

Exclusive

Shah's agents threaten students

Five men, under command of an Iranian diplomat who operates from a headquarters in the Yorkville section of New York, are among Iran's secret agents in the U.S., *In These Times* has learned.

The five are part of SAVAK, the Iranian intelligence agency. SAVAK has long harassed and intimidated Iranians who oppose the shah of Iran, may be planning murder and has the cooperation of U.S. police agencies, Iranians living here say.

An Iranian source in the U.S. with contacts inside the Iranian embassy in Washington has told *In These Times* the names of five top agents:

Mansour Rafizadeh heads SAVAK operations in the U.S. He holds a diplomatic passport. He came to the U.S. in 1957, was recruited to SAVAK in 1966 and received espionage training in Iran in the late '60s.

Rafizadeh works in close liaison with the FBI and CIA.

He lives in Franklin Lakes, N.J., and operates out of SAVAK's secret headquarters in the 1500 block of York Av., New York. He is building a barn in Booneville, N.Y., which Iranians charge will be used to house and torture kidnapped anti-shah dissidents.

Manuchehr Moradi monitors Iranians who fly to the Mideast from New York. Those who return to Iran often are arrested on arrival and face torture in the shah's jails. Arrested and charged Nov. 8 with selling stolen airplane tickets, he was immediately released.

Jamschid Sedghi, an insurance salesman, broadcasts a twice-weekly pro-shah radio show on New York's WHBI.

Javad Khakbaz edits the *Iran Times* at the Washington embassy.

Parviz Xavieh, who lives on Long Island, is a reporter for an Iranian newspaper.

►SAVAK has sections.

A spokesperson for the Iranian Students Assn., a main target of SAVAK operations, says SAVAK—like Chile's DINA, Korea's KCIA and other secret services trained by the U.S. CIA—has three U.S. sections.

One section handles pro-shah propaganda, which ranges from radio shows to financing departments in American universities; another conducts espionage, which includes harassment and threats to Iranians here, and the third does lobbying, which includes activities similar to those recently attributed to the KCIA.



Iranian students demonstrate against the shah's policies, wearing masks to avoid SAVAK persecution.

In August, Prof. Richard Cottam of the University of Pittsburgh said he was told by a State Department source that "hit squads" were planning to murder anti-shah Iranians in the U.S. The killings, he said, would be arranged by SAVAK agents who have Mafia connections.

"They will appear as ordinary muggers and kill the Iranians one by one," Cottam said.

The shah confirmed that SAVAK is active in the U.S. in a CBS-TV "Sixty Minutes" interview Oct. 24. He said it is "checking up on anybody who becomes affiliated with circles, organizations hostile to my country."

A day later, the Iranian newspaper *Kayhan* reported the shah had said if the U.S. tried to curtail SAVAK operations, he would expel CIA agents from Iran.

►No evidence.

The State Department didn't deny SAVAK's presence in the U.S., but said Nov. 9 there was no evidence of "illegal or improper activity" on the part of Iranian government agents.

Reza Baraheni, an outspoken Iranian poet who lives in New York and chairs the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran, is a probable target for "hit squads," according to Cottam. Baraheni's life has been threatened whenever he speaks against the shah at universities; in March campus police at San Jose State in California halted an appearance because they believed Baraheni would be killed.

"They've already tried everything short of murder to silence us," Baraheni says.

Association members say harassment of their families in Iran is common. Baraheni's 20-year-old niece was arrested and tortured earlier this year and is serving a seven-year prison sentence, charged with no crime except being related to Baraheni.

Association members say murder is still possible, but they charge SAVAK and police in the U.S. and Europe are cooperating in new methods of silencing them.

Two international association members say murder is still possible, but they arrested last month in France and charged with the murder of Homayoun Keykavoussi, a SAVAK agent who members say posed as a diplomat.

