

EIRSpecialReport

Iran's power vacuum: who will replace the ayatollahs?

by Robert Dreyfuss

The public burning of photographs of Ayatollah Khomeini and Ayatollah Montazeri, another top clergyman, by crowds of demonstrators in Iranian cities is a signal that the medieval Islamic Republic of Iran may be in its last days.

For the first time since the establishment of Khomeini's regime in January-February 1979, a pattern of overtly anti-mullah political activity has broken out across the entire nation. Violent demonstrations have taken place in Teheran and Qom, Iran's holy city, against the clergy's rule, sometimes erupting into clashes with the Revolutionary Guards. In Tabriz, Iran's second city, partisans of dissident Ayatollah Shareatmadari have begun distributing literature that attacks Khomeini and blames the clergy for the defeat of Iran at the hands of neighboring Iraq. Street marches and demonstrations have also occurred in such cities as Isfahan, Mashhad, and elsewhere. In Kurdistan and Khuzestan provinces, Kurdish and Arab partisan organizations, logistically supplied from Iraq and with stockpiles of weapons of their own, have recently begun campaigns of systematic guerrilla warfare against Khomeini's authority.

On a superficial level, what is happening in Iran would seem to be defined simply in terms of a general diminution in the power of the ruling Islamic Republican Party (IRP), the political instrument of the Iranian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood, the Fedayeen-e Islam, and the rise of the authority of the secular Islamic revolutionaries around Iranian President Abolhassan Bani-Sadr and his allies.

In fact, however, the process is far more complex than that.

In reality, an almost classic political power vacuum exists in Iran. The victory of Iraq's armed forces in crippling Iran's export-import outlets and shutting off its oil production while seizing large parts of Khuzestan has created a profound crisis in the country. Not only has the Iraqi success set off a crisis in Teheran and other cities, where food and fuel are rationed and shortages of essential commodities widespread, but the Iraqi action has dealt



Photo: Sygma

a total defeat to the Dark Ages clerical regime. In Iran, it has dawned on the various political and military factions that Khomeini himself is to blame for the crisis facing Iran.

Thus, throughout the population—among army commanders, merchants and *bazaaris*, the moderate clergy, businessmen, and the middle class—there is profound dissatisfaction with Khomeini and the IRP.

President Bani-Sadr, elected in January by an overwhelming margin but then gradually undercut and isolated by the IRP, is currently attempting to stage a comeback by rallying to himself the existing anticlergy sentiment in the country. Although at present Bani-Sadr is the only visible institutional pole of opposition to the clergy, most opposition forces bitterly mistrust Bani-Sadr and do not view as likely the prospect that Bani-Sadr can eventually emerge on top of whatever coalition manages to wrest power from the mullahs.

U.S.-Soviet policy

Before examining in detail the current internal balance inside Iran, it is first necessary to consider the international issues involved in the ongoing Iran crisis.

The election of Ronald Reagan has potentially transformed the regional context in which Khomeini's regime exists. The fall of the shah and the rise of the Khomeini dictatorship was engineered, according to a British design, by Cyrus Vance and Zbigniew Brzezinski of the Carter administration, in pursuit of the so-called Arc of Crisis strategy toward the region. They believed

that an alliance between the Anglo-American camp and the apparatus of the Muslim Brotherhood secret society would not only create an Islamic fundamentalist "bulwark against communism" in the area, but would also provide a framework for extending the NATO military bloc into the Middle East and Indian Ocean. Brzezinski viewed the crisis surrounding the Khomeini regime as a pretext and an opportunity to engage in a long-term militarization policy toward the entire region, in which the Camp David accords between Israel and Egypt were to be the first step toward a network of bases and military facilities east of Suez.

In addition, for the Carter-Brzezinski faction, and for the New York and London financial interests behind them, Khomeini and Bani-Sadr represented an opportunity to accelerate the neo-Malthusian economic thrust that included energy conservation, antinuclear policies, and de-industrialization. These policies were to be implemented through tight credit regimes and deliberate forcing up of energy costs.

