

offensive, ENI threatened to become a major competitor of the Rockefeller oil group.

The Rockefeller offensive was brutal. Against ENI, Rockefeller activated his covert operatives who apparently sabotaged a plane carrying Mattei. Immediately after Mattei's death, under Eugenio Cefis, ENI reversed its expansionary policy, sold its British holdings to Exxon under mysterious circumstances, and withdrew entirely from its Western Hemisphere (Rockefeller "turf") operations.

Strategic Attack on Soviets

While the Rockefeller moves against ENI were tactical, the attacks upon the broader Soviet threat were strategic. In 1961, Rockefeller's Exxon (the Jersey Standard) submitted a paper to the U.S. State and Interior Departments recommending a "free world" boycott of Soviet oil. In late 1962, NATO embargoed exports of oil pipeline to the Soviet Union in an attempt to reduce Soviet oil shipments to Europe.

It was this background that led to the formation of OPEC — a blatant cartel composed of a nearly unbroken chain of Rockefeller puppet governments. OPEC immediately began moving to create the necessary structures to meet the Soviet and other oil challengers, in addition to paving the way for the activation of OPEC machinery in 1969-70 and during the Great Oil Hoax of 1973. During the 1960s, OPEC's potential power remained largely dormant due to the mid-1960s collapse of Soviet oil exporting capabilities. In fact, during the 1960s, the Soviet bloc itself became increasingly dependent on oil and gas from OPEC members.

II OPEC and Rockefeller

The extent of Rockefeller's control over the international oil cartel is well known. The titanic Standard Oil Trust — including Rockefeller's three powerhouses, Standard Oil of New Jersey (Exxon), Standard Oil of New York (Mobil), and Standard Oil of California (Socal) — is linked closely with the other four majors. With Rockefeller's victory in the "oil war" over Royal Dutch Shell and the Detering group in the 1920s and the Rockefeller domination of the Gulf Oil octopus of the Mellon family, the history of oil company warfare since World War II has been essentially nothing more than a series of mopping up operations by the Rockefeller interests.

In addition, Rockefeller's two major New York banks, Chase Manhattan and First National City — known as the "oil banks" — are deeply involved in financing and controlling the operations of the oil industry.

The Temporary National Economic Committee in the 1930s reported that of the stock of Standard Oil of New Jersey, now Exxon, the Rockefeller family owned 8.7 per cent, their foundations 4.8 per cent, the Harkness family 4.3 percent, and Standard Oil of Indiana 6.7 per cent. The Chase Manhattan Bank, whose energy department is known in financial circles as the most sophisticated in banking, remains the firm's chief bank. Some finance and directors, however, are provided by the Morgan allies.

Mobil Oil (Standard Oil of New York) is more closely allied to the First National City Bank and Bankers Trust in operational terms, although about six per cent of its stock is owned by the Rockefeller family and 0.7 per cent is owned by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. In the case of Standard Oil of California, the Rockefeller family holds five per cent

of the equity. SOCAL, in addition, maintains close links with the First National City Bank of New York. In combination, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund control slightly less than three per cent equity. Apart from its director interlocks with the First National Bank of Chicago and the Harris Bank and Trust, Morgan Stanley is its leading investment bank.

What is less well known is the extent of Rockefeller's control of the various OPEC governments and finance ministries, especially Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Kuwait, in addition to the airtight control by oil cartel companies of the production, transport, refining, and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products, — which in effect reduces the power of the purportedly "independent" oil producing nations to next to nothing.

Iran: Total Control

In Iran, since the 1953 CIA coup d'etat which restored the Shah to power, the forces of Rockefeller and the CIA have exercised unlimited control over virtually all the political, military, and economic institutions of that unfortunate nation. As early as 1954, the Plan Organization was set up on a functioning basis funded by the Ford Foundation and the U.S. embassy and including a select group of Iranian bankers called the Harvard Advisory Committee. Its task was to serve as a government above the nominal state headed by the figurehead Shah. Despite the Shah's "progressive" stance and supposed independence, he is only a brutal, pompous aristocrat who is subordinate in policy making to the real Iranian executive — U.S. Ambassador Richard Helms, ex-Director of the CIA. Three huge military missions and thousands of American "advisors" oversee the vast and growing Iranian war machine under Helms' direct control. Foreign oil interests in Iran are overwhelmingly American and British, and Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank is involved heavily in ownership and management of the financial institutions of Iran — including the Ministry.