Although an organization called International Brigade claimed credit for the assassination, citing as evidence their earlier killings of Venezuelan and Turkish diplomats with bullets of the same caliber, Oskui and Takbiri are being tried in France this week and face deportation to Iran.

►Attacked by police.

When Iranian students in Houston peacefully protested the arrest Nov. 10, they were attacked by police. An association spokesperson says SAVAK agents were permitted to harangue students by loudspeaker and interrogate them while the students were on a hunger strike in the Houston jail. The 91 arrested students are free, but face trial and possible deportation in December. "It's just another way to try to silence us," a member says.

The association believes Iran, with 25,000 U.S. advisers, could be the next Vietnam. They explain the suddenly oil-rich nation is the No. 1 arms buyer from the U.S. and that the shah defends U.S. corporate interests in the Persian Gulf and Mideast.

They charge his fascist regime is hated by most Iranians and only keeps power through terror, torture and execution of dissidents, amply assisted by U.S. aid. Amnesty International says Iran has "the worst record of human rights in the world."

It's crucial that Iranians abroad speak out, the association believes, because if the American people understand the shah's regime, the U.S. will be forced to curb its support. "We trust the American people," a member says. "When they know the truth, they will change the policy." **Judy Maclean**

Washington Post pressmen ready for trial

By Tim Frasca
Washington Bureau

Washington. Fifteen of the pressmen who walked off their *Washington Post* jobs 14 months ago go on trial here Dec. 6 on strike-related charges that could send each to prison for 40 years. The liberal *Post*, meanwhile, basking in its Watergate reputation as an enemy of corruption, is actively supporting—outside the glare of its own publicity machine—criminal prosecution of part of its workforce.

The workers under indictment, all members of Local No. 6 of the Pressmen's Union, struck the *Post* Oct. 1, 1975. Contract negotiations had broken down and management had prepared for a long strike, with specially-trained management personnel ready to take over the presses and blunt the walkout's effect.

When presses that were to be taken over by strikebreakers were damaged that night, the *Post* launched a massive blitz through *Post*-controlled media (including a radio and TV station, *Newsweek* magazine and the newspaper itself) painting the action as vandalism of millions of dollars worth of equipment. Long after the moment's sensation had cooled, a *Chicago Tribune* reporter discovered that

only \$13,000 worth of equipment was replaced.

But the initial impression of "massive violence," fixed in many minds, has been the lasting one.

A grand jury was quickly convened, reportedly after a personal visit by Katherine Graham, the *Post*'s powerful publisher, to federal prosecutors. In July, after a nine-month investigation in which 88 local members were called, 15 men were indicted on charges of riot, destruction of property and assault.

Chip Berlet of the strikers legal defense committee says the investigation's length and the number of unionists called was a conscious policy designed to demoralize, intimidate and bankrupt the strikers.

►Maximizing profits.

The *Post* maintains of course that it bargained in good faith, made generous contract offers and was met with uncooperative attitudes from the union, followed by the pressroom destruction.

Strikers, however, deny this and point to a Graham statement to her board of directors in 1972: "The first order of business at the *Washington Post* is to maximize profits from our existing operations....Some costs resist more stubbornly than others. The most frustrating kind

are those imposed by archaic union practices....This is a problem we are determined to solve."

The story, says Local President Everett R. Forsman, is the *Post*'s relentless campaign to bust our union and destroy the pressmen and their families, a campaign that resulted in one suicide."

Less than a year after the strike began, the *Washington Post* Co. stock was skyrocketing while the market as a whole was sluggish. Explains an analyst writing in the July 25 *Washington Star*, "They've solved their labor problems."

Whether the *Post* is guilty of provoking the strike, the company was well prepared to win it. Production halted only two days, while helicopters airlifted copy to nonunion printshops in Maryland and Virginia.

"The *Post* did prove that it could print, and that was demoralizing," one newspaper stock analyst says. "Other newspaper unions....even in big labor cities like Detroit and Philadelphia, are taking a somewhat lower profile than they have in the past."