Reagan, in the view of most analysts, is determined to pursue an "Arc of Stability" policy in the Middle East, reversing the previous confrontationist Arc of Crisis strategy. To a large extent, Reagan will orient his Middle East strategy around Saudi Arabia and the stability of the Persian Gulf. From this standpoint, the Reagan administration cannot tolerate the Khomeini regime.

Already, many Iranian exiles are looking to the incoming administration to give a green light for a

military coup against the Islamic Republic.

But to oust Khomeini and establish some sort of stable military-backed coalition government in Iran would require, first of all, the acquiescence of the Soviet Union. President Leonid Brezhnev and the Soviet leadership do not like Khomeini and the IRP regime, but, for strategic reasons, Moscow will not tolerate the re-establishment of an Iranian regime which would participate in the regional military buildup policy of Brzezinski, Harold Brown, and the Pentagon's Deputy Secretary for Planning Robert W. Komer.

Thus, any U.S.-sponsored move to topple the Khomeini regime could only occur with the prior agreement of the U.S.S.R.

Last week, in India, Soviet President Brezhnev suggested in an offer to the United States, Western Europe, China, and Japan that an international accord be reached to ensure the neutrality and security of the Persian Gulf and to ensure the uninterrupted flow of oil to the industrialized countries. Left unstated but, according to Iranian sources, still contained in the proposal was a quiet Soviet offer to Reagan concerning Iran. If the United States will abandon "the Carter doctrine"

and agree to the creation of a zone of peace in the Persian Gulf area, Brezhnev was saying, then Moscow will silently assent to the toppling of Khomeini.

To succeed, of course, such an agreement could only be reached at the highest levels of the United States and Soviet governments.

According to former Iranian military sources, inside Iran there currently exists any number of generals and colonels who, under appropriate circumstances, would be prepared to launch coordinated armed insurrection against Khomeini. Many of these military men inside the country maintain telephone and other communications with the headquarters of several exile opposition military and political figures, including Gen. Ali Oveissi, Dr. Shahpour Bakhtiar, Gen. Bahram Aryana, and so forth. But their ability and willingness to move decisively now is hampered, among other things, by the pervasive belief that any coup d'état against Khomeini would run into total opposition from the United States.

Iranian exiles, long exasperated by the Carter administration's military and political support for Khomeini's regime, are well aware that the United States still has enough power to prevent a successful counter-

Bani-Sadr a captive of the hostage issue

In his interview with CBS-TV's Mike Wallace on 60 Minutes, President Bani-Sadr of Iran took pains to distance himself from the issue of the American hostages. Asked by Wallace whether he knew where the 52 Americans were being held and by whom, Bani-Sadr shrugged and admitted that he did not. "But that does not mean I am completely ignorant," he said, "since I have made inquiries."

Bani-Sadr also admitted that as long as the 52 Americans are being held, then Iran itself is hostage to the hostage crisis.

In the view of Bani-Sadr and his allies in Iran, the release of the American hostages is essential to his basic goal of restoring U.S.-Iranian cooperation in economic and military terms. Not the least issue for Bani-Sadr is the freeing of some \$8 billion that was frozen by the U.S. Treasury when the hostages were first seized. In addition, Bani-Sadr and his close aide, Central Bank Governor Reza Nowbari, have been working out a deal with the Carter administration to exchange U.S. weapons for releasing the hostages by

sending some \$550 million in ordered arms supplies that were blocked after the seizure of the hostages.

But, as he is willing to acknowledge, Bani-Sadr does not control the hostages. That power lies in the hands of several Iranian factions, especially those associated with the radical wing of the Islamic Republican Party (IRP) and the Fedayeen-e Islam, the British-sponsored Islamic Brotherhood. This week, both Ayatollah Beheshti and Prime Minister Rajai gave indication of their intent to release the hostages provided that the U.S. gives unspecified "financial guarantees" to Iran.

