

Carter must back the Bakhtiar option

LaRouche warns the Administration on dangers of further destabilization

The following is a policy statement on Iran by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

My representatives have checked the implications of the Iranian restabilization effort around Prime Minister-designate Bakhtiar with relevant official and other sources in Europe and elsewhere. It is clear that all Western continental European governments of importance are supporting this restabilization of Iran, and that only the British and their American "dumb giants" on a British leash are committed to near-term destabilization of a Bakhtiar government.

It is also clear that pro-Soviet elements in Iran are currently committed to the successful restabilization of Iran around Bakhtiar's "constitutional monarchy" package.

As long as the French-led European support of stability in Iran is permitted to be successful, the Soviet Union will play no significant direct role in the Iranian situation. However, should the Western Europeans prove unable to prevent the U.S. from supporting British destabilization efforts against Bakhtiar, it is probable that the Soviets

would view themselves obliged to intervene in the situation. The best estimate is that in event of an attempted "anti-Soviet Iranian generals' coup," Soviet sympathizers in Iran will react with a replay of the July 1917 Bolshevik mobilization against General Kornilov. The effects of a direct British-USA NATO intervention into Iran would, of course, have incalculable consequences.

Vital U.S. interests throughout the Third World and in respect of world petroleum needs are best served by supporting the Iran and related policies associated with France's President Valery Giscard d'Estaing. As long as Zbigniew Brzezinski, Walter F. Mondale, James R. Schlesinger, and Henry A. Kissinger continue to be major influences, in aggregate, in U.S. policy-making, the government of the United States is incapable of launching an independent and effective policy for the Middle East or any other part of the world. Since Western continental European governments are better judges of vital U.S. interests at this moment than the U.S. government itself, our national interests are best served by following and supporting the efforts of our anti-British friends.

Media eggs Carter to 'hang tough' against Soviets

A massive propaganda barrage was let loose by Britain and British-influenced media last week in an effort to move the Carter Administration into a confrontation with the Soviets over Iran. In France, Le Figaro carried an assertion that the Soviet KGB was running everything in Iran, even the Shah's British-linked opponent, the Ayatollah Khomeiny. Newsweek's Arnaud de Borchgrave claimed improbably that the Saudis were threatening to go over to the Soviet camp because the Carter Administration wasn't hanging tough enough. And the Christian Science Monitor called on Carter to make "the quick and prudent decision which, for example, characterized John F. Kennedy's

management of the Cuban missile crisis."

The press barrage was an attempt, as former CIA official Ray Cline acknowledged in an interview (page 10), ... "to get a campaign to pressure Carter to stand up to the Communists." Some major examples:

"This is Mr. Carter's time of testing. We will find out now whether he has learned enough during his apprenticeship to be able to bring to bear on a real crisis the clarity of understanding and the capacity for quick and prudent decision which, for example, characterized John F. Kennedy's management of the Cuban missile crisis."

*—Joseph C. Harsch,
Christian Science Monitor,
Jan. 2, 1979*

"Officials seem to agree that even if the Shah manages to survive the crisis, Iran would be unlikely to continue as the self-proclaimed pillar

of stability in the region. This has therefore led some to begin searching for another pro-Western nation that might fill this role in the future, what officials have begun to call 'a second pillar.'

"None of the nations within the Gulf, including Saudi Arabia, are thought to possess either the skills or the population necessary to take over Iran's security mission. As a result, analysts are looking farther afield for the 'second pillar,' and some Defense Department analysts contend that Israel, with its highly proficient armed forces, has taken on much greater strategic importance."

*—Richard Burt,
New York Times,
Jan. 2, 1979*

"As Iran disintegrates, the Saudis maintain, the U.S. has begun to look to Mexico as an alternative to Persian Gulf oil. In response, they say, Saudi Arabia is veering away from a close alliance with the U.S., and hedging

Did the CIA fail in Iran?

Certain liars and fools are reporting that the CIA failed to evaluate the internal situation in Iran correctly. On the contrary, according to best sources, the CIA professionals produced an accurate reading on the internal situation in Iran itself. However, as in the case of the British operation in Shaba province of Zaire last year, the official CIA position had next to no correlation with the factual findings produced by Agency professionals.

With aid of high-level sources of many governments, the U.S. Labor Party has accumulated a mass of cross-checked facts which account for every significant element of the destabilization of Iran. Acknowledging that elements of the U.S. intelligence establishment were deployed on British leashes into this situation, every facet of the destabilization was directed from outside Iran itself, with overall coordination by London.