Similarly, in Saudi Arabia, Rockefeller interests — and control — reign supreme. Chase Manhattan and First National City are ubiquitous in Saudi Arabia's foreign financial transactions and with their allies are the recipients of the lion's share of King Faisal's petrodollar deposits. The Aramco monolith (Arabian American Oil Company), which controls oil production in Saudi Arabia, has a board of directors which includes representatives of both Exxon, Mobil, Socal, and Texaco as well as the Saudi government, which is part owner. Aramco was founded in 1933 by Caltex (joint company of Socal and Texaco) and later joined in 1948 by Exxon and Mobil. The Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency was set up in 1952 on the advice of the American government.

Rockefeller's Oil Hoax

The continuing oil price crisis which resulted from last year's 400 per cent increase in the price of oil, according to the *New York Times*, threatens to touch off a world depression which will "topple governments like saplings in a hurricane." Politically and financially, the major benefactors of such a crisis have been the Rockefeller interests — not the Arab governments.

Aside from the numerous other effects of the Rockefeller-rigged oil crisis, the price rise has had the net result of vastly increasing the power of a select group of the world's largest banks who control the deposits of the OPEC governments.

Mideast Oil and Rockefeller Control

COUNTRY	OPERATING COMPANY	OWNERSHIP per cent	1974 PRODUCTION in million barrels/day
Saudi Arabia	Aramco	Exxon, 25 Mobil, 25 Socal, 25, Texaco, 25	8,100,000
Iran	Iran Oil Participants, Ltd.	BP, 49 Shell, 14 Exxon, 7 Mobil, 7 Socal, 7 Gulf, 7 CFP 6 Iricon, 5	6,500,000
Kuwait	Kuwait Oil Company	Gulf, 50 BP, 50	2,700,000
Bahrain	Bahrain Petroleum Co.	Socal, 50 Texaco, 50	250,000
Union of Arab Emirates	Abu Dhabi Petroleum Company	BP, 23.75 Shell, 23.75 CFP 23.75 Mobil, 11.875 Exxon, 11.875 Partex, 5.00	575,000
	Abu Dhabi Marine Areas	BP CFP Japanese Interests	360,000
Qatar	Qatar Petroleum Company	BP, 23.75 Shell, 23.75 CFP 23.75 Exxon 11.875 Mobil 11.875 Partex, 5.00	210,000
	Shell Qatar	Shell, 100	230,000

OPEC Total Production in 1974 = 33,000,000

1972 Production level.

NOTES

(1) While Iran nominally owns 100 per cent of the "nationalized" consortium, this is only a political fiction. Iran's oil is totally controlled by the Anglo-American Cartel.

(2) Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Arab Gulf producers currently are seeking 100 per cent "participation" agreements, paying compensation in full to the operating company. As the companies themselves admit, participation agreements are not a threat. Control of distribution remains with the Cartel.

(3) The revolutionary government of Iraq both has

nationalized much of its production and has expropriated the Exxon/Mobil interests in the Basrah Petroleum Company. Iraq is the sole OPEC country outside Rockefeller control.

(4) Exxon, Mobil, Socal, and Texaco (allied with Socal in the Caltex Corporation) are Rockefeller controlled. Gulf is largely Mellon interests with growing Rockefeller control. Shell is allied with Rockefeller and its Board of Directors interlocks with Chase Manhattan Bank and the Standard Oils. BP is owned by the British government, itself a satrapy of Rockefeller.

The intelligence division of the National Caucus of Labor Committees received this report of the oil crisis from the chief economist of Morgan Grenfell's in London, December 1973. According to Morgan Grenfell's, which specializes in Mideast finance, the decision to embargo oil shipments and later to raise oil prices on the part of the member nations of OPEC was motivated in large part by statements made by Treasury Secretary George Schultz during August and September. At the August meetings of the Committee of Twenty on International Monetary Reform, and later at the Nairobi annual conference of the International Monetary Fund, Treasury Secretary Schultz proposed that the "excess" dollar reserves of countries be frozen, i.e., put into unspendable accounts, in order to brake the increase of international liquidity. (The world's money supply doubled between 1970 and 1973, mainly as a result of the increase in U.S. dollars in circulation.)

The Arabs, in turn, had spent years negotiating oil price increases partly because they felt that increases were necessary due to the inflated dollars in which they were paid. According to Morgan Grenfell's, the decision to launch the "oil crisis" was made by Harvard-trained Sheikh Yamani, the Saudi Minister for Oil and Natural Resources. King Faisal, whose mind is not well attuned to the twentieth century, confirmed the decision partly out of concern for Saudi dollar reserves, and partly out of sincere commitment to **Jihad** against Israel.

