

coordinators: a clique of generals who ran the old SAVAK agency of the shah are now the heads of SAVAMA. These generals—Farouzi, Fardoust, and Kaveh—were trained under the British, NATO, and Israel. They applied their skills for Khomeini when they aided the overthrow of the shah in February of this year, in collusion with NATO General Robert Huyser, an emissary for NATO Commander Alexander Haig.

These three generals were present in Paris and London in the days and hours preceding the Shafik murder.

Aside from money and intelligence expertise, the SAVAMA has a large pool of potential agents among Iranian students abroad. For example, several thousands of the 50,000 or so Iranian students in the United States belong to groups under the control of the Muslim Student Association, headquartered in Plainsfield, Indiana. As *EIR* has documented, and as independent American and Pakistani investigators have corroborated, the MSA is controlled at the top by individuals, such as Mahmoud Abu Saud of Southwestern Missouri University, who are self-professed founders and members of the original Muslim Brotherhood created in Egypt in the late 1920s. They were jailed and expelled from Egypt and other Arab countries in the 1950s, and are now using the U.S.—and Europe—as the base for Islamic fundamentalist terrorism internationally.

In the U.S., the MSA apparatus harbors trained assassins posing as students. The “safehouse” infrastructure is supplemented by the fact that certain well-connected Americans are committed to more Khomeini-type destabilizations.

Take, for example, Princeton University Professor Richard Falk—now under fire by an Alumni Ad Hoc Committee for his pro-Khomeini sentiments. He told a Dec. 14 Boston conference of 200 students (120 of them Iranians) that “the real issue in Iran is the struggle for national self-determination against economic, cultural, and political burdens imposed by Western civilization. ... The shah had embarked on an ambitious nuclear technology program,” the antinuclear activist Falk continued. “It was this development pattern, oriented to the needs of the international capitalist order, which formed the basis of the shah’s rule. It was this development pattern, which, necessarily, inevitably required as integral to it a system of torture and political repression.”

Coming full circle, many of those who now rule Iran were tutored in the MSA apparatus in the United States. Former Foreign Minister Ibrahim Yazdi, the current Foreign Minister Sadegh Gotbzadeh (who spent five years at Georgetown University) and Defense Minister and SAVAMA head Mustapha Chamran (who did his postgraduate work at the University of California at Berkeley) were all members and leaders of the MSA or the so-called MSA-Persian-Speaking Group.

Congressman speaks out

Idaho’s Hansen demands Iran probe

Representative George Hansen (R-Id.) told the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on Dec. 13 that he had sent letters to House Banking Committee Chairman Henry Reuss and House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Clement Zablocki demanding an immediate congressional investigation and hearings on the “serious issues raised by the Iran crisis.”

Hansen also warned of the danger of imminent Muslim Brotherhood terrorism in the United States.

The Idaho Congressman, who recently returned from a fact-finding mission to Iran where he met with the American hostages and with Iranian government officials, decried the State Department’s complicity in the Iran crisis. The State Department had refused to debrief Hansen, the only American who has visited the hostages being held in Teheran. In addition, no national network or major newspaper has yet covered his initiative, despite the fact that the Congressman released his letter and related findings to a large array of media.

What follows is an “Outline of Serious Issues Raised by the Iranian Crisis,” prepared by Representative Hansen.

The people of the United States demand to know and need to know how and why the Iranian captivity developed. There is no excusing the violation of international law and human rights by the government and people of Iran. However, explanations by our own government regarding arbitrary decisions causing great risk to American lives and property have been contradictory and confusing, causing a serious need for hard facts and basic truth.

For example, there is now no doubt, both through admissions by government officials and by disclosures made by myself, and others that our State Department precipitated the invasion of the United States Embassy in Iran. Without any other fact, the serious consequences for the personnel now held hostage in the Teheran embassy and for our nation itself warrant a full and immediate investigation to determine responsibility for the disaster and to insure that failure both of intelligence and of the response to available intelligence shall not recur. And there are many other issues of similar grave concern.

There is good reason to believe that the mere fact that Congress will begin to investigate these matters would have a positive impact on the resolution of the Iranian crisis.

The American people will not tolerate either a cover-up or a Kangaroo court on issues involved in this crisis. To prevent mockery of justice and assure objectivity, it is critical that concerned committees of Congress exercise their investigative responsibilities into a broad range of questions, the more obvious of which are the following:

On the crisis itself—

1. Who made the decisions to admit the Shah into the United States ignoring the advice of both the intelligence community and internal elements of the State Department itself, regarding the high risk of invasion of the Teheran embassy and the kidnapping of the personnel stationed there?
2. Why was such a decision made without prior strengthening of security forces or even a temporary closing of the embassy?
3. Why were existing security forces not authorized to use available force to protect the embassy?
4. What benefit from the Shah's entry into the United States counterbalances the resultant physical danger to embassy personnel, destruction of embassy property, compromising state secrets and ensuing terrorist attacks against American embassies elsewhere in the world?

On the handling of the crisis—

1. Since diplomatic relations have not been severed, why, in the five weeks since the capture of the embassy, has there not been one apparent official contact between the government of the United States and *any* official of the government of Iran?
2. If our official position is that we will not negotiate with the Iranians until the hostages are released, on what issues would such negotiations occur?
3. Why, if we will not negotiate, do we seek to have others, like the U.N. and the World Court, negotiate in our place?
4. Why, after more than a month, have our government's representatives officially or unofficially, failed even to get into the country or see the hostages?...
6. How did we permit the loss of two lives and the burning of several of our buildings in Pakistan, long after the Iran crisis was underway?