Beheshti and Rajai are primarily motivated by their desire to trade their control over the hostages for acceptance by the incoming Reagan administration. The IRP believes that it can use the hostages as a bargaining chip, and it has hinted it will release them if and when the IRP is assured that its rule in Iran is guaranteed. But that may be a desperate gamble—and some observers are already predicting that the IRP's little game may blow up in their face. One such warning came in a *New York Times* article by Barry Rubin of Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies, who delivered the opinion that just as Iranian Prime Minister Mossadegh in the 1950s escalated his demands too far until they backfired, today the IRP may find itself making the same "fatal mistake."

revolution from proceeding smoothly.

The choice facing Reagan's administration is between two simple alternatives. Either the Reagan administration will work out a viable post-Khomeini regime in concert with its allies, the U.S.S.R., and the Arabs, to bring about a moderate government centered around the military, or Khomeini's regime will collapse of its own weight in the near future and disintegrate into civil war.

Many sources currently are willing to predict a civil war in Iran. Princeton University's Prof. Richard Falk, for instance, who has been a strong backer of Khomeini since 1977 and who headed the U.S. People's Committee on Iran, said last week, "I just spoke with a source in Teheran. They are convinced that Iran is moving to the breaking point and that civil war will break out. Khomeini has lost control of the factions."

Added Falk, "Before the Iraqi attack I would have thought that the IRP could win in a civil war, but now, if the Mujaheddin [leftist Muslim militia] and Fedayeen along with the military back Bani-Sadr, I think he could come out on top."

Actually, the forces that put Khomeini in power perceive that, together, Reagan and the U.S.S.R. might agree on efficiently removing Khomeini and the mullahs, then they will be prepared to precipitate a civil war. To accomplish that, the British and the Anglo-Jesuit intelligence faction will seek to polarize Iran into right- and left-wing camps, pitting the proclergy militia and the Revolutionary Guard against the leftist Mujaheddin and Fedayeen organizations.

The Bani-Sadr option

From completely different standpoints, the anti-Khomeini opposition and the so-called Iranian liberals are looking at President Bani-Sadr as the key actor in the current situation.

Said one Iraqi source, "We know that Bani-Sadr is making a power play. But we also know that some Iranian generals and other officers are moving very fast. The important thing to keep in mind is that the idea of a religious state in Iran is dead, and the ideology of nationalism is gaining in Iran. The regime that succeeds Khomeini will be a nationalist one. There will be no Islamic revolution."

He continued, "Our strategy is the following. We knew that as long as we fought the war with Iran we would unify the country, but we also knew that this would be only temporary. Now, we have halted the fighting, and exactly what we knew would happen is happening. The country is disintegrating politically. We are watching every faction: Khomeini's group, the Rajai group, the Bani-Sadr group, the Ghotbzadeh group, the military, the tribes.

"You see, we have made an offer to Iran to stop the

war and to make peace, to negotiate. That has caused a great crisis in Iran: everyone is fighting with everyone else. The basic issue is that Iran is now forced to admit defeat by Iraq—and everyone will blame that defeat on the mullahs. They cannot cover it up any longer. The army tried to make a counterattack on Abadan several times, and now people are beginning to wonder."

Since the beginning of the war, Bani-Sadr and his allies have attempted to maneuver themselves into a position from which they can capitalize on the anticlergy ferment touched off by the war. Since last year, Bani-Sadr has not had a power base that could support him against the clergy, which used the Revolutionary Guard and the *komitehs*, or Revolutionary Committees, to maintain their power. By appearing in military uniform and by consistently arguing the case for the armed forces, Bani-Sadr has won some support from the weakened Iranian military.

From Bani-Sadr's point of view, his strategy is as follows.

Around himself, Bani-Sadr has rallied a small group of so-called Iranian liberals such as Dr. Ibrahim Yazdi, Sadegh Ghotbzadeh, Mehdi Bazargan, Mustafa Chamran, and Amir Entezam. Within Iranian politics, this is the faction closest to American and British intelligence, and they are generally pro-Western from the standpoint of the Brzezinski policy of establishing an alliance with the Muslim Brotherhood. During the prerevolutionary period, this group clustered around Khomeini in Iraq and then in Paris, becoming his closest advisers and political confidants.

Since late November, the Bani-Sadr group began its political offensive.

In a letter to Ayatollah Khomeini late in November,

Upsurge in Tabriz

In Tabriz, Iran's second city in northwestern Iran, anti-Khomeini demonstrators took over part of the city Dec. 17, including the television station there.

