

and axes with forces which have strong economic and military potentials in the developed capitalist countries. Peking's aim is to capitalize on and woo these countries into a force rallied by them against the Soviet Union and the forces of peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress in the world.

They feverishly collude with the United States, and in return for this alliance they support unconditionally all U.S. plans in the world. They woo the Federal Republic of Germany and other European Economic Community member countries. In the northeast Asian region they seek always to make use of Japan's economic potential, draw Japan into their orbit with a view to realizing their ambitions. They hope that with a big contingent of Chinese residents — about 25 million living in Southeast Asian countries — and making use of Japan's economic potential, they would be able to gradually eliminate the influence of the United States, Japan and other industrial capitalist countries, manipulate the political, economic and military situation of the Southeast Asian countries and

draw Southeast Asia into their zone of influence. Of late, they were carrying out a series of acts including wooing, coercing and threatening Japan, aimed at drawing Japan into their orbit.

The treaty of peace and friendship signed by China and Japan in Peking recently is further proof of this calculated move of several Chinese leaders. This is only a narrow calculation. In the current situation, especially with the hostile policy against Vietnam by some Peking leaders, the Southeast Asian people cannot but heighten their vigilance.

As far as Japan is concerned, many influential personalities in the government recently declared: Japan undertakes to adopt a policy of peace and friendship and hopes to contribute to establishing peace, independence and neutrality in Southeast Asia and the world. People hold that in the face of Peking's great ambition, Japan can only do this if it persists in its policy of peace and friendship as it claimed. To do otherwise, willy-nilly, Japan would be criticized as contributing to the expansionist ambition and hegemony of a number of Chinese leaders.

## Pushing Iran Into The 'China Option'

*Brzezinski's 'human rights' destabilization paves road for Hua*

Over 400 people perished this week in the worst act of terrorism in Iran since World War II when a fully occupied theatre was set ablaze in the oil-producing city of Abadan near the Iraqi border. This atrocity is the latest in a series of bloody actions against the Shah by rebel opposition groups in alliance with Shi'ite Islamic leaders known to be paid agents of British and Israeli intelligence services.

Over the past weeks, reactionary Shi'ite mobs have rioted in several cities attacking banks, clubs, and theatres which have been targeted as symbols of Iranian modernization. The Shi'ites are pressing for Iran to foresake the Shah's aggressive economic development program and return to the backwardness that British colonialism imposed on the country in the 19th century. The current crisis can be directly attributed to U.S. Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's human rights campaign which was leveled at the Shah of Iran last year.

Under this pressure from within the Carter Administration, the Shah has acquiesced and agreed to "liberalize" his government by holding free elections in June 1979. Such a move has opened up the opportunity for a "left-right" scenario of chaos and confusion to be played out in Iran, producing serious unrest similar to the early 1960s when experimental elections were attempted.

Then, as now, anti-Shah leftist elements have begun to organize openly while ultraright-wing religious leaders have reacted violently to the liberalization in their campaign against modernization. Various factions on *both sides* are known to have direct connections to both British and Israeli intelligence services.

Iran is strategically central to both Brzezinski and London, who have a common goal, that is, to realign Southeast Asia and ultimately the Mideast into a pro-Chinese axis. This strategy is designed to undermine both superpowers' policy interests in the region. Such a dangerous plan is calculated necessary by the City of London and its monarchical allies to renew flagging financial domination over the world economy.

On August 18, Pars Newsservice in Tehran appraised the situation:

There are two forces responsible for the current outbreaks, a mass of common, naive and limited people who have been subjected to systematic brainwashing are being manipulated by both religious fanaticism and the landed classes. The first group of fanatics is fundamentally opposed to reform and modernization. The second lost many of its privileges and its power since the 1960s because of the revolution of the Shah and the people (referring to the 1962 White revolution when land reform took place — ed.).

These forces are fighting and encouraging others to fight not to accelerate the democratization of the country but to stop it. It takes a few years to economically develop a country but a generation to change the mentality of certain people. Nothing will be able to prevent the process of liberalization from being pursued and carried to its end. These same forces leading the unrest are accompanied and encouraged by certain foreign elements which are politically hostile to the development of Iran.

