



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](#)

Heads Up: US War Plans Versus Iran Updated



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

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

Author

Alpha

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 42686

Message

Posted: Tue Jan 16, 2007 3:36 pm Post subject: Heads Up: US War Plans Versus Iran Updated



Re: **Heads Up: US War Plans Versus Iran Updated**

From: "JJ Steinberg"

Subject: Heads Up: US War Plans Versus Iran Updated

Date: Mon, 15 Jan 2007 11:52:00 -0500

The following information has been provided by several Washington and Middle East sources, and should be assessed in light of President Bush's speech of Jan. 10. First, a Pentagon public affairs officer has confirmed that the U.S.S. Stennis carrier group is headed towards the Persian Gulf and will arrive sometime in mid-February, to supplement the U.S.S. Eisenhower carrier group already in the region (Eisenhower group is temporarily off the coast of the Horn of Africa). At that point, the assets will have been put in place for a two-track provocation against Iran, intended to provide a justification for a U.S. or Anglo-American "retaliatory" strike against Iranian targets, including alleged secret nuclear weapons sites, according to one source.

The first track of provocations has already been initiated with the U.S. military action against Iranian officials visiting the Kurdish region of Iraq last week, and with bombings inside Iran that occurred around the same time. The second track, according to a Middle East source, will be initiated anytime after the full U.S. Naval force has arrived in the Persian Gulf. Expect a U.S. naval incursion into Iranian coastal waters, aimed at provoking an Iranian military action. This will be the "Gulf of Tonkin" incident (provoked, or, as in the original Gulf of Tonkin affair, fabricated) to justify an American military strike against Iran.

The sources emphasized that Vice President Cheney, in particular, is committed to a war with Iran, and, perhaps with Syria, before he leaves office.

Several Washington sources added further details. They noted that, beginning prior to Bush's Jan. 10, 2007 speech, unveiling the Administration's "surge" plan, the Administration had shifted its propaganda line. White House claims about Iran's quest for nuclear weapons were deemed ineffective, given that the Administration had lied about Iraq's alleged WMD threat. Nobody, the source emphasized, is going to support a war against Iran on the basis of the discredited Bush-Cheney Administration's claims of "proof" that Iran has a secret nuclear weapons program, about to build a nuclear bomb. The new propaganda campaign will focus on Iran's involvement in arming insurgents inside Iraq with the anti-tank weapons ("improvised explosive devices"--IEDs) that are killing American and British soldiers. With the new rules of engagement under Bush's "surge" policy guaranteed to increase the number of American soldiers killed and wounded, the Administration plans to cynically build up this propaganda front, hoping to force Republicans in the Congress, and even some Democrats, to back their calls for action against Iran to punish them for their continuing role in the anti-American violence in Iraq.

Add to this the factor of the U.S. naval buildup in the Persian Gulf, the sources warn, and the elements are all there for Cheney's new war.

One source emphasized that the Bush speech of Jan. 10th sent shockwaves through the U.S. establishment. While many details of the Bush "surge" plan had been leaked out and briefed prior to the speech, the emphasis on Iran and Syria in the President's remarks came as a shock, and prompted many who felt the Administration's war schemes against Iran had been contained, to reassess the situation.

Thanks for this, Jim.. Thank you for writing such, Jeff.. You have been on to the JINSA/PNAC Neocon war for Israel agenda going all the way back to 'A Clean Break' as it looks like Cheney is trying to get the rest of it underway via Wurmser (who co-wrote such and is in Cheney's office) and Abrams at the NSC. Did you see the following URL yet?:

Read about the '**A Clean Break'/war for Israel** agenda via the following URL:

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=28769>

Kuwait media: U.S. military strike on Iran seen by April

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=66426>

The following by Wurmser from Seymour Hersh's article was very telling:

Then take a look at what a co-author (Wurmser who is working for Cheney) of the 'A Clean Break' document mentioned from Seymour Hersh's article below:

<http://www.commondreams.org/views06/1120-20.htm>

In the current issue of Foreign Policy, Joshua Muravchik (who is associated with JINSA as well), a prominent neoconservative, argued that the Administration had little choice. "Make no mistake: President Bush will need to bomb Iran's nuclear facilities before leaving office," he wrote. The President would be bitterly criticized for a preëemptive attack on Iran, Muravchik said, and so neoconservatives "need to pave the way intellectually now and be prepared to defend the action when it comes."