►None of us are safe.

Though the antiunion media blitz has been effective, many Washington unionists and union sympathizers remain de-

fenders of the pressmen. Washington Teachers Union President William Simons, now vice president-elect of the American Federation of Teachers, told the rally marking a year of the strike, "As long as management nourishes the idea that unions can be broken, none of us are safe."

The *Post*'s ability to control dissemination of news has already arisen as a major trial issue. The New York-based National Jury Project's demographic survey of the Washington area found 87 percent of the sample read the *Post* and 24 percent believed a fictitious survey question that strikers had bombed a *Post* executive's car.

"That one-quarter of those questioned actually thought we had bombed a car shows the extent to which the *Post* has poisoned the minds of potential jurors," Forsman says. "Not only has there never been a car bombing, but this absurd charge has never even been rumored."

The unionists' defenders are fairly confident about winning acquittals on all counts, but caution that "Graham is going for convictions, not solely the six weeks of antiunion publicity" the trial will generate.

IN THE NATION

Million-dollar Stevens' boycott

Clothing workers begin campaigning against 'No. 1 Labor Law Violator,' the nation's 2d-largest textile conglomerate.

By Dan Marschall
National Staff Writer

J.P. Stevens is hardly an everyday household word to residents of Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Louis or a dozen other cities. But about 40,000 shoppers in these cities heard that name last month as the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers union (AFL-CIO) kicked off the most ambitious consumer boycott in recent history.

J.P. Stevens and Co. manufactures bedsheets, towels, draperies, over-the-counter fabric goods and a wide range of textile products and is the nation's second-largest textile conglomerate with 85 domestic plants, most located in North Carolina, and subsidiaries in six foreign countries.

To the 44,000 people who work for it, the name Stevens means low wages, brown lung disease from breathing high levels of cotton dust, racial and sexual discrimination and a history of crushing labor unions by any means necessary.

►Number one labor law violator.

In 1963, the Textile Workers union set out to organize Stevens with AFL-CIO backing and a squad of organizers from other unions. The company retaliated with a barrage of not-always-legal tactics, including firing union supporters, bugging phones of union organizers and threatening to close any plant that unionized.

Stevens' conduct has won it a reputation as the nation's "No. 1 Labor Law Violator." In 13 years, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) has found it guilty of breaking the law 15 times.

Stevens' pattern of labor relations was disrupted in 1974 when 3,500 Stevens

workers in Roanoke Rapids, N.C., voted for union representation. The sides have yet to achieve a contract, however.

Observers pin this failure on Stevens' refusal to even discuss two provisions contained in 95 percent of all U.S. collective bargaining agreements: a voluntary dues check-off and the binding arbitration of grievances. Without these clauses, the union says, the Roanoke Rapids local would have little financial security and would be compelled to resolve grievances by strike.

►Making Stevens pay.

"Stevens presumably will remain an outlaw until the company's vicious antiunion campaign becomes unprofitable," the AFL-CIO's monthly magazine said last April. To put a crimp in Stevens' profits, the labor movement has initiated a nationwide boycott of Stevens' products.

The boycott was authorized last June by the convention that merged the Textile Workers union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union into the ACTWA. The boycott has only recently been fired up, however, since the 500,000-member union placed "everything else on the back burner" until after the recent election.

The union has hired 40 staff people to work on the boycott full-time in addition to many in its regular staff for whom it will be a major commitment. A smaller staff is based in New York to coordinate boycott efforts among Catholics, Protestants, civil rights groups, students and sympathetic Stevens stockholders.

At an estimated cost of \$1 million, the boycott will involve opening offices in 27 cities, releasing a film on Stevens in

mid-January, publishing a monthly newsletter and flooding the country with educational literature.

In its early stages, the campaign will focus on institutions that use Stevens' goods.