Likewise London and Brzezinski's plot is precisely what is motivating the Aug. 28 arrival in Tehran of Chinese Premier Hua kuo-Feng. Hua's journey to Iran, the first ever by a leader of the People's Republic of China, has been preceded by a consistent Chinese diplomatic effort to warm relations with Tehran, a pattern of making inroads which began to materialize at about the same time that serious civil unrest began to sweep Iran in the early summer.

#### *Where the Shah Stands*

There is virtually no chance that the staunchly pro-U.S. Shah would ever sacrifice his allegiance to the U.S. — let alone his growing economic relations with the Comecon countries — for an alliance with China. Only through strong coercion — for which the civil strife in Iran is the major component — could such a suicidal pact be realized.

According to State Department and Iranian sources, disturbances are expected to intensify over the coming months as the elections near. There are widespread predictions of new violence during the Aug. 24-26 Shi'ite Islamic holidays. Already Shi'ite religious leaders, known as Ayatollahs and Mullahs, have stirred riots in a dozen Iranian cities this month.

The August 20 fire at a theatre in Abadan, killing hundreds, was the culmination of the work of such religious fanatics and their extremist allies.

The Aug. 22 *Financial Times* editorially took the opportunity to put the squeeze on the Shah:

A senior adviser to the Shah asked last week whether there was a risk that the outbursts could lead to an abandonment of the elections and possibly even the liberalization programme, made the point that "we have so far only used the velvet glove. The steel fist remains." But this could very well be just the tactics on which the opposition is banking — goad the Government into actions that suggest that it was never sincere in the first place about making Iran more democratic. In reaction to the Abadan fire there were two clear cut choices: one was to crack down heavily and thereby lend weight to the opinions of the opposition, the other was to act with restraint, as the Government in fact has done by instituting a commission of enquiry. But this could also be taken by the Shah's opponents as a sign of weakness.

#### *Who's Pulling The Strings*

According to the London *Telegraph*, Aug. 21, there is strong evidence that international terrorist leader Abu Nidal, a Palestinian, had a hand in the Abadan incident. The *Telegraph* reports that

## Chinese-Inspired Coup Attempt Aborted in Afghanistan

*The Cuban news agency Prensa Latina reported on Aug. 23 from New Delhi, India:*

The government of Afghanistan has in its possession definitive evidence demonstrating the participation of foreign nations in the preparations for an aborted coup d'etat in Afghanistan, according to diplomatic sources in New Delhi. Afghan diplomats in this capital refused to reveal which nations were involved in this conspiracy against their government, but reliable sources indicate that the U.S., Pakistan, and China were involved.

The announcement of the discovery of a coup attempt was made by Radio Kabul on Aug. 17 though the report did not say when the plot was aborted. It is however believed that it was aborted before the address made by President (and Prime Minister) Nur Mohammad Tarakki to a group of air force officials. The President urged air force officers to be ready to turn back any attempt and indicated that the armed forces would be utilized only in the interest of the Afghan people.

*In the same presentation, Prensa Latina reported that Tarakki described the victorious coup carried out by his party as the final blow to the British-backed Afghan royal family. On April 29, Tarakki, aided by military and air force officers, overthrew the royal government of President Daud.*

(Abadan) is only four miles from the Iraq border. Security forces were last night investigating a report that terrorists have been assisted by the Palestinian guerrillas of Abu Nidal, the renegade Palestine Liberation Organization man now based in Baghdad.

Four days ago, Mr. Darius Houmayoun, Persian Information Minister, said that there was firm evidence that "Palestinian extremists" were supplying large sums of money to "Leftist extremists" and "Communists," said to be behind the riots in Persia.