Having seized the station, the anticlergy partisans staged a broadcast drama that brought home the nature of the protest wave currently sweeping Iran. Taking a photograph of Ayatollah Khomeini, the demonstrators ripped it into shreds and then burned it—for all the population of Azerbaijan, Iran's most populous district, to see.

Khomeini, in a statement issued afterwards, pretended to be unfazed. "If my picture is insulted, then the people should show no reaction."



Photo: Henri Bureau/Sygma

Iraqi soldiers returning from the Abadan front in September.

Bani-Sadr demanded the resignation of Prime Minister Mohammed Ali Rajai, an IRP member who comes from the Fedayeen-e Islam. "The presence of the current government is more disastrous than a war," said Bani-Sadr. "This government is not worthy of the situation and the fate of the country should not be left to those who do not have the slightest knowledge about the country's position, and whose capabilities are minimal."

According to Iranian sources, behind the scenes Bani-Sadr is pushing for former Foreign Minister Ghotbzadeh to replace Rajai.

The response from the mullahs was immediate. Hossein Khomeini, grandson of the ayatollah, blasted Bani-Sadr. "Today, those who have gathered under the umbrella of Mr. Bani-Sadr want to start acting against the imam. They have made grave errors. The friends of Mr. Bani-Sadr are falling away. The clerical figures who had issued communiqués supporting him for the presidency repent today. I myself was very active in his campaign for the presidency, but today I see there is a big conspiracy against the imam."

In demonstrations organized across the country by the IRP, the slogan was: "The clergy fights, the liberals tremble."

Then, on Dec. 11, the IRP issued an official state-

ment registering its distress over the threat of a Bani-Sadr power play. "It is clear to everyone that at present there is a dreadful plot to crush the Islamic Revolution with the help of some elements related to the United States," said the IRP. Without mentioning Bani-Sadr by name, the IRP statement accused certain Iranian officials of having "allied themselves with coup d'état plotters," a reference to Bani-Sadr's action in freeing Iranian air force officers jailed earlier this year for anti-Khomeini activities.

But Bani-Sadr continued to gain momentum—not because of the inherent appeal of the Bani-Sadr group, but because of the precipitous collapse of the prestige of the mullahs. Aides to Bani-Sadr, such as Ahmed Salamatian and Ayatollah Lahouti, toured the outlying cities and led rallies to break the power of the IRP. But those rallies, themselves organized spontaneously, were built on slogans chanted defiantly: "Death to Beheshti! Death to Rafsanjani! Death to Khomeini!", three prominent mullahs in the IRP leadership.

Working alongside Bani-Sadr, Ghotbzadeh this month renewed charges first made last year that many of the members of the IRP, including leading ayatollahs such as Beheshti, previously worked for the Savak, the shah's old security police. In 1979, when the revolution first seized power, Ghotbzadeh and Lahouti took control of the old Savak files, and added to them when Ibrahim Yazdi's son-in-law Shahriar Rouhani, Iran's ambassador to the United States, sent the massive embassy files home to Teheran. With that material, Ghotbzadeh and Yazdi have accumulated enormous ammunition with which to blackmail several leading Iranian religious figures.

Can Bani-Sadr rule Iran?

Because the political power of the mullahs and Khomeini—who is expected to die soon anyway—is virtually nil, Bani-Sadr is the great hope of those who are trying to maintain the existence of the Islamic Republic.

The chief support for Bani-Sadr at present is the Second International.

At a meeting in Washington, D.C. last week of the entire Second International apparatus, attended by Olof Palme, Willy Brandt, Anthony Wedgwood Benn, and large numbers of European socialists, the issue of Iran was intensively discussed, especially in private meetings. The consensus, as shown in the interview below with Thomas Ricks of Georgetown University, was that only Bani-Sadr and the liberals can salvage Iran.

In Iran itself, the key contact man near Bani-Sadr—for the Carter administration, for the Second International, and for Henry Kissinger—is Mansour Fahrang, formerly Iran's ambassador to the United Nations.