The main Middle East expert on the Vice-President's staff is David Wurmser, a neoconservative who was a strident advocate for the invasion of Iraq and the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. Like many in Washington, Wurmser "believes that, so far, there's been no price tag on Iran for its nuclear efforts and for its continuing agitation and intervention inside Iraq," the consultant said. But, unlike those in the Administration who are calling for limited strikes, Wurmser and others in Cheney's office "want to end the regime," the consultant said. "They argue that there can be no settlement of the Iraq war without regime change in Iran."

Congressman Ron Paul very concerned about a 'Gulf of Tonkin' incident as well:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?p=322639#322639>

Last edited by Alpha on Tue Jan 16, 2007 4:51 pm; edited 2 times in total

[Back to top](#)



Alpha

Posted: Tue Jan 16, 2007 3:38 pm Post subject: Kuwait media: U.S. military strike on Iran seen by April



Kuwait media: U.S. military strike on Iran seen by April

www.chinaview.cn2007-01-1415:19:28

Special report: Iran Nuclear Crisis

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-01/14/content_5604565.htm

KUWAIT CITY, Jan. 14 (Xinhua) -- U.S. might launch a military strike on Iran before April 2007, Kuwait-based daily Arab Times released on Sunday said in a report.

The report, written by Arab Times' Editor-in-chief Ahmed al-Jarallah citing a reliable source, said that the attack would be launched from the sea, while Patriot missiles would guard all Arab countries in the Gulf.

Recent statements emanating from the United States indicated the Bush administration's new strategy for Iraq doesn't include any proposal to make a compromise or negotiate with Syria or Iran, added the report.

The source told al-Jarallah that U.S. President George W. Bush recently had held a meeting with Vice President Dick Cheney, Defense Secretary Robert Gates, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and other assistants in the White House, where they discussed the plan to attack Iran in minute detail.

Vice President Dick Cheney highlighted the threat posed by Iranto not only Saudi Arabia but also the whole Gulf region, according to the source.

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 42686

"Tehran is not playing politics. Iranian leaders are using their country's religious influence to support the aggressive regime's ambition to expand," Dick Cheney was quoted by the source as saying. Indicating participants of the meeting agreed to impose restrictions on the ambitions of Iranian regime before April 2007 without exposing other countries in the region to any danger, the source said "they have chosen April as British Prime Minister Tony Blair has said it will be the last month in office for him. The United States has to take action against Iran and Syria before April 2007."

Claiming the attack will be launched from the sea and not from any country in the region, he said "the U.S. and its allies will target the oil installations and nuclear facilities of Iran ensuring there is no environmental catastrophe or after effects."

The source added that the U.S. has started sending its warships to the Gulf and the build-up would continue until Washington has the required number by the end of this month.

"U.S. forces in Iraq and other countries in the region will be protected against any Iranian missile attack by an advanced Patriot missile system," the source noted.

The Bush administration believes that attacking Iran will create a new power balance in the region, calming down the situation in Iraq and paving the way for their democratic project, which have to be suspended due to the interference of Tehran and Damascus in Iraq, according to the source.

Editor: Pan Letian

Citizens for Legitimate Government
15 January 2007
<http://www.legitgov.org/>

All links to articles as summarized below are available here:

http://www.legitgov.org/index.html#breaking_news

Kuwait media: U.S. military strike on Iran seen by April 14 Jan 2007 U.S. might launch a military strike on Iran before April 2007, Kuwait-based daily Arab Times released on Sunday said in a report. The report, written by Arab Times' Editor-in-chief Ahmed al-Jarallah citing a reliable source, said that the attack would be launched from the sea, while Patriot missiles would guard all Arab countries in the Gulf.

