

Zbigniew Brzezinski: How to Justify a “Defensive War” against Iran? Transcript of Testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

By Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski and Prof Michel Chossudovsky - Global Research, January, 2025

“A plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran involves Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks, followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure, then by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the United States blamed on Iran, culminating in a quote-unquote “defensive”

U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire, eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan

Preemptive Nuclear Warfare

The notion of preemptive nuclear warfare was first formulated in the **2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR 2001)** in the immediate wake of September 11,2001 (9/11). It was released in 2002.

The underling concept was that the U.S should attack an enemy country **preemptively as a means of self-defence**.

A particular category of “peaceful” nuclear weapons “safe for civilians” namely the so-called **tactical low yield U.S nuclear weapons** also designated as **mini nukes** : B61-11, B-61-12.

In the current of the Middle East War, Israel plays a key role with regard to the “peace” use of nuclear weapons. **The Jewish State is an undeclared nuclear weapons state** with a vast arsenal of nuclear weapons which are contemplated be used against Iran as a means of **“deterrence”**.

What is now contemplated by US-NATO in the corridors of the Pentagon is for Israel to wage **a preemptive nuclear attack against Iran, as a peace keeping operation**, namely preventing the Islamic State of Iran from attacking the Western military alliance(US-NATO-Israel).

This peaceful use of nuclear weapons has been embraced by the Atlantic Alliance without addressing that the use of nuclear weapons would inevitably lead us into a World War III scenario.

According to Brzezinski,

...Indeed, a mythical historical narrative to justify the case for such a protracted and potential expanding war is already being articulated. Initially justified by false claims about WMDs in Iraq, the war is now being redefined as the decisive ideological struggle of our time, reminiscent of the earlier collisions with Nazism and Stalinism. In that context, **Islamist extremism and al Qaeda are presented as the equivalents of the threat posed by Nazi Germany and then Soviet Russia, and 9/11 as the equivalent of the Pearl Harbor attack which precipitated America's involvement in World War II.**

This simplistic and demagogic narrative overlooks the fact that Nazism was based on the military power of the industrially most advanced European state, and that Stalinism was able to mobilize not only the resources of the victorious and militarily powerful Soviet Union but also had worldwide appeal through its Marxist doctrine".

Of significance, **Brzezinski tacitly acknowledges that the “war on terrorism” is bogus.** He points at length at the fabricated pretext for waging war on Iraq and cites the controversial Downing Street Memo.

In relation to the war on Syria, Brzezinski's statement is significant, namely US-NATO support and recruitment of al Qaeda “rebels”, while also waging “a war against Al Qaeda terrorists”

Carefully read both his opening address but also the discussion, where he points to the politically corrupt nature of the Bush administration and how fake intelligence was used as a pretext to wage war on Iraq.

If you do not have time to go through the entire transcript, read the highlights below.

Highlights of Dr Brzezinski's statements

Al Qaeda is an isolated fundamentalist, Islamist aberration, most Iraqis are engaged in strife because of the American occupation, which destroyed the Iraqi state, while Iran, though gaining in regional influence, is itself politically divided, economically and militarily weak. To argue that America is already at war in a region with a wider Islamic threat of which Iran is the epicenter is to promote a self-fulfilling prophecy.

...no country in the world — no country in the world — shares the Manichean delusions that the administration so passionately articulates. And the result, sad to say, is growing political isolation of and pervasive popular antagonism towards the U.S. global posture.



Iran and Syria have no reason, however, to help the United States consolidate a permanent regional hegemony. It is ironic, however, that both Iran and Syria have lately called for a regional dialogue, exploiting thereby the self-defeating character of the largely passive and mainly sloganeering U.S. diplomacy. A serious regional dialogue, promoted directly or indirectly by the United States, could be buttressed at some point by a wider circle of consultations involving other powers with a stake in the region's stability, such as the EU, China, Japan, India and Russia.

Escalating the war as a consequence of protracting it is hardly an attractive option for the United States, because before too long, as I say in my statement, we could be facing a 20-year-long involvement not only in Iraq but Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Real Reasons behind the War

I have no idea what his [president Bush] initiative objective was because the motives he provided for the action proved to be entirely erroneous, and if they were the real motives, then the whole campaign was based on false assumptions.

Now, if there were hidden motives, I can imagine potentially several.

One would be to gain American domination over the region's oil, to put it very simplistically.

Another could be to help maximize Israel's security by removing a powerful Arab state.

Another one could have been to simply get rid of an obnoxious regime with which the United States had accounts to settle going back to '91 and the alleged assassination attempt against President Bush Sr. There could be a variety of motives.

Escalation

My horror scenario is that if we simply stay put this will continue, and then the dynamic of the conflict will produce an escalating situation in which Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks will be blamed on the Iranians. There'll be, then, some clashes, collisions, and the war expands.

But basically, escalation, accusations, some incidents — there have already been some incidents between us and the Iranians. There are some allegations that the Iranians are responsible for certain acts — allegations but not facts. And that would spark, simply, a collision. It could even be in some fashion provoked.

WMD and the Downing Street Memo

Let me draw your attention to something that your staff should give you, and I think this might be of interest to some other members of this committee. And that's a report in *The New York Times* dated March 27, 2006. **It's a long report on a private meeting between the president and Prime Minister Blair two months before the war, based on a memorandum of conversation prepared by the British official present at this meeting.**

And in it, according to this account, **the president is cited as saying that he's concerned that there may not be weapons of mass destruction found in Iraq and that there must be some consideration given to finding a different basis for undertaking the military action.** And I'll just read you what this memo allegedly says, according to *The New York Times*.

The memo stated, "The president and the prime minister acknowledged that no unconventional weapons had been found inside Iraq."

This is two months before the war.

"Faced with the possibility of not finding any before the planned invasion, Mr. Bush talked about several ways to provoke a confrontation."

And he described, then, several ways in which this could be done, and I won't go into that. I don't know how accurate these ways were. They're quite sensational, at least one of them.

And if one is of the view that one is dealing with an implacable enemy that has to be removed, that course of action may, under certain circumstances, be appealing.

I'm afraid if the situation in Iraq continues deteriorating, and if Iran is perceived as in some fashion involved or responsible — or the potential beneficiary thereof — that temptation could arise.

February 1, 2007 Thursday