develop a plan for the invasion of Iraq. Like his predecessors, he subscribed to the belief that you only enter battle with overwhelming force.

But Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld thought the job could be done with fewer troops and high-tech weapons.

How many troops did Zinni's plan call for? "We were much in line with Gen. Shinseki's view," says Zinni. "We were talking about, you know, 300,000, in that neighborhood."

What difference would it have made if 300,000 troops had been sent in, instead of 180,000?

"I think it's critical in the aftermath, if you're gonna go to resolve a conflict through the use of force, and then to rebuild the country," says Zinni.

"The first requirement is to freeze the situation, is to gain control of the security. To patrol the streets. To prevent the looting. To prevent the 'revenge' killings that might occur. To prevent bands or gangs or militias that might not have your best interests at heart from growing or developing."

Last month, Secretary Rumsfeld acknowledged that he hadn't anticipated the level of violence that would continue in Iraq a year after the war began. Should he have been surprised?

"He should not have been surprised. You know, there were a number of people, before we even engaged in this conflict, that felt strongly we were underestimating the problems and the scope of the problems we would have in there," says Zinni. "Not just generals, but others -- diplomats, those in the international community that understood the situation. Friends of ours in the region that were cautioning us to be careful out there. I think he should have known that."

Instead, Zinni says the Pentagon relied on inflated intelligence information about weapons of mass destruction from Iraqi exiles, like Ahmed Chalabi and others, whose credibility was in doubt. Zinni claims there was no viable plan or strategy in place for governing post-Saddam Iraq.

"As best I could see, I saw a pickup team, very small, insufficient in the Pentagon with no detailed plans that walked onto the battlefield after the major fighting stopped and tried to work it out in the huddle -- in effect to create a seat-of-the-pants operation on reconstructing a country," says Zinni.

"I give all the credit in the world to Ambassador Bremer as a great American who's serving his country, I think, with all the kind of sacrifice and spirit you could expect. But he has made mistake after mistake after mistake."

What mistakes?

"Disbanding the army," says Zinni. "De-Baathifying, down to a level where we removed people that were competent and didn't have blood on their hands that you needed in the aftermath of reconstruction – alienating certain elements of that society."

Zinni says he blames the Pentagon for what happened. "I blame the civilian leadership of the Pentagon directly. Because if they were given the responsibility, and if this was their war, and by everything that I understand, they promoted it and pushed it - certain elements in there certainly - even to the point of creating their own intelligence to match their needs, then they should bear the responsibility," he says.

"But regardless of whose responsibility I think it is, somebody has screwed up. And at this level and at this stage, it should be evident to everybody that they've screwed up. And whose heads are rolling on this? That's what bothers me most."

Adds Zinni: "If you charge me with the responsibility of taking this nation to war, if you charge me with implementing that policy with creating the strategy which convinces me to go to war, and I fail you, then I ought to go."

Who specifically is he talking about?

"Well, it starts with at the top. If you're the secretary of defense and you're responsible for that. If you're responsible for that planning and that execution on the ground. If you've assumed responsibility for the other elements, non-military, non-security, political, economic, social and everything else, then you bear responsibility," says Zinni. "Certainly those in your ranks that foisted this strategy on us that is flawed. Certainly they ought to be gone and replaced."

Zinni is talking about a group of policymakers within the administration known as "the neo-conservatives" who saw the invasion of Iraq as a way to stabilize American interests in the region and strengthen the position of Israel. They include Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz; Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith; Former Defense Policy Board member Richard Perle; National Security Council member Eliot Abrams; and Vice President Cheney's chief of staff, Lewis "Scooter" Libby.

Zinni believes they are political ideologues who have hijacked American policy in Iraq.

"I think it's the worst kept secret in Washington. That everybody - everybody I talk to in Washington has known and fully knows what their agenda was and what they were trying to do," says Zinni.

