

ate cease-fire between the two countries—resolutions supported by Iraq. And when Baghdad threatened to break the 1972 friendship treaty should Moscow fail to renew its military deliveries, the Soviets speedily came through, and Baghdad, in a good-will gesture, released a score of Iraqi communists from jail. Predictably, Teheran answered by arresting Iranian communists and banning the main Tudeh newspaper *Mardom*, driving underground once again the communist Tudeh leadership led by “Ayatollah” Kianouri. With the Soviet Baku radio beaming into Iran characterizing Rafsanjani as a “rat” or Montazeri as an “ass,” a slow deterioration of Iranian/Soviet relations began a few weeks ago; on Aug. 6 Tass blasted Khomeini for the first time for heading a “theocratic regime.” In between, mullahs of various ranks suspected of sympathy for the Tudeh had been purged. Hojateslam Khomeini, the man who had controlled the Iranian “students” at the American embassy, was voted out of the post of deputy speaker of the parliament and Nabui, the man who had negotiated the release of the hostages, was forced to resign as deputy prime minister.

Disillusioned by the present regime, Moscow has obviously not abandoned its hopes of controlling the country by proxy. Aware of the ongoing process of internal political disintegration, it remains ready to act. This is where British intelligence and its allies will intervene as they know that Khomeini will launch Iran into a desperate flight forward against its neighbors or internally, rather than admit defeat. Such an action would in turn force the Americans to intervene in the region to protect their allies in the Gulf. But an American military presence would force the Soviets to react on profile, too, and intervene in northern Iran. That’s London’s scenario, and that will be realized unless the superpowers enter into an agreement which 1) would curtail Iran’s military supply lines; 2) back up the moderate Arab countries against Iran and the threat of radicalization of the region; 3) make the commitment that whatever happens in Iran as a result of such steps would be entirely an internal matter and thus the business of none of them. Then London’s manipulation and bluff could be called and the region stabilized.

---

Interview: Shahpour Bakhtiar

---

## Iranian ex-Premier on Israel’s intrigues

*The following interview with Shahpour Bakhtiar, former Prime Minister of Iran, was conducted by Mary and Thierry Lalevé in Paris, on July 7.*

**EIR:** Could you tell us your view of the situation in the

Middle East, and particularly the situation in Lebanon?

**Bakhtiar:** I can tell you that Khomeini will once again show his real face after the withdrawal of Iraqi forces [from Iran—ed.]. He will find another alibi, another diversionary maneuver. One day it is the American hostages, another day it is the war with Iraq, another day it is the call to open the gates of Jerusalem to the Islamic forces. All that has as its main aim to divert the attention of the population in Iran, which has many problems.

I think that following the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Iran, Khomeini is going to say, “I am going to go to Iraq to impose my Shiite doctrine.” This is contrary to international order. It is like Hitler, who said, “I possess the truth. I am going to impose it on others.” And Khomeini’s flag will fly perhaps over Iraq, Jordan, Egypt, or the states of the Persian Gulf.

As for Lebanon, I think personally that the country can hope to free itself from a certain number of contingencies. I knew Lebanon when I was very young, when I was at the Lycée Français in Beirut when I was about 16 or 17. It was a beautiful country, where several communities—Jews, Armenians, Druzes, Orthodoxes, Maronites, Shiites, and Sunnis—lived in peace.

But the problems of the Middle East will not be solved in Iran or in Lebanon. The problems are infinitely more complicated. The problem of the Persian Gulf, for example, is that these countries are not really countries. These countries did not exist when I was a boy. Names like Bahrain or Kuwait existed, but that was all. Then oil was discovered. It was expensive; the Western world needed it, and some people got rich. These countries are not viable countries. When the oil runs out, the burning desert will return. These countries are not like Iran, Iraq, Turkey, or even Lebanon, which have other resources, not only oil. All these problems exist, and will not be solved by the Iran-Iraq war.

**EIR:** What do you think about the relations between the Soviet Union and Khomeini?

**Bakhtiar:** The essence of Khomeini is archaic. It is a dictatorship. It is a total absurdity. The Soviet Union would not be happy if there were a social-democratic regime in Iran. She would prefer a regime more like the Shah’s, knowing perfectly well that it would finish badly one day, a regime like the Khomeini regime, where there is disorder, killings, executions. “That is good,” think the Soviets, saying to themselves, “We will wait our turn, we will wait till the fruit is ripe and falls from the tree.” That is why the Soviets and Khomeini do not have bad relations. They understand each other. I find the Soviet Union even more cynical than Khomeini.

