

manner.” The organizational precedent he cited spoke volumes to any Soviet citizen who remembered the mobilization to lift Russia from backwardness to the status of an industrial power: a government bureau for the Urals-Kuznetsk Combine, the greatest area development project of the First Five Year Plan in the 1930s.

Aganbegyan stated bluntly that the State Committee on Science and Technology “ought to” set up a subdivision to be responsible for a coherent program of science and technology in Siberia, whose development Brezhnev and other leaders consider crucial to the entire country’s economic health. With the promotion of Marchuk, Novosibirsk took responsibility for the State Committee itself.

### What next?

There are several key areas of policy development in which follow-up to the State Committee shakeup will occur.

1) The economic debate will continue as the Soviets grapple with the demands of their current mobilization. Probable follow-up to Marchuk’s promotion will be a further shakeout of Soviet planners and administrators whose “managerial” approach results in the kinds of inefficiencies Academician Aganbegyan exposed.

These circles overlap with the systems analysis advocates, but include other followers and associates of Prime Minister Kosygin, who has been in charge of economic reforms for over a decade. Kosygin, reportedly ill, is not active in the Soviet leadership at this point.

The clash between “managers” and “Siberians”—bearing in mind that not everyone in the latter group works at Novosibirsk—raises a perennial Soviet argument over the balance between “applied” and “basic” research. With the promotion of Marchuk, the Siberian Division has evidently recouped from a Central Committee criticism two years ago, when it was accused of being too tied up in basic research to produce sufficient “concrete results for practice.” Aganbegyan in *Pravda* demonstrated that it is the Novosibirsk combination of both kinds of effort that leads to successful development.

2) A broader and more intense attack on the advocates of systems analysis is a strong possibility, especially since these layers are heavily involved in promoting “environmentalist” arguments in the U.S.S.R. Cothinkers of Academician Marchuk, such as President of the Academy A.P. Aleksandrov, have openly criticized the Soviet “greenies” in recent weeks.

3) The question of Western participation in Siberian development remains open. Marchuk and people like him in the leadership are acutely aware of the benefits accruing to the Soviet economy from Western investment in Siberia, as well as of the leverage that Western business interest in such investments provides toward business taking a more active role in saving détente.

## MIDDLE EAST

# Can Abolhassan Bani-Sadr rule Iran?

by Robert Dreyfuss

For several weeks, it has been an open secret in Washington that the Carter administration has placed its bets on Iran’s newly elected President Abolhassan Bani-Sadr. According to administration sources, Washington—especially National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance—believes that Bani-Sadr can assemble a working political coalition with a mandate to negotiate a release of the hostages. Then, according to their scenario, Bani-Sadr will bring Iran into harmony with the policy enunciated by President Carter in his State of the Union address, in which he called for a virtual alliance with Iran against the U.S.S.R.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who visited Saudi Arabia on Feb. 5, reportedly paid a secret visit to Teheran to discuss the resolution of the Iranian crisis. Brzezinski’s visit came after reports of intensive secret negotiations between Iran and the United States over the shape of a proposed alliance to follow the release of the hostages. The London *Sunday Times* reported Feb 3 that a package deal to free the Americans held in Teheran was the subject of “messages sent by President Carter to the Ayatollah Khomeini and the new Iranian President, Abolhassan Bani-Sadr over the past few days.” According to the *Times*, the messages included “promises that the moment the hostages are freed, the U.S. government will start negotiations with Iran for future cooperation, including the important matter of military spare parts.”

For the one year since the seizure of Teheran by the Khomeini forces, *Executive Intelligence Review* has reported on the extensive behind-the-scenes cooperation between Iran and the Anglo-American military and intelligence establishment. In fact, the Khomeini dictatorship was put into power as a deliberate act of geopolitical strategy by the Carter administration and the City of London, who encouraged the growth of Muslim fundamentalism and the activities of the secret society called the Muslim Brotherhood to which most of the present Iranian leadership belongs. It is therefore not surprising to readers of the *EIR* that President Carter now openly moots a military alliance with the Khomeini regime. In

the past few weeks, the Carter administration—because of the Afghanistan crisis—has simply decided to make what was, until now, a covert relationship public.