WSJ: 50 Active-Duty Officers To Deliver Petition Against Surge:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=66409>

***P.C. Roberts: Bush: We must attack Iran & Syria:**

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=66182>

Major investment bank issues warning on strike against Iran :

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?p=322880#322880>

Bush's Iraq Plan - Goadng Iran into War (for Israel):

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=66212>

[Back to top](#)

 [profile](#)  [pm](#)

Alpha

Posted: Tue Jan 16, 2007 4:36 pm Post subject:

 [reply](#)

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 42686

<http://queen-of-swords.dailykos.com/>

The Jones Resolution for Avoiding War with Iran

by Queen of Swords

Tue Jan 16, 2007 at 04:21:16 PM PST

Patrick Buchanan had some good thoughts recently on both the Democratic efforts to end the war and a bit of resourceful and positive action now being taken by Rep. Walter Jones of North Carolina.

http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/cgi-bin/buchanan.cgi/Conservatism/Mr_Bush_Meet_Walter.html?seemore=y

Mr. Bush, Meet Walter Jones

Tuesday, January 16, 2007

Mr. Bush: Meet Walter Jones

America is four years into a bloody debacle in Iraq not merely because Bush and Cheney marched us in, or simply because neocon propagandists lied about Saddam's nuclear program and WMDs, and Iraqi ties to al-Qaida, anthrax attacks and 9-11.

We are there because a Democratic Senate voted to give Bush a blank check for war. Democrats in October 2002 wanted the war vote behind them so they could go home and campaign as pro-war patriots.

And because they did, 3,000 Americans are dead, 25,000 are wounded, perhaps 100,000 Iraqis have lost their lives, 1.6 million have fled, \$400 billion has been lost and America stands on the precipice of the worst strategic defeat in her history.

Yet, Sens. Clinton, Biden, Kerry and Edwards—all of whom voted to give Bush his blank check—are now competing to succeed him. And how do they justify what they did?

"If only we had known then what we know now," they plead, "we would never have voted for the war." They are thus confessing to dereliction in the highest duty the Founding Fathers gave Congress. They voted to cede to a president their power to take us to war.

Now they wash their hands of it all and say, "It's Bush's War!"

And now George Bush has another war in mind.

In his Jan. 11 address, Bush said that to defend the "territorial integrity" of Iraq, the United States must address "Iran and Syria."

"These two regimes are allowing terrorists and insurgents to use their territory to move in and out of Iraq. Iran is providing material support for attacks on American troops. We will disrupt the attacks on our forces. We will interrupt the flow of support from Iran and Syria. And we will seek out and destroy the networks providing advanced weaponry and training to our enemies in Iraq."

The city sat bolt upright. If Bush was talking about Iranian agents inside Iraq, he has no need of a second aircraft carrier in the Gulf, nor for those Patriot missiles he is sending to our allies.

But does Bush have the authority to take us to war against Iran?

On ABC last Sunday, National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley, while denying Bush intends to attack Iran, nonetheless did not deny Bush had the authority to escalate the war—right into Iran.

George Stephanopoulos: "So you don't believe you have the authority to go into Iran?"

Stephen Hadley: "I didn't say that. That is another issue. Any time you have questions about crossing international borders, there are legal questions."

Any doubt how Attorney General Gonzales would come down on those "legal questions"? Any doubt how the Supreme Court would rule?

Biden sputters that should Bush attack Iran, a constitutional crisis would ensue.

I don't believe it. If tomorrow Bush took out Iran's nuclear facilities, would a Senate that lacks the courage to

cut funds for an unpopular war really impeach him for denying a nuclear capability to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad? Bush's lawyers would make the same case Nixon made for the 1970 "incursion" into Cambodia—and even a Nixon-hating Democratic House did not dare to impeach him for that.

Bush's contempt for Congress is manifest and, frankly, justified.

Asked if Congress could stop him from surging 21,500 troops into Iraq, Bush on "60 Minutes" brushed aside Congress as irrelevant.

"I fully understand (the Congress) could try to stop me from doing it. But I've made my decision. And we're going forward." Asked if he had sole authority "to put the troops in there no matter what the Congress wants to do," Bush replied, "In this situation I do, yeah."

Is Congress then impotent, if it does not want war on Iran?

Enter Rep. Walter Jones, Republican of North Carolina.