**EIR:** What do you think about Israeli aid to Khomeini?

**Bakhtiar:** Khomeini has received technical assistance, especially military, mainly for aviation—spare parts, maintenance, repairs, and so on—during the war. . . . Israel had

different aims. First, to be sure that the Iraqi army, which was a threat, could no longer be operational. That is now the case. After all that has happened between Iran and Iraq, neither the Iranian army nor the Iraqi army is operational. Israel had other aims too: to help the Iranian army defeat the Iraqi army, which it considered its enemy, as far as possible, then, they intend to tell the Iranians later, "we helped you, don't forget!" I don't think that the Israelis can remain friendly with Khomeini for very long—unless Khomeini is really pro-Israeli!

I think there is no doubt that Khomeini knew that spare parts were coming from Israel. The Israelis did this mainly to put the Iraqi army to the test, which they have done, and also to infiltrate the Iranian army, to have contacts, relations, and so on. Whether they have succeeded or not, I don't know.

**EIR:** How do you see the situation inside Iran?

**Bakhtiar:** One thing can be said. Given the problem of Lebanon, and other problems, neither the United States nor England has a plan to solve the problems in Iran. They said to themselves, "After all, there is a mullah, the county may be suffering, but we don't care!" The communist danger is not immediate for them. Evidently, there is communist infiltration which started some time ago. But it is not yet obvious, it is not yet urgent, they think.

Resistance is crushed inside Iran, by Khomeini's terrorism. It is unimaginable. I lived in France during the German occupation. There was the Gestapo, and I knew what it was, as a soldier in the French army. I don't think the Gestapo ever acted like the Pasdarans [Revolutionary Guards]. . . .

Now, Khomeini says, "Whoever I, or any other mullah, declares impious, or agnostic, could be executed without trial by anyone." You can see what results this can lead to.

Therefore, it is simply not possible for the Iranian people to make any signs of insurrection at the moment. That has to be organized from the outside, but with armed elements inside the country. Otherwise, there is no solution. Countries like the United States or England have no plan to help us, to send an expeditionary corps, which we do not want, as it would cost us dearly later.

**EIR:** What are your own plans for the future?

**Bakhtiar:** I can answer all your questions, except to talk of my plans! It is our duty to fight Khomeini with all our means. Someone asked me one day, "Now that there is peace, what are you going to do?" I said, "This is their business. I never agreed with this war, never. Now, if Mr. Saddam and Mr. Khomeini have no arguments with each other, or if they want to shake hands, that's their business. I have another task—to fight Khomeini. We will continue, we have to fight, there is no other solution. We must live fighting or disappear.

**EIR:** What do you think of the Iranian exile movement?

**Bakhtiar:** There is a lot of romanticism in all this. There are two groups that I distinguish completely, at least two groups.

I am leaving aside those who are described as the fervent supporters of Reza Pahlavi. In principle, those people were not very clean. They have their interests; they want to return to loot the country. Let's leave those people aside, as well as the communists, who simply execute orders received. For the rest, there is one group which I call "dissidents," and another I call "opponents," those who said no to Khomeini from the very first day, or even before. The dissidents are those who collaborated with Khomeini, and somewhere along the road, they said, "I don't like that." But in principle, these people were expelled by Khomeini, they did not resign. Look at Bani-Sadr. I must admit, I find that Khomeini's government has done one legal act in the last two years . . . the ouster of Bani-Sadr, in conformity with the constitution. . . .

There is one problem in Iran, you know. People say that the mullahs are indecent. But the children of mullahs. . . .!

---

Interview: Dr. Mehdi Rouhani

---

## Islamic leader declares that Khomeini will fall

*The following is an interview with Dr. Mehdi Rouhani, the spiritual leader of the Shiite community in Europe, and an important opponent of Ayatollah Khomeini. The interview was conducted in Paris by Mary and Thierry Lalevée, on July 8 1982.*

**EIR:** How do you view the events of the last three years in Iran?

**Rouhani:** According to our tradition, the Shiite clergy represents a symbol of popular will, and it took the leadership of the revolution. The clergy wanted to take power and eliminate the civilians. I think that this was a danger for the Shiite clergy, and this danger still exists. Even faith and good will can never replace experience, which is necessary to run a country. This is what is happening in Iran. It is the result of political ignorance and the intolerance of the Shiite clergy, religious and political intolerance. I think that sooner or later the regime will be overthrown. There is no doubt about that. If you talk about the revolution, a popular movement, it does not exist any more. Those who used to support the revolution are now against it. Once they have power it is difficult to take it from them.

**EIR:** If the Khomeini regime is overthrown, there will probably be a big anti-religious movement. How do you see that?

**Rouhani:** I don't agree, for the reason that there are many well-respected religious representatives inside Iran who are leading the opposition to events in Iran. If the clergy were