

Bipartisan consensus pushes for Iran attack

By [Larry Chin](#)

Global Research, September 12, 2007

[Online Journal](#) 12 September 2007

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

The 2008 US presidential dance has already been decided: the winner will be a [corrupt](#) elite warmonger who will intensify and expand Bush-Cheney's criminal "war on terrorism" into Iran and beyond, and with the full support of an acquiescent US populace. The latest rhetoric from Bush, and the candidates, spells this out in black and white.

"First Afghanistan, then Iraq, then Iran"

Covert destabilization and increasing military escalation towards a full-scale Iran attack have been [underway](#) for months. In recent weeks, the bellicose, cocky and certifiably insane George W. Bush named Iran as the "[world's leading supporter of terrorism](#)." His administration is openly constructing an attack plan against Tehran.

As astutely noted by Patrick Buchanan in "[Phase III of Bush's War](#)," "those who hoped that . . . America was headed out of Iraq got a rude awakening. They are about to get another." Remarking on the "astonishing" rhetoric from a Bush who is "brimming with self-assurance," Buchanan notes, "Confident of victory this fall on The Hill, Bush is now moving into Phase III in his 'War on Terror': First, Afghanistan, then Iraq, then Iran . . ." and that "U.S. forces may already be engaged in combat operations against Iranians. Who or what can stop this drive to war? . . . What is to prevent Bush from attacking Iran and widening the war, sooner than we think? Nothing and no one."

The virtual certainty of an attack on Iran, and the absence of any resistance to such a war, is echoed by the analysis of [former CIA analysts Kathleen and Bill Christison](#), and many other observers.

The only remaining debate is if an attack will take place during Bush-Cheney's final months in power, or after, led by their successors. In fact, the successors seem even more eager to do Bush-Cheney one better by fighting the "real war on terrorism" that was, according to the now [infamous deception](#), "squandered" by the mismanagement of the occupation of Iraq.

Presidential candidates fight for place at Iran/war feeding trough

From the start, candidates from both Democratic and Republican factions have fallen over themselves, and each other, to proclaim their "[tough on terrorism and security](#)" credentials, and their eagerness to "confront Tehran." From Mitt Romney, [Rudy Guiliani](#) (thoroughly

exposed as a 9/11 insider in [Mike Ruppert's](#) *Crossing The Rubicon* and [here](#)) and just announced candidate Fred Thompson, to the slippery Democrats, the war rhetoric is the same.

The Democrats have been particularly hawkish in recent weeks. See:

["If Bush doesn't force Iran to back down, then his successors will"](#)

[Barack Obama: "Hit Iran where it hurts"](#)

["Obama and Clinton go nuclear" \(William Arkin, Washington Post\)](#)

["Welcome to Hillary's wars" \(Pepe Escobar, Asia Times\)](#)

["Hillary Clinton: clear and present danger"](#)

Bipartisan **"war on terrorism" consensus**

With increasing frequency, the myriad of Iran "terrorism" red herrings and lies have been irrevocably fused on to the larger 9/11 "war on terrorism" deception that has justified every criminal activity since 2001. The wealth of these deceptions has been detailed by Scott Ritter, author of the book *Target: Iran*, who has tracked the impending Iran war for years. The same template that led to the attack and occupation of Iraq is being applied to Iran.

As this writer previously noted in "[Washington's consensus Al-Qaeda deception](#)": "The 'war on terrorism' is a foreign policy weapon favored by an elite and ironclad Anglo-American consensus, supported equally by Washington's political factions. The surge of ["Al-Qaeda" covert operations and "terrorism" propaganda](#) over the past three weeks, and reports of "renewed Al-Qaeda power," marks the beginning of intensified false flag deception . . .

"Neocons, neoliberals, and "antiwar progressives" continue to enthusiastically embrace and reinforce the myth of the "ever-more powerful, ever-more cunning outside 'terrorist' threat to America" — and will continue to do so ad nauseum, as they have for nearly six years since 9/11. Meanwhile, the long-standing and enduring relationship between Islamic 'terrorists,' 'Al-Qaeda,' Osama bin Laden, etc. and Anglo-American and US-allied intelligence agencies (CIA, FBI, MI-6, Pakistani ISI, Mossad, etc.) and their [ongoing use and manipulation of these 'terrorist' groups](#) on behalf of Anglo-American geostrategy remains completely ignored, and the focus of ongoing cover-up, media silence and academic obfuscation . . .