But Bani-Sadr cannot deliver.

In the following report, we present the evidence leading to our conclusion that Bani-Sadr is not capable of building the machine necessary to maintain state power in Iran. In fact, should the Carter administration pursue what one analyst called “the Bani-Sadr option,” the result will be a takeover of Iran by the Communist (Tudeh) Party and its allies, possibly with the support of Soviet armed forces, in a repeat of the Afghanistan developments.

In addition, we also provide a glimpse of the new president’s policies and his politics, in Bani-Sadr’s own words. It proves that, far from the supposedly “moderate” image conveyed by the American media, Bani-Sadr is a radical ideologue and a confirmed lunatic who represents a grave danger to American interests in the area *even were he able to establish a viable regime*.

### **Factions of factions**

At present, Iranian politics is a confused jumble of factions and competing currents. In the midst of it, Bani-Sadr is attempting to pull together enough support in the clergy, the middle class, and other layers to translate his powerful 75 percent electoral victory into real political power. In doing so, he has run into opposition from two circles: first, the Communists, the left, and the forces generally allied to the Soviet Union; and second, the Iran clergy.

By far the most important factor is the Soviet Union. Iran’s powerful neighbor, especially after its impressive military takeover of Afghanistan, has been building up assets within Iran in virtually every layer of the Iranian population that will not easily allow Bani-Sadr to forge a pact with the United States.

A former Iranian military officer described the situation as follows:

President Carter is making a big mistake if he seriously thinks that he can rely on Bani-Sadr in the coming period. Whatever government he forms will be too unstable. In Iran, the mob still rules. Thousands of undisciplined young fanatics, armed to the teeth, control the cities. There exists no coherent military or security force that can guarantee law and order, and the army command continues to disintegrate. In the last three weeks, there have been three separate purges of the military command, and a total of 16 generals have been executed. This started with the uprising in Tabriz involving the air force. Many other officers have been arrested or exiled recently, and trials are taking place.

At present, there exists no potential combination other than the communists who might represent any stable formation. What exists is a series of factions: leftist and rightist extremists, religious groups and the clergy (including left-leaning mullahs, the radical-Islamic faction, and a middle group of individual power-grabbers), the Tudeh Party (in two or three factions), and others. And the mob is very well armed and powerful. All of these forces agree on the necessity of purging the armed forces.

The Russians are gaining in strength every day, especially in the Mujaheddin and Fedayeen [two radical guerrilla groups]. At present, although Moscow has the power, they do not want to force an uprising by their forces now. However, they may be compelled to do so by the actions of the West. Moscow is very active now behind the Tudeh, and I would not be surprised if there were a sudden and rapid unification of the fractured communist movement to present a challenge to the regime. Moscow’s strongest card is to provoke a declaration of an independent republic in Azerbaijan, which would then call for Soviet aid. In addition, the Iraqis might cooperate in taking over Iran’s oil fields in Khuzestan.

### **Revolutionary council power play**

Almost as soon as he was elected, Bani-Sadr moved to consolidate power. Within the space of a few days following his inauguration Feb. 4, Bani-Sadr carried out a power play to have himself named chairman of the Revolutionary Council, the semisecret body that has ruled Iran since the revolution last February. He also denounced the terrorists holding the Americans at the embassy as “dictators who have created a government within a government.”

But the power of that shadow government was exercised in a series of countermoves that took place even as Bani-Sadr was maneuvering to outflank them. For instance;

- At the initiative of the embassy mob, Minister of National Guidance Nasser Minachi was arrested Feb. 6 on charges of being an agent of the CIA. Minachi, who is close to former Foreign Minister Ibrahim Yazdi, was linked to ex-Deputy Prime Minister Abbas Amir-Entezam who is presently on trial on similar charges. Bani-Sadr, along with former Prime Minister Mehdi Bazar-gan, protested the arrest and the trial, but to no avail.