As a result the Iranians have begun to seal their border with Iraq, where Abu Nidal operates. Abu Nidal, who has been repeatedly condemned by the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), has been privately characterized as an agent of Israeli intelligence by U.S. Defense Department sources. Iranian Information Minister Houmayoun's statement last week in fact made a sharp distinction between such extremist Palestinian elements and the PLO as well as the government of Iraq. Nonetheless, numerous press sources, including the *London Telegraph* and the *Washington Post* have been fueling the

chaos by reporting that Houmayoun had implicated the PLO in Iranian terrorism.

A second decisive element in the Iranian destabilization is radical Shi'ite Ayatollah Khomeini, who also operates out of Iraq. Khomeini has been actively involved in orchestrating anti-Shah terror since his failed coup attempt in 1963 at which time he was exiled to Iraq. Khomeini is known to have links to radical Palestinian networks as well as Maoist connections. Khomeini made a proclamation early last week that on Aug. 20, the anniversary of the Shah's return to power following the 1953 coup by Mohammed Mossadegh, there would be a dramatic new upsurge of violence. His prediction was borne out with the Abadan mass murder.

The *Washington Post*, in an Aug. 20 article by William Branigan, took the occasion of the anniversary to peddle the standard anti-Shah propaganda line regarding his connections to the CIA:

The celebration comes at a time when the Shah is facing his most serious challenge since that time in August 1953 when he was forced to flee to Rome and considered, according to the memories of his former wife, buying a farm and settling in America . . .

The Shah's despair proved premature. In his fourth day of exile, turbulent pro-Shah demonstrations in Tehran toppled Mossadegh and paved the way for the Shah's triumphant return to his throne. According to widely published accounts, the demonstrations were organized by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in a plan carried out on the spot by one of its best agents, Kermit (Kim) Roosevelt, a cousin of the late President Franklin Roosevelt.

The CIA believed at the time that a Communist takeover of Iran by the pro-Moscow Tudeh Party was imminent, and the agency's then-director, Allen Dulles, was determined to prevent such a development at all costs, former CIA officials have been quoted as saying. Although Mossadegh's National Front government was not itself Communist, it was seen as amenable to subversion and eventual overthrow by the Tudeh Communists.

Taking the cue, former British intelligence officer Lord Chalfont, in the *London Times* Aug. 21, defensively rebutted the notion that the British could be behind efforts to undermine the Shah:

There are, in Tehran, so many explanations for the current unrest. . . One school of thought advances the curious proposition of a British conspiracy; however, on closer investigation it turns out that no one can provide any evidence, or even logical justification, for this bizarre theory. . .

What is clear beyond doubt is that someone outside Iran is closely involved in the organization of the civil disturbances. Arms and money are freely available to the leaders of the dissident groups; and the Iranian Government has traced some of the money back to numbered bank accounts in Switzerland. Here, predictably, the trail goes cold.

Lord Chalfont, ignoring that both Zürich and Basel funds for Israeli intelligence are laundered through

Switzerland, then tries to build a case for Soviet manipulation of the current crisis in Iran, touting the same line which other press sources, such as the *Frankfurter Rundschau* have put forth to promote a red scare on the northern tier and Southeast Asia. Such propaganda is timed to lay the basis for Chinese Chairman Hua Huang's visit to Iran on Aug. 28:

Iran has been watching with growing concern the extension of Russian influence in the Horn of Africa and in Afghanistan; and more than one Iranian politician has expressed the view that the recent outbreaks of violence may have been timed to create a political crisis to coincide with the forthcoming visit to Tehran of the Chairman of the People's Republic of China . . .

There is a conviction among many of the Shah's closest advisers that the mullahs, whatever may be the sincerity of their religious preoccupations, are being manipulated by political extremists. It is this belief which gives rise to the description now frequently used to describe the instigators of violent protest . . . "Islamic Marxists."

Numerous sources both inside and outside Iran have publicly stated that unrest in Iran is being manipulated by foreign intelligence services. With heightened prospects for increased terrorism in the Mideast, Egyptian sources in Europe report that the governments of Egypt, Iran and Saudi Arabia have intensified their security cooperation. An Iranian General was quoted in *Die Welt* Aug. 22, that Islamic Marxists are not conducting terror in Iran but that what is occurring is part of the pattern of international terrorism.