To the extent there was any failure in the findings and evaluations of CIA professionals, those professionals did not misread the *internal situation* in Iran. Their sole failure was their fear of bucking Brzezinski and others, their fear to identify and to counteract British-coordinated elements behind the destabilization.

Let us review key known elements of the destabilization.

The central figure of the destabilization was Ayatollah Khomeiny, who began his role in the destabilization from his former exile base in Iraq, and following his expulsion from Iraq, abused the hostility of France. Khomeiny has

a long British-intelligence pedigree, dating from his formative period in the British-created and British-intelligence-controlled Moslem Brotherhood. The network in which Khomeiny is situated is a collection of Asharite cults fostered as British-intelligence agents-of-influence over a period now approaching two centuries.

The organizations most prominently featured together with Khomeiny included the following.

The Bahai cult. This is a synthetic religious cult created by British intelligence during the 19th century, paralleling the Theosophy cults of Madame Blavatsky and her heiress Annie Besant. This is run as an intelligence cover through centers in Britain, the USA, Israel and Iran, and operated through British-Israeli intelligence networks deployed under the international cover of *the British faction of Freemasonry*.

The Aspen Institute. The Aspen Institute is a de facto branch of British intelligence, with notable bases in Chicago, West Berlin and Colorado.

Israel-Peking. The drug-financed wing of Chinese Communist foreign intelligence is codeployed from Israel throughout the region Brzezinski has defined as the "Arc of Crisis," working in concert with networks coordinated through the Socialist International and the Socialist International's "Trotskyist" and "Maoist" subsidiaries. The Israelis, Peking and the Socialist International are running an escalation of bloodshed in Eritrea, the Ogaden region of Ethiopia, and elsewhere, and are in place to launch a destabilization in both the Oman and Yemeni

its bets with the Soviet Union. The Saudis gave their tacit approval to the Camp David process; they assumed that Carter had decided to act resolutely to contain Soviet expansionism in the entire area through a tacit alliance between Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Israel. But the Saudis say they have concluded, from Carter's equivocal performance during the Iranian crisis, that the President is defeating his own strategy and is emboldening, not discouraging, the Soviets.

"The Saudis' new perspective has wide-ranging implications. They are talking to the Russians about establishing diplomatic relations. And in private conversations, top Saudi officials now say they believe that the Geneva conference, where the U.S. and USSR are co-chairmen, is the proper approach to a comprehensive Mideast settlement. . . .

"Some of the Saudis' own recent actions could get them into trouble with Washington. They backed away

from the Camp David peace process, which helped persuade Egypt to stiffen its terms. Later, they acquiesced to OPEC's large oil-price increase. Unless the Saudis can show that American weakness caused those steps, there may be second thoughts in the U.S. about the sale of F-15 jet fighters to Riyadh."

— Arnaud de Borchgrave
Newsweek, Jan. 1, 1979

"Things are as bad for the West as they could possibly be and they are getting worse. The Europeans have to deal with the weakest American administration in my lifetime."

— Former British Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, quoted by syndicated columnists Roland Evans and Robert Novak, Jan. 2, 1979

"Everyone knows that the USSR does not desire the installation of an

Islamic regime in Teheran. But that's not the question, contrary to what we have been told complacently by the majority of the Western mass media. . . . Far from carrying on a religious discourse, this sinister old man (Ayatollah Khomeiny — ed.), manipulated by the Tudeh, has not ceased to launch appeals to insurrection more closely resembling Marxist methods than religious inspiration. . . .

"The internationalization of the Iranian affair creates conditions for world conflict. Through it, Moscow intends to return to the classic solution of dividing up zones of influence. Authorizing, thereby, Mr. Carter to save face. But at the price of the Finlandization of his principal ally in that part of the world.

— Jacques Guilleme-Brulon
Le Figaro, Jan. 3, 1979

regions of the Arabian Peninsula. These elements, of which the "Iranian students" sideshow-organization is a subsidiary, have been a contributing feature of the Iranian destabilization.

Exemplary of the British policy expressed in the operation is the doctrine of British agent, *Professor Bernard Lewis*. Lewis, associated with Princeton and with Georgetown University's CSIS, proposes to transform entire regions of the world into an ulcer of "Thirty Years War" scenarios through playing upon every conceivable variety of communalist conflict-potentials. *Henry A. Kissinger is a supporter of the Bernard Lewis policies.*

Also included in the overall efforts at destabilization throughout the Brzezinskian "Arc of Crisis" is the so-called "*Sufi Order in the West*," of which former IMF Director *Witteveen* is a prominent spokesman. Former National War College official *Joseph Malone* is up to his ears in the overall destabilization operation, as is *Duke University-based Ralph Braibanti*. This intersects the same British-USA complex which organized the March 1975 assassination of Saudi monarch King Faisal.