Shahpour Bakhtiar broadcasts to Iran

The most prominent Iranian opposition figure is Shahpour Bakhtiar, the former prime minister, who broadcast the following interview into Iran from his clandestine radio transmitters outside Iran. The interview, first given to the Iran Tribune, is the sort of informational broadcast that is now rallying anti-Khomeini sentiment throughout Iran. In the interview, Bakhtiar acknowledged that Baghdad has every reason to attack Iran for spreading its medieval revolution across its borders. Bracketed sections are in the original, except where noted.

The *Iran Tribune* correspondent asked: Dr. Bakhtiar, in your opinion will Khomeini's regime be unable to continue?

Dr. Shahpour Bakhtiar said: [It can continue] only on the condition that it continues its assassinations, that fear is spread everywhere, and fresh blood is shed, Khomeini's regime needs fresh blood. As soon as blood is not shed, this accursed person will fall. His mission is bloodshed in Iran. The youths are dying; their blood taints the ground. But what does this matter as far as Khomeini is concerned? For him it is only important that the people are terrified, that they fear for their own lives and the lives of their dear ones. The mullahs live in the best palaces and houses. They are guarded from above and below. But the youths are falling like autumn leaves so that, as Mr. Khomeini puts it, they can go to paradise in the other world. Actually . . . at present in this same world 36 million Iranians are being burned in the fires of hell.

The correspondent asked: Dr. Bakhtiar, did Iraq's attack against Iran prevent the fall of Khomeini's regime?

Dr. Bakhtiar replied: I believe that Iraq should not have attacked. The Iranians are patriots. Each Iranian loves his homeland as his life and reacts against any foreign invasion. But Mr. Khomeini should be made to understand that if the people of the country are fighting, it is not to defend Khomeini but to defend Iran. But you who do not like Iran, you who are more concerned with the Muslim *ummah* [community of believers—ed.] and not the Iranian nation, then what are you doing in Iran? You are yet another foreigner in this country who has occupied our country by force.

Go to a place where you can find a Muslim *ummah*.

The *Iran Tribune* correspondent then asked: Dr. Bakhtiar, why did a group say that in this war you sided with Iraq?

In reply, Dr. Bakhtiar said: Let me use the language spoken by these criminals in order to say that this is [words indistinct]. I issued a statement. . . . I am not a man to go back on what I said. I say once again: Between Khomeini and Saddam [Hussein—ed.], I choose Saddam. But with regard to Iran and Iraq, there is no room for discussion. Definitely Iran is my homeland, and I consider Iran above any other place. But in the war between Saddam and Khomeini, Mr. Khomeini is to blame because he is the one who has always wanted to export his false revolution. Khomeini wanted to start a war between Shiites and Sunnis. For years Shiites and Sunnis lived peacefully in Iran and elsewhere; there were no differences between them. Even Bani-Sadr said this, that "we should export this Islamic revolution abroad." If you see that your neighbor [is threatening] your home, will you not take steps? If someone wants to set you afire, will you allow him to do anything he pleases? Naturally he will react, and the result will be the Iran-Iraq war. In this war neither Ahmad Khomeini nor Mr. Bani-Sadr will be martyred, but a group of innocent . . . people and our youths are the ones who are killed in this war.

The *Iran Tribune* correspondent then asked: Dr. Bakhtiar, does the National Resistance Movement of Iran, of which you are the leader, follow the objectives of de Gaulle, leader of the French national resistance?

Dr. Shahpour Bakhtiar replied: My objective, as that of de Gaulle, has been and continues to be the saving of the homeland from the claws of the enemy. In my opinion the Gestapo treated the French more humanely than the way that Mr. Khomeini and his [mad] associates treat the Iranian nation. See what happened in the German courts and what is happening in the courts of the mullahs. These people know nothing of law and legality. They slaughter the people like hens. There is neither court nor defense. Only the person who has money can be saved from death. These plunderers thirst for blood and money. Hangings, life imprisonments, and other imprisonments are all [word indistinct]. Do you not know these things? . . .