According to numerous press reports, Chase Manhattan Bank is the leading financial advisor to the Saudi Arabian monetary agency, just as First National City Bank is advisor to the Kuwait equivalent.

Who Benefits?

As noted above, the principal beneficiaries of the oil crisis — which drew an amount roughly equal to 2.5 per cent of one year's wage bill of the industrial countries — have not been the Arabs and other oil producers, who, on their own, are literally incapable of spending their oil revenues. The two principal beneficiaries are the large international banks, who have received the use of very large proportion of the total revenues, and the large oil companies. The oil companies increased their profits on at least two accounts: first, through inventory profits during the fourth quarter of 1974, based on purchase of oil at the old price and sale at the quadrupled price; and second, through the huge increase in their turnover resulting from the higher oil prices. In addition, major oil companies are under investigation and in some cases indictment in almost every industrial country for conspiracy to fix prices and other violations of monopoly legislation. The answer to the oft-repeated question, "Who benefits?" can be only the Rockefeller family and related interests.

In passing, it should be added that Mr. George Schultz, the **agent provocateur** of the oil crisis, is now a Vice-President of the Bechtel Corporation, the U.S.A.'s (and perhaps the world's) largest privately-owned corporation, a major contractor for the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam and elsewhere. (Former CIA director John McCone was a founder). Stephen D. Bechtel Sr. is a member of the Board of Directors of Morgan Guaranty Trust.

III The PLO, Fatah, and King Faisal

To show that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as currently constituted is absolutely not — in

any sense — a legitimate liberation movement, it is necessary to review the origins and policies of its overwhelmingly dominant faction, the Fatah group headed by Yasser Arafat. Such a review clearly will show the destructive political influence that Fatah has had on the emerging organized Palestinian movement during the mid-1960s and beyond.

Funded from the start by reactionary King Faisal — himself merely a manipulated, bewildered puppet of Rockefeller's Aramco consortium — Fatah has acted consistently to enforce rigid, anti-socialist regimentation, to the limits of its ability, on all sections of the Palestinian movement including inside the refugee camps and among the student movement.

The means used by Fatah are two seemingly opposed techniques. One the one hand, Fatah has behaved as a classic centrist organization, counseling "moderation" on more radical groups and at times resorting to violence to purge the PLO of socialist and communist-linked Palestinian formations. The vast Saudi funds available to Fatah have allowed it to maintain a large standing "army" and to dominate the PLO by virtue of superior organizational and propaganda resources as well as discreet backing from most Arab regimes, including "reactionary" ones (Saudi, Kuwait) and "conservative" (Egypt, Lebanon).

Terror Tactics

Fatah's second method of control is terror. Fatah second-in-command Salah Khalaf (Abu Iyad) is widely known unofficially as the leader of the fanatic terrorist Black September aberration, responsible for a series of hideous crimes and slaughter of innocent victims as well as spectacular, headline-grabbing explosions and assassinations. All of this has served to discredit honest, non-terrorist Palestinian organizations by smearing all factions with the wide brush of terrorist activity.

Thus Fatah has developed a typical "hard cop/soft cop" relationship to the Palestinians. Yasser Arafat, the father figure and nationalist par excellence is known throughout the PLO as "the old man;" Abu Iyad, the terrorist, is called the "dangerous man." The Arafat-Iyad combination thus allows Fatah to meet criticism and opposition on several levels and also increases the CIA's options in guiding the Palestinians through the turns and twists of manipulated Middle East politics.

Abu Iyad most recently is known in this context for his statement which indirectly but clearly warned that the vicious Black Septemberists might be reactivated, this time **against Iraq**, to "expose Iraqi schemes" regarding the PLO. In reality, Iraq and the associated Palestinian factions (including the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, PFLP) are the sole remaining active points of resistance to the Rockefeller/U.S. CIA plan for the Middle East. The PFLP recently withdrew from the Fatah-controlled Executive Committee of the PLO in a protest against PLO contracts with the CIA at the American embassy in Beirut.

By playing both sides for the CIA, terror and "moderation," Fatah has managed to secure the PLO for King Faisal and the Rockefeller oil interests.

Origins of Fatah

While reports about the origins of Fatah are understandably scanty, it is known that the leadership emerged around 1959, centering on a purely nationalist periodical entitled "Our Palestine."

Politically, the group had no identifiable orientation. Instead, Fatah insisted on a non-