The day after Bush's threat to Iran, Jones introduced a Joint Resolution, "Concerning the Use of Military Force by the United States Against Iran." Under HJR 14, "Absent a national emergency created by attack by Iran, or a demonstrably imminent attack by Iran, upon the United States, its territories, possessions or its armed forces, the president shall consult with Congress, and receive specific authorization pursuant to law from Congress, prior to initiating any use of force on Iran."

Jones' resolution further declares, "No provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall be construed to authorize the use of military force by the United States against Iran."

If we are going to war on Iran, Jones is saying, we must follow the Constitution and Congress must authorize it.

If Biden, Kerry, Clinton and Obama refuse to sign on to the Jones resolution, they will be silently conceding that Bush indeed does have the power to start a war on Iran. And America should pay no further attention to the Democrats' wailing about being misled on the Iraq war.

To find out more about Patrick Buchanan, and read features by other Creators Syndicate writers and cartoonists, visit the Creators Syndicate web page at www.creators.com.

CREATORS SYNDICATE INC.

Revealed: IRA bombs killing soldiers in Iraq reports The Independent!??

<http://kurtnimmo.com/?p=718>

One can hear JINSA/PNAC Neocon Richard Perle basically lying to Congressman Walter 'Freedom Fries' Jones about his co-authoring of the 'A Clean Break'/war for Israel agenda via the audio link for their exchange at the following URL:

<http://gorillaintheroom.blogspot.com/2005/04/operating-off-different-agenda.html>

More about Perle's co-authoring of the 'A Clean Break' agenda which was the blueprint for the invasion of Iraq with Syria and Iran to come next is included at the following URL from pages 261-269/318-321 of esteemed US intelligence author/writer James Bamford's 'A Pretext for War' book:

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=28769>

Jim Bamford had mentioned that Congressman Jones had told him that his 'A Pretext for War' book had been instrumental in turning Jones against the Iraq quagmire.

Iran: The Next War (Bamford's article which appeared in the August 10th, 2006 of 'Rolling Stone' magazine):

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=56761>

Buchanan: Bush's ace up his sleeve (Attack Iran!):

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=66205>

Subject: **Commentary: Thinking the unthinkable**

Date: Tuesday, January 16, 2007

Commentary: Thinking the unthinkable

By ARNAUD DE BORCHGRAVE, UPI Editor at Large

WASHINGTON , Jan. 16 (UPI) -- No sooner did the United States invade Iraq in March 2003 than Iran poured hundreds of agents into Iraq to aid the majority Shiites in consolidating a sudden geopolitical bonus -- majority control (60 percent) over the minority Sunnis (20 percent) that had kept them in vassalage for generations. This was payback time.

Before the end of 2003, the Jordanian intelligence service informed the CIA that "several hundred thousand had come across the (900-mile-long) Iranian border, including Iraqi Shiite refugees who had escaped when Saddam attacked Iran in 1980 (a war that lasted eight years with about one million killed on both sides). Thus, several hundred Iranian Revolutionary Guards came in and scattered to major cities to train volunteers for the two principal Shiite militia -- the Mahdi army and Badr organization.

Almost four years later every major power and smaller regional players are involved in Iraq , stirring their own brew to be consumed after the United States leaves Iraq . When President Bush says, "we will seek out and destroy the networks providing advanced weaponry and training to our enemies in Iraq ," he knows this campaign cannot be confined to Iraq . The challenge, says Bush, "is playing out across the broader Middle East " and "it is the decisive ideological struggle of our time." Clearly, this cannot be undertaken without going outside Iraq to disrupt the privileged sanctuaries of self-avowed enemies.

Iran has been smuggling sophisticated IED's with remote control triggers for years. To interdict the border is as much pie-in-the-sky as interdicting Taliban fighters moving into Afghanistan from Pakistan .

Targeting a handful of Revolutionary Guards at an Iranian "consulate" in Irbil is the proverbial drop in the bucket. It angered the Iraqi government that had not been consulted. Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki, like his two predecessors, has invested a lot of time and effort into cultivating closer relations with Tehran . Iran has reciprocated with \$2 billion in aid for schools and power grid improvements. Besides Shiite militias, Iran also assists Sunni insurgents, notwithstanding deep theological differences, while attempting to drive a wedge between foreign jihadists and Iraqi Islamists. All these groups consider the United States a bigger threat than Iran .