Hussein Ghorbaninasab, president of the Workers Organization, delivered a thinly veiled threat to expose London in his July 25 statement:

The BBC has been insulting and criticizing the Iranian nation in its Persian broadcasting services . . . Iranian development and progress is like a thorn in the eyes of the imperialists.

The BBC does continue to make frequent references to these riots, but has forgotten that Iranian workers and the Iranian government's financial assistance in 1974 saved the British Government from bankruptcy.

Within Iran's old established clique of aristocratic families that once controlled almost all of Iran's land there lingers strong resentment against the Shah's efforts to centralize and redistribute land to the peasants through land reform. This group of families which comprises Iran's oligarchy gained their wealth during British colonial domination of Iran. A sizeable number of the members of the Iranian oligarchy have direct ties to the British monarchy through such secret societies as the Bahai sect and the freemasons (which also provides a link to Israel's ruling elite). The families are known to be allied with Iran's religious establishment in promoting a dramatic curtailment of Iran's development plans.

### *The Economic Factor*

A prominent feature of the Shi'ite ability to organize large scale riots in Iran has been the continuing economic problems involved in developing the country. Since Prime Minister Jamshid Amuzegar took office last year, there has been a marked economic slowdown in attempt to reduce inflation. As a result, construction has taken a nose dive and large numbers of illiterate Iranian peasants who have been displaced into the cities from the countryside have been left jobless. It is these peasants that make up the mobs that have been rioting in over a dozen cities this month requiring the imposition of martial law in at least three towns.

Another factor in Iran's economic woes is the stalled negotiations with British Petroleum, the leader of a 14-company consortium which comprises the service company for Iran. Since the beginning of this year the Shah has tried to reach a new contract whereby the consortium would increase oil liftings and pay more revenues per barrel. As per the contract negotiated in 1973, the consortium was to have marketed 7 million barrels a day (mbd) of oil by 1978, yielding increased and badly needed revenue for Iran's development. But the consortium is only selling about 3 mbd.

The Shah shocked British Petroleum earlier this month by demanding that any new contract with Iran be as good as that just completed by the Arabian American Oil Company (ARAMCO) and the Saudis. This once again, produced another deadlock in negotiations.

Iran is not sociologically ready to enact a full democratic system which the liberalization is aimed at achieving. Describing the religious reaction as "a lot of Mullahs pining for the seventh century," the Shah has repeatedly stated, that the key to achieving a democratic form of government rests with continued economic development which will undermine the still-

strong vestiges of a feudal Iran under British colonial domination.

A guest column entitled "The Impossible Democracy" appeared in *Le Figaro* Aug. 22 by Freidoune Sahebjam, journalist and author of the book *Iran Toward the Year 2000*:

Some assert that 'There is a future for Iran only in democracy.' I would be curious to know what democracy could be implemented in Iran. The democracy of 1941-1953 which saw thirty governments overthrowing each other one day after the other, from Foroughi to Mossadegh, from Ghavam Salt to Hossein Ala? Or a popular democracy, as some of the partners of the Tudeh (Communist Party) and the National Front seem to want? Or even a religious democracy, which some in Iran call the "black plague" as opposed to the "red Plague."

What is the difference between the Iran of August 1953 and the Iran of August 1978? A quarter of a century later, we are still at the same point. At the center the Shah, the State, the Army, and the little people who have just been given access to property and who demand nothing more than the right to work. On the right, a very respectable, but discouragingly conservative Church, blind to the future and jealous of its rights. On the left, people of valor, ready to do anything to imperil the stability, not only of the Empire, but also and especially that of the region . . . . We have been promised free elections for 1979. There is good there, but elections must be prepared in calm and serenity. On the left as on the right. It is time to put out the fuse, hold out our hands and collaborate together. Because at the rate we are going, I don't see the country voting in ten months . . . .

For Iran, human rights means a higher standard of living for its near-40 million people through continued industrialization. Anything less is playing games with London's efforts to maintain Iran as an underdeveloped nation.

— Judith Wyer