" . . . Slippery variations on the "war on terrorism" theme include (but are not limited to) the following:

- "The Bush administration has failed to fight the 'real war on terrorism' begun after 9/11
- "Mismanagement and blunders of the war in Iraq have created radical jihadist insurgencies that wish to destroy the United States
- "The Iraq mistake has distracted us from fighting the 'real' war on terrorism
- "We should declare war on Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, which harbor the real 'terrorists' who attacked us on 9/11
- "The Iraq distraction has prevented us from capturing Osama

- “The world was united after 9/11, but Bush squandered it all”

“As pointed out by Michel Chossudovsky, the “Al-Qaeda” deception is [central to Anglo-American foreign policy](#), which rests squarely on the perpetual threat of a fabricated outside enemy, and fear of a “[new 9/11](#).” This deception provides the ongoing pretext used to justify endless warfare and endless criminality.”

The presidential candidates have continued to feast on “Al-Qaeda” propaganda meat, and its most recent incarnation, the “Iran-as-leading-terrorist-nation” rhetoric now being spearheaded by Bush himself.

It goes without saying that a Hillary Clinton presidency would [continue the Bush-Cheney agenda](#), and return Anglo-American criminality to its 1990s glory. Not surprisingly, Hillary Clinton’s advisors include legendary war criminals Madeline Albright, Sandy Berger, Richard Holbrooke, Strobe Talbott and, of course, Bill Clinton himself. The “Al-Qaeda” war politics blossomed during the Bill Clinton administration with the use of Al-Qaeda/militant Islamic mercenaries in Kosovo and Bosnia, and what is arguably the true start of today’s “war on terror” — the identification of Osama bin Laden as “enemy number one” in 1998, followed by the bombing of Sudan. The cooperative role that the deeply corrupt Clinton faction played alongside the Bush “crime family,” in virtually all of the major US government crimes from the 1980s to the present, can fill several libraries.

Other former Clinton security hands, such as former National Security Advisor Anthony Lake and former Assistant Secretary of State Susan Rice can be found in the Obama camp.

Despite his inexplicable popularity among liberals and “progressives” who are easily fooled by his smooth style and projections inspired by his dark complexion, Obama’s foreign policy agenda is [identical to that of the Bush administration](#), including his approach to the “war on terrorism.” Obama virtually promises to be a worldwide mass murderer, justifying his crimes with “[blowback](#)” deceptions. Like other members of Congress, Obama has access to classified material. He and others are complicit in hiding the fact of Anglo-American intelligence connections behind both the “terrorism” and the “insurgencies” . . .

John Edwards, desperate to gain ground on the clear front-runner, recently blasted Clinton as the candidate of a process “rigged by the elites.” This deceptive rhetoric hides the fact that Edwards himself is an elite, supported by Jimmy Carter, and backed by equally powerful and unsavory financial and political interests. Edwards has never stopped proclaiming his intention, should he become president (or vice president) to “kill terrorists.”

The election is, of course, rigged, but not in the red herring manner that Edwards suggests. All modern US elections have been rigged, as grotesquely evidenced by the open theft of every election since 2000, and the still-unaddressed electronic control and scripting of the entire voting process.

The elite forces in control of the rigging of the world political power are amply documented. According to investigative journalists such as Daniel Estulin, author of a soon-to-be released book on Bilderberg, the leading US presidential candidates (who stand any realistic chance of being selected) share extensive Bilderberger connections, including the Clintons (members of long standing), and Edwards.

With the exception of Democrats Dennis Kucinich and Mike Gravel, Republican Ron Paul (all

of whom continue to be routinely shut out by the political establishment, and dismissed by their own party apparatuses), and even more marginal names, the war and “anti-terror” platforms of the leading candidates are malodorously pure fascism, straight out of the Bush-Cheney’s playbook.

What is clear is that the next US president will not only continue but also expand the “war on terrorism” and the “war against radical extremists” into Iran, and beyond. If Bush-Cheney engineer a “next 9/11,” crushing political and popular resistance, the war will come even sooner. Both Republican and Democratic Party factions are hell-bent on pushing the same post-Peak Oil geostrategic control agenda, the same false flag terror, and the same propaganda.

With an empire and its survival at stake, the most “unthinkable,” apocalyptic and criminal options are “on the table.” And the table is getting smaller.

The original source of this article is [Online Journal](#)
Copyright © [Larry Chin](#), [Online Journal](#), 2007

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of “fair use” in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than “fair use” you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca