

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

takeover: a plan that backfired

and around Saudi Arabia, and the evidence concerning the attack on the Grand Mosque. Next week, EIR will publish a detailed report.

The stakes in Saudi Arabia

Inside Saudi Arabia, two factions can be roughly identified as competing for power and influence. Although King Khaled reigns, he does not really rule. Effective power is in the hands of Crown Prince Fahd and his brothers, the seven sons of the Sudeiri family, which include Defense Minister Prince Sultan. It is generally known that these seven brothers are committed to a relatively forward-looking, prodevelopment policy in which Saudi Arabia is being slowly dragged into the 20th century. Fahd and his faction have been the prime movers behind Saudi Arabia's enormous \$142 billion industrial development strategy. More important, the Fahd faction has been responsible for Saudi Arabia's closer relations with Western Europe, especially Paris and Bonn, and the European Monetary System. In that regard, Saudi Arabia is one of the main stabilizing factors behind the dollar and the world economy.

On the other hand, a pro-London faction is grouped around Prince Abdullah, who is generally considered to be the sponsor of the Muslim Brotherhood in the Arab world. Abdullah's power rests in his command of the Saudi National Guard, an elite, British-trained force that draws on the backward, Bedouin-tribal elements of Saudi society, especially the "minority" tribes which tend to be dissidents in the Saudi power structure. Throughout the Middle East, it is known that Abdullah is extremely close to British intelligence and the Oxford and Cambridge University "Orientalists." It is therefore Abdullah who has argued most strongly for Saudi support, or at least tolerance, of the Iranian revolution of Muslim extremists.

Among the country's technocrats, Oil Minister Zaki Yamani is known to be allied with Prince Fahd and Prince Sultan. But most of the rest of the powerful technocratic elite—including Planning Minister Hisham Nazer, Industry Minister Ghosaibi, and Finance Minister Aba al-Khayl are sponsored by Prince Abdullah. It is that reactionary, antidollar faction that Yamani denounced recently as the Saudi "Young Turks," who are seeking to reverse Saudi Arabia's progressive oil policy. At the time, Yamani stated that this Young Turks faction was gaining in power and would threaten the world economy if it succeeded in its aims.

Now, at the height of the Iran crisis, the British and the Muslim Brotherhood launched the attack on the Mecca mosque. The aim was to create a panic in the Saudi ruling elite that the kingdom's stability was no longer assured. It was expected that the terror seizure of the mosque would strengthen the conservative Abdullah faction by convincing the rest of the Saudi elite they could not resist the "Khomeini phenomenon" unless the kingdom gave greater power to its religious element and the *ulemas*, or Muslim priests, that have great power in the country.

The Mecca attack, by a band of some 200 men with arms from the Saudi National Guard, came only one day after Yamani stated on Nov. 19 that no matter what decision OPEC might take, the Saudi government would always accept dollars. Yamani's statement was all the more important in that it followed threats from the Khomeini regime to break with the dollar and demand payments in currencies other than the dollar.

At the time, the British had begun an effort to create a panic against the dollar in the international markets, a crucial feature of which was the attempt to scare the Arabs away from American banks over the Iranian assets freeze. When the news of the Saudi attack at Mecca came across the wires, it was coupled with reports that Saudi Arabia had closed down its entire communications system. Within hours, rumors of a coup d'etat and worse raced through the financial gossip circles.

What really happened?

Initially Abdullah moved in to run the counteroperation against the attack on the Mosque. The London *Financial Times* predicted Nov. 22 that Abdullah would emerge triumphant in the Saudi power struggle and that the event "would strengthen Abdullah and the conservatives." But within 24 hours, Prince Fahd assumed personal command of the military operation along with his brother, the defense minister, and Abdullah was edged aside.

Meanwhile, it was revealed that the Saudi rebels who terrorized the mosque belonged to the same Ikh-wani sect—affiliated to the Muslim Brotherhood—that was earlier responsible, in 1975, for the assassination of King Faisal. The *Washington Post* of Nov. 25, noting that the protestors were demanding the closing of Saudi television, reported, "Observers recalled that Saudi television particularly had been the object of demonstra-

tions by religious extremists in the past. The assassin who killed King Faisal in March 1975 was said by Saudi investigators to have acted because he was seeking to avenge a relative killed during efforts to put down a protest against a television station.”

But it is known also to Saudi intelligence that Dr. Henry Kissinger ordered the murder of King Faisal, and that the operation was run through Colorado and California networks of the narcotics mafia linked to Israeli intelligence. In December 1978, the *Executive Intelligence Review* printed a major exposé of the story behind the Faisal assassination, including the role of Joseph Malone, a British intelligence agent who was also CIA station chief in Beirut during the 1960s.

On Nov. 27, the Saudi newspaper *Okaz* issued an official appeal to the authorities by its chief editor calling for an investigation of the Ikhwan over the Mecca terrorist incident. According to *Okaz*, there are links between the Mecca events and the massacre at Aleppo, Syria, in August when the Ikhwan murdered 60 Syrian military cadets.

At the same time, several newspapers including the London *Times*—identified the Ikhwan as responsible for the terrorism. The Ikhwan the *Times* referred to was the old, World War I era organization that formed the backbone of the movement that catapulted Ibn Saud and the Saudi family into power in Arabia. That organization—which is not the same as the Egyptian

Ikhwan, the current Muslim Brotherhood—is nonetheless affiliated to it. After World War I the No. 1 sponsor of the Saudi Ikhwan was St. John Philby, the British agent who engineered Ibn Saud's coup in the mid-1920s. But, after his assuming power, in which Saud defeated the Western Arabian-based Hashemite family which was run by Lawrence of Arabia, King Saud suddenly turned around and crushed the Ikhwanis, much to London's surprise. Later, a disgruntled Philby asserted that the Ikhwan had “become a Frankenstein that Ibn Saud had to destroy before it destroyed him.”

When it was suppressed, the Ikhwan formed an alliance with the heirs of the Idrissi family in southwest Arabia, led by Ahmed el-Idrissi. To this day, the Idrissi alliance still exists with the Ikhwan in Saudi Arabia, under British sponsorship.

According to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the Idrissi clique is linked to Rashid Pharaon, the chief political adviser to the last three Saudi kings, and to a faction of Saudi Arabia's intelligence service. That faction, according to observers, is probably that associated with ex-Saudi intelligence chief Sheikh Kamal Adham, who is a business partner of Ghaith Pharaon, the son of Rashid Pharaon. Adham was fired by Prince Fahd last year for supporting the Camp David alliance between Egypt and Israel.

—Robert Dreyfuss