Key in the operation are the *Rothschild-linked British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell*, whose executives formed part of the command structure in London for the coordination of the overall Iranian destabilization.

Naturally, National Security Council advisor to President Carter, *Zbigniew Brzezinski*, is up to his curiously-fashioned ears in the whole affair. Through Brzezinski et al., elements of U.S. intelligence and other institutions were deployed in support of British operations in Iran.

The British objectives in the Iranian destabilization are severalfold. Most immediately, the British deployed this action with the intent of wrecking Europe's and Japan's petroleum supplies. In this project, the destabilization of Iran was foreseen as complementary to a further destabilization of Saudi Arabia — the latter a project toward which the British and such U.S. elements as *Joseph Malone* have been working currently.

Congress must wake up

The Administration, the Congress, the Republican Party's National Committee, must finally wake up to the reality of the policies pushed by Kissinger and Brzezinski.

"Traditional" U.S. policy has always been to promote strong governments as U.S. clients or allies, thus to create a global network of strengthened direct and indirect U.S. influence and security. In fact, Kissinger and Brzezinski, as National Security Council chiefs, and Kissinger as Secretary of State have worked for exactly the opposite policies in every instance but Israel and Peking.

A list of such policies proves the point.

1. — *The Kissinger-Einaudi "Second War of the Pacific."* Using the pretext of Bolivia's access to the sea as a trigger, this RAND-associated scenario proposed to engulf all of South America in a kind of ulcerous "Thirty Years War" scenario.

2. — *A Similar Central American "Thirty Years War" scenario.* Using triggers such as the Belize question, a

Nicaraguan coup spilling into Costa Rica, and a Linowitz-*"Senile Six"* destabilization of Panama, this region was to be engulfed in a perpetual ulcer of instability and bloodletting.

3. — *The Kissinger-London Southern African Scenario.* Using the Rhodesia crisis, the Namibia crisis, and intertribal conflicts, Kissinger's southern Africa policy aimed to set racial and intraracial warfare into motion in another "Thirty Years War" scenario.

4. — *The April 1975 Chamounist coup in Lebanon.* London, Kissinger and Jerusalem, working in cooperation with Asharite and Coptic elements in Lebanon, triggered a bloodbath with the specified objective of a tripartition of Lebanon along communalist lines, with Israel gobbling up the southern portion and Syria awarded an Alawite region.

5. — *The Horn of Africa Scenario.* During the period Kissinger and London perceived the Ethiopian government to be in Kissinger's pocket, Kissinger from State attempted to cultivate in the Ethiopian government the "perception" of Soviet-influenced Somalia as Ethiopia's adversary. London and Kissinger fumbled a coup d'etat in Ethiopia, with the Soviets picking up the good relations. Then, Brzezinski and London ran a Horn operation directly the reverse of Kissinger's original scheme.

6. — *The Kissinger-Bernard Lewis scenarios.*

7. — *The Kissinger-Brzezinski "Camp David" scenario,* with the included feature of an Israeli-monitored Egyptian military deployed as an IMF policeman in Africa.

8. — *The London-Kissinger-Brzezinski "Baluchistan" caper.* The proposal to carve a nation of Baluchistan out of Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan is the pivot of a general Bernard Lewis-type destabilization-project involving India in the Brzezinski "Arc of Crisis" operation.

9. — *The London-directed attempted destabilization of Turkey, part of the "Arc of Crisis" operation.*

Can any senior member of Congress or of the Executive branch's senior ranks argue with clear conscience that such destabilizations of regions of the globe are American-style operations, policies or objectives? There is only one principal policy-making entity in the world which thinks in that way: *the Bertrand Russell-Churchill-centered New Dark Age hooks in Britain.*

The arguments offered by apologists Dr. Kissinger, Brzezinski et al. is that it is necessary to follow such a "scorched earth" policy in those numerous regions of the world in order to "deny ground" to presumed imminent Soviet takeover in those regions. *Is it U.S. policy to wreck the economies and nations of the non-Communist world in order to prevent a Communist takeover?*

How long will the Executive and Congress continue to tolerate the Bertrand Russell-type lunacy of Kissinger, Brzezinski, et al.?