- The Revolutionary Council declared that Iran would attend the Moscow Olympics later this year, a sharp rebuff to the Carter administration. The Council also denounced the Islamabad Conference of Islamic



## Bani-Sadr: a terrorist with credentials

The election of Abolhassan Bani-Sadr to the position of President of Iran brings to power a man who has promised to impose Cambodia-style "ruralist" genocide on a population already rocked by the rule of Khomeini's Muslim Brotherhood terrorism.

"Teheran is a monstrous, parasitical town," Bani-Sadr told the Paris daily *Le Monde* last November, "which absorbs by itself half the national consumption and poses an abusive burden on the state budget. We will depopulate it. ..."

foreign ministers held in late January as a "pro-American" operation.

- Ahmed Khomeini, the son of the Ayatollah, said in a speech on Bani-Sadr's inauguration that the main enemy of Iran is the U.S.-Israeli axis, and although he condemned the invasion of Afghanistan he refused to mention the Soviet Union by name.

In interviews over the past 10 days, Bani-Sadr himself has described the opposition that he is facing. On Jan. 27, he told the French daily *Le Monde*:

The people have chosen me despite the scandalous partiality of the radio and television, the insidious campaigns launched by the leading press organs, the veiled hostility from the top clergy, the battle waged against me by the Islamic Republican Party, although really by a handful of fascist prelates within the party falsely claiming support for Imam

Bani-Sadr was educated at France's University of the Sorbonne, as was the same Pol Pot who went on to oversee the murder of three million Kampuchean. Like Pol Pot, Bani-Sadr is one of an array of personalities carefully trained in the philosophical-political arm of zero-growth doctrine known as French existentialism, more popularly recognized in the person of terrorist controller Jean Paul Sartre.

Bani-Sadr's ideological tutor, Sorbonne Professor of Sociology Georges Balandier, in turn touches base with all the institutions named as the centers for the "braintrust" behind international terrorism, environmentalism, and cult creation.

A cornerstone creation of the Paris nexus of existentialists, environmentalists, and anthropologists linked to Sartre, the Zionist lobby's Jacques Soustelle and cultist Claude Levi Strauss, was the late Professor Ali Shariati. Shariati, a fanatic Iranian ideologue once close to Britain's Bertrand Russell, became a cult figure in Iran by preaching the revolt of Islam against the "evils" of the industrial West. It was Shariati who helped set the atmosphere needed in Iran to make the Khomeini entourage's return appear to the world as "revolutionary."

As the Ayatollah's economic advisor, Bani-Sadr defined Khomeini's "Islamic economic system" as centered on plans for Maoist-style factory and village councils reminiscent of the Dark Ages, import cutbacks, and limitations on oil production and foreign investment. It was Bani-Sadr who announced last Nov. 23 the default of Iran's \$15 billion foreign debt to finance the "revolution."

Khomeini and also despite a political campaign of filthy slanders.

Among the reports circulated by Bani-Sadr's opponents—especially the media controlled by propaganda czar Sadeq Ghotbzadeh, the foreign minister, and by Ayatollah Beheshti of the Islamic Republican Party—are that he was an agent of France, Israel, and the CIA, and that he was a collaborator of General Zahedi, the founder of the Shah's SAVAK secret police. In response, Bani-Sadr has threatened to make use of the secret SAVAK files and archives to discredit his opponents. According to *Le Monde*, Bani-Sadr suggested that the many trials and executions of former SAVAK officials have been held to hush up scandals involving current Iranian officials. "Could there be people infiltrated into the revolutionary movement who fear the publication of the SAVAK documents?" asks Bani-Sadr.

Concerning the press and media, Bani-Sadr pledged several times to purge the apparatus. The first result of that promise was the resignation of the director of the Iranian Radio-TV system, Ayatollah Khoini, who reportedly was very close to the leadership of the organization that seized the U.S. Embassy last Nov. 4. Khoini resigned Feb. 5 following charges that he attempted to sabotage the broadcast of Bani-Sadr's inauguration.