Earlier this year, and even in 1979 just before the seizure of the U.S. embassy, Fahrang played an important role in what was reported widely to be a coup d'état attempt by Bani-Sadr, Yazdi, Entezam, and others that had been conceived and directed by Willy Brandt. Now, Olof Palme—the former Swedish prime minister and confidant of Brandt—has established himself as the official United Nations mediator in the Iraq-Iran war, and he expects to go back to the Middle East early in January on a visit in which it is expected that he will act to further strengthen the Bani-Sadr faction. During his visit this week to Washington and New York, Palme talked with U.S. intelligence officials, Kissinger, Arab League ambassador Clovis Maksoud, and Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations.

In an interview with the *Christian Science Monitor*, Fahrang revealed the thinking of the Bani-Sadr group by making the first Iranian peace offering to Iraq to end a war which has crippled Iran. “We are ready to work out a face-saving device for Saddam Hussein [of Iraq] so that he can justify and ratify his actions,” said Fahrang.

More important, Fahrang became possibly the first Iranian official publicly to call Khomeini insane. Iran, he said, cannot hope to overthrow the Baathist regime in Iraq by continuing the war. But, he added, “Phrased in other words, how do we convince Khomeini of political realities? How can we work on the assumption of the downfall of the Baath regime when we don’t know how long this will take?” Instead, he offered to find a solution with Iraq based on the previously ratified 1975 Iran-Iraq accord for the Shatt al-Arab waterway and boundary.

“The problem is,” said Fahrang, “that Bani-Sadr’s conception of Iran leaves room for the fundamentalists. But the fundamentalists do not envision any future for the president.”

Outside Iran, the Second International is now trying to use such initiatives as Fahrang’s to build an exile constituency to stabilize Iran’s Islamic Republic around a Bani-Sadr regime still heavily based on the mullahs, but with the secular liberals in control. Former Iranian Prime Minister Ali Amini, an old British agent in Iran who worked with President Kennedy in the early sixties, is said to be the center of such a group that also includes such figures as Admiral Ahmad Madani, former National Iranian Oil Company chief Hassan Nazih, and some others. Madani and Nazih cooperated with the regime of Khomeini during the first year or so after the revolution, but were then forced out of the country. Because of their role as collaborators, they are not trusted by the majority of the exiles. It is said now that Madani and Nazih might return to Iran if Bani-Sadr were able to consolidate power.

However, it is almost certain that even if the Iranian president manages to oust the IRP and consolidate power, he will not last long.

“If Bani-Sadr does make a coup, he will be a puppet of the generals, nothing more,” said one leading source in the exile community. “They will get rid of him as soon as they can.”

According to Iranian and Arab sources as well as sources in the U.S. intelligence community, it is considered unlikely that Bani-Sadr can rule the country. What is happening, in fact, is that every political center of opposition to Khomeini and the IRP is using Bani-Sadr to advance its own leverage in the country. Said one source, “For instance, Ayatollah Shareatmadari, who has always opposed the Khomeini mafia, has been under house arrest for a year. Now, some people are reporting that he has managed to escape his prison in Qom and flee up to Tabriz, his home base. In any case, Shareatmadari is using Bani-Sadr now to gain some elbow room for his movement.”

Fariborz Nazari challenges Palme

The following are excerpts from an Open Letter to former Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, who is a leading figure in the Second International and is currently United Nations mediator in the Iraq-Iran war. The author of the letter, Prof. Fariborz Nozari, is a leading figure in current Iranian exile politics and, reportedly, is close to Gen. Bahram Aryana, former Iranian chief of staff who now lives in Paris. Dr. Nozari’s brother was murdered in Iran by Khomeini’s gangs.

A few months ago when you were in Teheran, in connection with the American hostage drama, you must have noticed the black clouds of barbarous backwardness which were shadowing a country once called the mother of the world civilization. In spite of the serious violation of the most sacred norms of international law and in spite of the crimes of genocide against minorities and intellectuals and despite the mass-assassination of the country’s honest and talented military and civilians by the regime of the criminal mullahs, on your return to Sweden, you shamelessly commented that “they (the mullahs) are establishing a democracy with pedantic accuracy.” At that time I did not bother to give you a reply on such an atrocious remark. I did not think anybody would take you seriously.