On the cause of the crisis—

1. Department of State documents refer to substantial pressure to admit the Shah. From what source

did the pressure come? How much did it influence the decision to admit the Shah?

2. Did the State Department know in advance that Mexico would not readmit the Shah after expiration on Dec. 9 of his six month tourist visa?

3. Was his admission here under the excuse of medical necessity a ruse to procure his permanent admission?

On the questions raised by the crisis—

1. Was the confrontation a result of a foreign policy aimed at benefitting certain special interests even if the general welfare is undermined and American lives are endangered?
2. Are Americans paying taxes to line the pockets of special foreign and domestic interests and for purposes not in keeping with our own national interests?
3. Are American consumers the victims of oil diplomacy which has raised the price of domestic energy, devalued the dollar and set off rampant inflation all for the benefit of a few big banks and oil companies?
4. Because of all the damage done to American interests by the Iran crisis, how can we be assured of the future security of American personnel and property in foreign lands?

On other questions regarding the crisis—

- ...2. How can domestic oil profiteering be labelled wrong with investigations and penalties, but the role of a nation like Iran in boosting OPEC prices be overlooked?...
3. How can we disrupt friendly relations with South American nations over their alleged human rights violations, but refuse to look at the record of Iran?
4. How can it be proper to investigate foreign currency deals by the Franklin National Bank, but unreasonable to see how major American banks fit into the handling of Iran over the last 25 years?
5. Why can the CIA generally be fair game for investigation and even emasculation, but not its role in activities involving the government of Iran, past and present?
6. Why would we make such an issue over the security of secret documents and U.S. operations in the Pueblo incident involving North Korea and not register more concern for the loss of secret documents in our Embassy in Teheran which has become a propaganda coup for the Iranians?
7. What was the policy basis for Secretary Vance overruling the security measures recommended by his field experts on the Teheran embassy?

8. In the matter of my own trip to Iran, how do the State Department and Security Agencies justify their failure to debrief me on the information obtained in direct contact with Iranian officials in Teheran? They cannot, without such procedure, know whether I have valuable information on:

- a) Current government makeup and operation in Iran.
- b) The positions and decision-making responsibilities of the different members of the Iranian government with whom I talked. Recent events have emphasized that Iranian officials have diverse opinions on many issues, even to the release of the hostages.
- c) The security and physical situation at the American embassy and other key areas.

d) The condition and other data regarding those hostages I saw. (It might be recalled that after my visit the number of known hostages was increased from 49 to 50).

9. During that visit, after initial successes, I contacted the State Department and White House in Washington to see if I could be of assistance while I was there on the ground floor, but found little interest. Why were they not even concerned for the welfare of the hostages?

10. Why has the State Department failed to open and maintain channels to the new Iranian government?...

11. Why has the State Department... continually lobbied to keep Congress inactive and in a support role to inactivity?

Government refuses to act on threat from terrorists

The White House, the State Department, and the Justice Department are refusing to take any appropriate action to pinpoint and root out Muslim Brotherhood agents in the United States, despite their knowledge of the Brotherhood terrorists' capabilities and plans and despite the clear and present danger to the President himself.

Ever since Nov. 5 and the taking of hostages at the U.S. Embassy in Teheran, White House press spokesman Jody Powell has consistently *defended* Islamic fundamentalism as a "bulwark against Communism," citing National Security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski as his source for this analysis.

The following interchange, as detailed in an official press conference transcript, is indicative.

Q: Jody, now that somebody at the Muslim Brotherhood has claimed credit for terrorist actions against U.S. installations in at least two cities, and now that the Saudis have named the Brotherhood as one of the responsible organizations in the

destabilization in that country, why isn't this government saying anything about that organization?

Mr. Powell: I don't have any comment on that.

Q: I just want to follow up.

Mr. Powell: You get one follow-up.

Q: Advisors to this administration have been extremely soft, to say the least, on the Muslim Brotherhood. Is that one reason why you would find it embarrassing if you had to hold them responsible for these actions?

Mr. Powell: I don't believe—I don't remember comments directed toward the Muslim Brotherhood or specific organizations. I think there have been comments about the fact that in terms of East-West conflicts, that those who hold a devout faith in Islam would find the materialism and the atheism of Communism to be repugnant to them.

The State Department, through spokesmen Hodding Carter and Tom Reston, has been equally evasive.

On Dec. 4, Hodding Carter declared that the State Department was "neither capable nor authorized" to deal with the Brotherhood in answer to a question that was prefaced with an outline of how Muslim Brotherhood networks were responsible for anti-American activities in Pakistan and for the Mecca mosque incident in Saudi Arabia.

On Dec. 13, Reston, who was asked about reports that 200 to 300 Iranian terrorists had just entered the U.S., stated: "Security precautions in this matter are not the concern of the federal government. This question is being left to local authorities to handle the situation." One member of the press corps pointed out, privately, that this attitude would give "carte blanche" to Iranian terrorists, since local authorities had no capability of handling a situation national—and, in fact, international—in scope.

The State Department later went so far as to deny that visas were being forged in Teheran for entry into the United States. But one Customs Service official who independently confirmed the visa-forgery phenomenon declared that the resulting terrorist infiltration of the U.S. "constitutes a massive conspiracy—with U.S. government officials deeply implicated."