In another interview with *Le Monde* on Jan. 29, Bani-Sadr was even more explicit about his political enemies:

Mr. Bani-Sadr believes that the Islamic Republican Party, which dominates the radio-television service and the Revolutionary Council, "died on election day." Did it not support Mr. Hasan Habibi, who came third with fewer than 10 percent of the vote?" The republic's president continues: "Among others, Ayatollah Madani in Tabriz and Ayatollah Saduqi in Yazd called in the population to vote for Habibi. More than 70 percent of the electorate in these two towns gave me their vote."

Are you suggesting then that Mr. Habibi's defeat is also a defeat for the clergy?

"Yes, for a large part of the upper clergy. On the other hand, the lower clergy, the young mullahs supported me. ... I appreciate the support of the progressive mullahs."

Asked whether the expulsion of the U.S. journalists was a proper move by the Iranian authorities, especially by Ghotbzadeh and the Council, Bani-Sadr replied: "I suspect that the Iranian authorities' motives were less pure. Some people perhaps hoped to rig the elections and prevent me from becoming president; hence they tried to remove embarrassing witnesses."

### Upstaging the Revolutionary Council

Tactically, Bani-Sadr's strategy is as follows. In the space of the next month, elections will take place for the *majlis*, or parliament. Although Bani-Sadr hopes to win a majority for his point of view in those elections, the Beheshti forces and the Islamic Republican Party is fully mobilized to sweep the vote, amid a great deal of behind-the-scenes maneuvering. Theoretically, after the parliamentary elections, Bani-Sadr will appoint a prime minister who will form a government, and after that the Revolutionary Council will be disbanded entirely according to the Constitution. Recently, however, Bani-Sadr has started hinting that he may try to form a government even *before* the elections to ensure that he can consolidate his own authority.

His opponents, led by Beheshti, claim that the office of the President is only a figurehead position, and that the real constitutional power ought to be exercised by the prime minister. Thus, Beheshti argues that the parliament should have the authority to appoint the prime

minister—hoping that his Islamic Republican Party can thus wield actual power.

Bani-Sadr's strategy was recorded by the Paris daily *Le Matin*:

A parliament will have to be elected within one month, but I hope that it will be favorably disposed toward me because otherwise the country could become paralyzed. The president's role as defined by the Constitution is limited. However, this applies to ordinary situations, not to a crisis period when there is no political structure, when there are no parties and when there is a need for someone who would be able to prevent a breakup or a splitup. As soon as a parliament is elected then the Revolutionary Council will be dissolved.

He also told *Le Monde*:

The Islamic committees (the Komitehs) will be dissolved as soon as they have finished the purging and reorganizing the prefectures, police, and gendarmerie left over from the empire. The guardians of the revolution (the Islamic mili) will themselves be suppressed after the reorganization of the military into a truly popular army with officers of General Giap's quality.

That, as Bani-Sadr knows full well, is a tall order. To order the dismantling of the Revolutionary Council and the fascist-modeled komitehs means an assault on the only real forces that wield power in Iran—and it will be fiercely resisted.

Speaking to *Le Monde* on Jan. 29, Bani-Sadr also was asked why Iran so far has not aided the Afghanistan rebels. "Because," he answered, "the many different decision-making centers and the differences of opinion between the Revolutionary Council members—it will be disbanded when the government is formed—have paralyzed us in this sphere." That is a clear and frank admission that elements in the Council oppose aiding the anti-Soviet Afghani rebels, and recently a Teheran Radio broadcast attacked the government of Pakistan as kowtowing to U.S. imperialism by supporting the rebels. On this and other issues, the would-be American agent Bani-Sadr has been handcuffed by the opposition.

Further, in a series of communiqués, the "students" who are occupying the U.S. Embassy have declared that they will not obey an order from Bani-Sadr to release the hostages unless the Shah is returned to Iran. Last week, the Tudeh Party issued a subtle statement attacking Bani-Sadr for his "liberalism," a reference to his willingness to cooperate with the United States. And Ayatollah Beheshti, a former SAVAK agent who was, until now, the dominant force in the Council, warned last week against "some people not exactly in line with the Islamic revolution." That was also meant for Bani-Sadr.