"And one article, because I mentioned the neo-conservatives who describe themselves as neo-conservatives, I was called anti-Semitic. I

mean, you know, unbelievable that that's the kind of personal attacks that are run when you criticize a strategy and those who propose it. I certainly didn't criticize who they were. I certainly don't know what their ethnic religious backgrounds are. And I'm not interested."

Adds Zinni: "I know what strategy they promoted. And openly. And for a number of years. And what they have convinced the president and the secretary to do. And I don't believe there is any serious political leader, military leader, diplomat in Washington that doesn't know where it came from."

Zinni said he believed their strategy was to change the Middle East and bring it into the 21st century.

"All sounds very good, all very noble. The trouble is the way they saw to go about this is unilateral aggressive intervention by the United States - the take down of Iraq as a priority," adds Zinni. "And what we have become now in the United States, how we're viewed in this region is not an entity that's promising positive change. We are now being viewed as the modern crusaders, as the modern colonial power in this part of the world."

Should all of those involved, including Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz, resign?

"I believe that they should accept responsibility for that," says Zinni. "If I were the commander of a military organization that delivered this kind of performance to the president, I certainly would tender my resignation. I certainly would expect to be gone."

"You say we need to change course -- that the current course is taking us over Niagara Falls. What course do you think ought to be set," Kroft asked Zinni.

"Well, it's been evident from the beginning what the course is. We should have gotten this U.N. resolution from the beginning. What does it take to sit down with the members of the Security Council, the permanent members, and find out what it takes," says Zinni.

"What is it they want to get this resolution? Do they want a say in political reconstruction? Do they want a piece of the pie economically? If that's the cost, fine. What they're gonna pay for up front is boots on the ground and involvement in sharing the burden."

Are there enough troops in Iraq now?

"Do I think there are other missions that should be taken on which would cause the number of troops to go up, not just U.S., but international participants? Yes," says Zinni.

"We should be sealing off the borders, we should be protecting the road networks. We're not only asking for combat troops, we're looking for trainers; we're looking for engineers. We are looking for those who can provide services in there."

But has the time come to develop an exit strategy?

"There is a limit. I think it's important to understand what the limit is. Now do I think we are there yet? No, it is salvageable if you can convince the Iraqis that what we're trying to do is in their benefit in the long run," says Zinni.

"Unless we change our communication and demonstrate a different image to the people on the street, then we're gonna get to the point where we are going to be looking for quick exits. I don't believe we're there now. And I wouldn't want to see us fail here."

Zinni, who now teaches international relations at the College of William and Mary, says he feels a responsibility to speak out, just as former Marine Corps Commandant David Shoup voiced early concerns about the Vietnam war nearly 40 years ago.

"It is part of your duty. Look, there is one statement that bothers me more than anything else. And that's the idea that when the troops are in combat, everybody has to shut up. Imagine if we put troops in combat with a faulty rifle, and that rifle was malfunctioning, and troops were dying as a result," says Zinni.

"I can't think anyone would allow that to happen, that would not speak up. Well, what's the difference between a faulty plan and strategy that's getting just as many troops killed? It's leading down a path where we're not succeeding and accomplishing the missions we've set out to do."

60 Minutes asked Secretary Rumsfeld and his deputy Wolfowitz to respond to Zinni's remarks. The request for an interview was declined.

Last edited by Alpha on Thu Dec 14, 2006 7:20 pm; edited 2 times in total

[Back to top](#)



Alpha

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 41811

Posted: Mon Dec 11, 2006 2:00 pm Post subject:



President Carter talks about AIPAC and Israel on C-SPAN

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wBJgaBe5NgM>

US Support of Israel's brutal oppression of the Palestinians PRIMARY MOTIVATION for tragic attacks on the World Trade Center in 1993 and on 9/11:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=39590>

[Back to top](#)



Display posts from previous:



[War Without End Forum Index -> Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

All times are GMT

You **cannot** post new topics in this forum
You **cannot** reply to topics in this forum
You **cannot** edit your posts in this forum
You **cannot** delete your posts in this forum
You **cannot** vote in polls in this forum

Powered by phpBB © 2001, 2005 phpBB Group