

Iran: 'the public has a right to know'

Idaho representative investigates Trilateral Commission and CFR complicity

Representative George Hansen (R-Id.) charged during a press conference in Washington on Nov. 29 that "elements in our country" share responsibility with Iran's leadership for "precipitating" the crisis in Iran.

Stressing that the Oct. 22 admission of the Shah of Iran to the United States "set the conditions for the assault" on the U.S. Embassy in Teheran, Hansen claimed to have seen State Department and Iranian documents that show conclusively that an "arbitrary intervention" had been made by State Department higher-ups, notably including Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, to "overrule lower-level technicians" at State who warned about the dire consequences which would ensue from admitting the shah onto U.S. soil.

Two days earlier, while in Teheran, Hansen named former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Chase Manhattan Chairman David Rockefeller as responsible for setting up the Iran crisis. "I think that what we need to do if we are going to persist in the hostage game is let Mr. Rockefeller, the banker in New York, and Mr. Kissinger, who seems to be so involved in this business, come over and replace the hostages. Let innocent people go home and let us sweat it out over these people," said Rep. Hansen.

Investigating the CFR

At his Washington press conference, Hansen emphasized that the motivation behind his exposure is "the public's right to know" the truth about the Iran crisis.

This opens the way for a full-scale congressional investigation not only into how the Iran crisis developed, but, from information provided by circles close to Hansen, into the more fundamental question of how American foreign policy is being subverted by the David Rockefeller-led Trilateral Commission and the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

A Washington adviser to Hansen noted in an interview that "the Congressman's aim is to find out the details, the facts, about Rockefeller's and Kissinger's complicity for this Iran mess. This will open the case for the *real* target of Hansen's investigations—the Trilateral Commission and the CFR."

An Idaho friend of Hansen's elaborated: "We know the CFR and the Trilateral Commission are behind this whole operation, and we know why. They're out to wreck the American economy as a step toward the imposition of their goal of a 'One World Government'."

CFR Explodes

These reports of what is behind Congressman Hansen's recent efforts explain the astounding press attack mounted against him during this past week. Virtually every press outlet for the New York Council on Foreign Relations and its Trilateral Commission subcommittee has issued thundering denunciations of Hansen's Teheran activities.

The Nov. 28 *Washington Post*, for example, ran a lead editorial labeling Hansen a "jackass." The same day's *New York Post* ran a prominent page two editorial entitled, "Please Shut Up, Hansen," which claimed that Hansen had "lost his self-control" by attacking Kissinger and Rockefeller.

These character assassinations were matched on the floor of the Senate by John Glenn, Democrat for Ohio, who called Hansen "insane." Glenn insisted that the documents Hansen claimed to have seen in Teheran implicating Secretary of State Vance were fabrications. Glenn, a staunch administration backer and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, then proceeded to justify the U.S. armed taskforce build-up in the Indian Ocean-Arabian Sea area as having been done in response to "threats in the Persian Gulf other than Iran."

Glenn's statement fits a pattern described by Capitol Hill sources as "enormous armtwisting" by congressional leaders against any motion at all for a congressional investigation into the Iran events. Instead, 54 congressmen, led by Rep. Stratton (D-N.Y.), are circulating a joint statement demanding that President Carter declare a "time limit" on how long the U.S. will tolerate the hostage-taking, after which time a military move will be made. Others in the Senate are demanding "full solidarity" with President Carter and no question-

ing of how his administration is handling the Iran events.

Military intervention

Glenn's warning of growing military dangers in the Persian Gulf and the congressional joint statement conform with reports that the United States will follow through on plans to militarily intervene into Iran in the next days.

According to a Washington source, the National Security Council has already decided to go ahead with a military intervention, despite widespread distaste for the move among professional layers in the military." Reportedly, specially trained divisions of the U.S. 82nd Airborne Division have been flown to bases in West Germany and possibly Turkey for intervention into Iran.

By Nov. 29, Capitol Hill sources were predicting that Carter would invoke the War Powers Act during the week of Dec. 3 in a speech before the joint houses of Congress. One Capitol Hill source who favors such a move stated: "The past three weeks, since the hostages were taken, have given the U.S. the time to put all the pieces in place for a military move, which now can be expected to take place pretty soon."

These statements are backed up by military realities. The U.S. aircraft carrier Kittyhawk has steamed to the Indian Ocean, and is possibly preparing to move into the Persian Gulf Straights of Hormuz region through which most of the world's daily oil supplies travel on tankers. Sources in Bahrain report a build-up of U.S. aircraft at the airport in that country, reportedly from the USS Midway in the Arabian Sea.

There is a complementary Soviet buildup in the Indian Ocean. Pentagon sources report that three additional Soviet ships have moved into the Indian Ocean region, and Iranian naval sources claimed on Nov. 29 that 15 Soviet warships had moved into the Gulf of Oman and were heading toward the Straights of Hormuz.

The London *Daily Telegraph* is reporting that the French have sent a special naval task force to the Indian Ocean, including some of the best ships in the French fleet.

From the Iranian side has come a full array of naval maneuvers, paratroop mobilizations, and, more generally, the calling-to-arms of the entire population by the Ayatollah Khomeini.

Other nations in the region have also begun maneuvers; Egypt, for example, is reportedly carrying out naval maneuvers in the Mediterranean area in response to the growing crisis in Iran.

—Mark Burdman

The Grand Mosque

The little-known band of tribal fanatics who seized the Grand Mosque in Mecca, Saudi Arabia, last week sent shivers up the world's collective spine. For a moment, it seemed as if the nation that by itself produces more than one-third of OPEC oil exports was suddenly fallen victim to the plague that has overcome Iran.

But to pin the blame properly for what happened in Mecca on Nov. 20 and afterward, one need not look any further than two names: T.E. Lawrence ("of Arabia") and St. John Philby, Great Britain's two leading Saudi Arabian field intelligence hands, and their heirs, including London's master triple agent, H.A.R. "Kim" Philby. Though both long dead, the two British Arabists are the responsables for the atrocity at the Grand Mosque.

The attack on Mecca's holy place was calculated to upset the Saudi government. From first reports it seems that the incident has backfired, resulting not in a strengthening of the pro-Muslim Brotherhood faction in Saudi Arabia but in the reverse—strengthening Prince Fahd and the so-called stability faction in Saudi Arabia.

Before going into details, two basic points must be made clear at the outset.

First, the operation in Mecca was the work of the secretive Muslim Brotherhood, operating through tribal alliances in southern and southwestern Saudi Arabia and Yemen, under the control of British intelligence, with the complicity of a certain faction of the Saudi ruling family.

Second, the purpose of the attack on the Grand Mosque was to bring about a shift in the power structure inside the Saudi ruling elite, in which Saudi Arabia would undertake a major policy realignment, dropping its traditional position in support of the U.S. dollar and in support of relatively low oil prices and high production rates. Instead, London wanted the Saudis to join Khomeini's Iran in cutting oil output, raising prices to at least \$30 per barrel at the December OPEC meeting, and then making a break with the dollar in favor of a basket of currencies, including the British pound.

So far—put the stress, so far—it hasn't worked. To understand why, the reader must understand something of the internal balance within Saudi Arabia and of Saudi history, especially the role of the British played therein. In the following, EIR presents in summary form an exclusive analysis of the political situation in