U.S. curbs on Iran's ability to perform financial transactions with foreign banks are further evidence the Bush administration's policy on Iran's role in Iraq is precisely the opposite of what the Iraq Study Group recommended last month -- a surge, not in U.S. troops for Iraq, but in U.S. diplomatic contacts with Iran and Syria to try to build a consensus on how to stabilize Iraq.

Confronting Iran within Iraq's borders is as illusory as confronting the Vietcong in South Vietnam without using U.S. air power north of the 17th parallel into North Vietnam. A widening of hostilities is preordained on the present geopolitical track. And welcomed publicly by a growing number of Israeli officials.

The latest was Daniel Ayalon, the just retired Israeli ambassador to the United States , when he told UPI's Claude Salhani, " Iran will have to be stopped, no doubt about it." Not only will they be able to equip a terrorist group with a nuclear device, but "they can become the de facto controller of oil supply from the Middle East , or (at least) dictate oil prices."

Iran , meanwhile, is garnering support for a de facto anti-U.S. alliance of radical regimes in Latin America, led by

Venezuela 's Hugo Chavez, Shiite militias in Iraq , Hezbollah in Lebanon , Hamas and Islamic Jihad in the Palestinian territories. Iran 's clandestine warfare apparatus is also geared to disrupt Sunni regimes in Saudi Arabia , Egypt and Jordan . In such a Mideastern dovecote of troublemakers, Syria 's dictatorship would bet on the predators. The Saudis have made clear to the Bush administration they will assist their Sunni brethren in Iraq with weapons and funding. These are the ingredients for a combustible mix that spells regional mayhem.

For a whole year before the invasion of Iraq , the Bush administration was in denial while planning for a war that had long been decided. A sustained, three-night, rolling thunder bombing of Iran 's nuclear facilities is ready to be launched at short notice from Diego Garcia and from two aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Oman and the Persian Gulf . Supporting ships and submarines also can fire scores of Cruise missiles.

There is no question that Iran is helping to orchestrate attacks on U.S. troops in Iraq . But whether a bombing campaign will deter or goad the mullahocracy is open to question. There seems little doubt that president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad himself would prefer military confrontation. The apocalypse-in-his-own-lifetime syndrome would enable him to consolidate his leadership.

Ahmadinejad and some of the more hawkish Revolutionary Guard generals no doubt salivate at the thought of the United States being forced into a humiliating withdrawal a la Vietnam . Shiite Islam would be seen as victorious from Tehran to Beirut to Damascus via Baghdad , rectifying centuries of perceived injustices.

By comparison, the "surge" recently announced by President Bush to restore Iraqi government control in Baghdad seems hugely irrelevant. Shutting down Iran 's clandestine networks in Iraq will take a lot more than adding one U.S. battalion to each Iraqi brigade patrolling the streets of the capital. Iran 's infrastructure in Iraq has been growing much the way the Vietcong and North Vietnamese honeycombed South Vietnam . A Vietcong division headquarters was tunneled under a U.S. division HQ, unbeknownst to military intelligence.

The Maliki government knows Iran 's presence in Iraq is already a lot more influential than America 's. As much was stated in the Baker-Hamilton Iraq Study Group report, which was why it recommended diplomatic engagement with both Iran and Syria . Maliki also knows when the United States leaves, and leave it will, most probably before the 2008 election campaign, Iran will be the dominant power in the region.

The U.S. military has to go after Iran 's underground network without notifying Maliki's dysfunctional government, which has cultivated close relations with Tehran and is penetrated by Iranian agents. To do otherwise, would be risking American lives unnecessarily. Yet Maliki has to be kept in the loop.

It is in Iran 's interest to provoke chaos in Iraq to hasten a U.S. withdrawal. Whether this can still be spun as a strategic redeployment will depend more on decisions taken in Tehran than in Washington . Small comfort to know Iran does not want all-out civil war in Iraq .

--

Copyright 2007 by United Press International.

All rights reserved.

--

[Back to top](#)



Display posts from previous: All Posts Oldest First



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

All times are GMT

Page 1 of 1

Jump to: [Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

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