Be that as it may. However, when about ten days ago your friend Kurt Waldheim, who, by means of his silence has given a free hand to the mullahs to commit all sorts of national and international crimes during the last two years, and who, after several weeks of war in the Persian Gulf region, suddenly began to think of his duties as the Secretary General of the United Nations, called you to New York to mediate in the conflict, I did not believe that you would once again make a fool of yourself. This time you did surpass yourself by stating in Teheran, to mass-media reporters, that "the people of Iran are building up their country!". . .

I believe, Mr. Palme, that you owe an apology to more than two million homeless Iranians wandering around the world, escaping from Khomeini's tyranny; the masses of Iranians living under the continuous terror of the mullahs' reign; and, the large number of relatives of the victims of the crime of genocide and all sorts of barbaric mass murders committed by the mullahs. In spite of your attempt to ignore the facts, you must have known all the time that the whole story is about a bloodthirsty old lunatic who believes in destruction rather than construction; who wants nothing but personal revenge; who has no respect for human life or human rights; who does not recognize any established norms of common behavior; and, to whom terms like national interests, social values, human dignity, and integrity bear no meanings. . . .

And, if the Iranian army receives the necessary weapons and equipment, in an effort to recover from the humiliation caused to them by the mullahs, they will defeat Iraq militarily. This will give Khomeini the opportunity to bring about total destruction to Iraq creating, consequently, chaos and disaster in the entire Persian Gulf region. The question then arises whether this was the main objective of the leaders of the Western world when they planned the fall of the late shah by helping a lunatic like Khomeini to power. In that case the real beneficiary of such a situation in the long term, the Soviet Union, should demonstrate its gratitude for this fortunate windfall to the "master-planners.". . .

Finally, what kind of a man are you, Mr. Palme? A few years ago, during the reign of the late shah, you begged him for a personal favor by granting you a large amount of money on an advantageous basis. For that, you regarded him as a great man and savior as long as he was in power. Today, you are not only praising the criminal mullahs, but by also doing their bidding, have joined their other errand-boys like Bani-Sadr, Ghotbzadeh and Rajai.

What's next?

Fariborz Nozari
Professor
of International Law

Thomas Ricks on Bani-Sadr's politics

An excerpt from an interview with Prof. Thomas Ricks of Georgetown University's Center for Contemporary Arab Studies in Washington, D.C. Ricks is a left-leaning, Jesuit-trained Iran specialist who helped bring about the Khomeini regime. Ricks is soon leaving for Israel to attend a conference of the West German Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Foundation), tied to the Willy Brandt wing of the SPD.

Q: Was Bani-Sadr discussed at the recent Second International meeting in Washington?

A: Oh, yes, Bani-Sadr is indeed a Social Democrat of the German 1880s kind. He is prepared to work for socialist principles within a parliamentary context. When Willy Brandt and company were here, the subject of Bani-Sadr came up. I spent a long evening talking to people who had been at that conference, and Bani-Sadr was discussed from this standpoint. It was clear even before the conference that Bani-Sadr was being looked at a lot by the Second International. The people I talked to discussed Bani-Sadr in a European context: what does Bani-Sadr mean for Europe? Bani-Sadr stands for *limited* capital development, through special trade accords. Everybody agreed on that, that it has to be limited, not like the shah.

William Beeman fears new U.S. Iran policy

An excerpted interview with William Beeman of Brown University, a member of the Iran Society, who has U.S. intelligence connections.

Q: What do you think Reagan will do concerning Iran?

A: Who knows? I don't know one Iran specialist who has consulted with Reagan's people. Not one! In fact I am very disturbed by what a friend of mine, the son of Reagan adviser Richard Pipes, has been saying. David Pipes wrote that we should no longer negotiate with Iran, since we are sacrificing our national honor. Well, let me tell you: if we take that attitude with Iran, we are going to see that country swing to the left. . . .

I think the thing that people should be concerned about is that Reagan is dealing with Iran with no adequate intelligence. He will blindly try to impose his will. For Reagan, his best friend in the area will be Saudi Arabia.