"We'll approach hospitals, motels, hotels, jails and anyone else using linens to ask them to use discretion when placing orders," comments Stan Clair, regional director of the Amalgamated's Union Label department. They will describe Stevens' record on labor relations and civil rights, Clair explains, but avoid actions that might be interpreted as coercive when dealing with retailers.

Boycott representatives will also approach city and county governments with fair wage laws and ask them not to buy from companies that have broken the Civil Rights Act. Union charges of Stevens' discrimination against blacks and women are being investigated.

To generate publicity, the union will set up local and national citizens committees. Sources close to the boycott have told *In These Times* that Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) will be asked to become chairman of the National Citizens Committee.

Boycott supporters will leaflet department stores, apartment complexes and plant gates to inform the public of Stevens' record.

►Union moving cautiously.

Boycott representatives look to the successful 22-month boycott of Farah several years ago as an example of how a nationwide—and ultimately worldwide—boycott can put the economic screws on an antiunion employer.

Unlike Farah slacks, Stevens' products are often difficult to recognize because

they're marketed under many brand names. About half its goods are sold in an unfinished state to apparel manufacturers who turn them into clothing that can only be identified by registered numbers. Only 34 percent of Stevens products carry one of its own 22 brand names.

Union lawyers have decided to proceed cautiously with the boycott since recent Supreme Court decisions and NLRB rulings have clouded the definition of a secondary boycott. The union will not employ pickets in front of retail stores and only distribute leaflets a block away.

Meanwhile, in Roanoke Rapids, an "Employees Educational Committee" is petitioning the NLRB to decertify the union and stop the boycott completely. Observers suspect the effort is another item in the company's bag of antiunion tricks.

Federal government actions will strongly influence the boycott's progress. Proposed reforms of NLRB procedures may increase board enforcement powers. In addition, labor is expected to push President-elect Carter to issue an executive order prohibiting federal contracts with companies that violate NLRB directives.

However long it takes, the ACTWA is committed to breaking Stevens as the first step in organizing the textile industry.

U.S.-based corporations seem to treat the South as another country, unionists have pointed out; a place where they can shift production and find low wages, right to work laws, tax breaks and quick profits. Unless labor can successfully storm this open-shop fortress, the jobs and living standards of all working Americans will never be secure, they say. ■

Pentagon moves to tie Carter to fat budget

Defense submits record \$128 billion request, inflated 14 percent to cover 'cuts' by Carter.

By John Markoff

Washington. The Pentagon in mid-November submitted a defense budget request of \$128 billion, a record increase that is more than 14 percent over last year's budget. The Office of Management and Budget will review the proposed budget before sending it to the outgoing Ford White House.

Defense Department critics claim the budget has been artificially inflated in hopes of committing President-elect Carter to a defense-spending increase.

Robert Brammer, coordinator of the National Campaign to Stop the B1 Bomber, said in an interview, "It looks like the Pentagon is trying to tie Jimmy Carter's hands by increasing defense spending far above what even President Ford wants. Carter said he is going to cut \$5 to \$7 billion out of the defense budget and the military is taking out insurance by adding \$7 billion before Carter takes office."

Until several weeks ago the Pentagon budget was even larger. The individual military services submitted requests totaling \$133.5 billion, up almost 20 percent over last year's \$112 billion record defense budget.

One key reason for this year's increase is that sophisticated new weapons systems, deferred during the Vietnam war, are entering production. All three legs of

the nuclear "triad"—land and sea-based missiles and strategic bombers—are being "modernized."

The Air Force wants \$1.5 billion for the heavily criticized B1 bomber and accelerated development of a new mobile ICBM called the MX. The Navy is asking for increased funding for the giant missile-firing Trident submarine. Spending on a new main battle tank—the XM-1—expansion of the Army from 14 to 16 divisions and a new Navy shipbuilding program are also fueling the increase.

►Palace intrigue and the scramble for power.

The atmosphere in postelection Washington is one of palace intrigue as Democratic advisers, out of power for eight years, jockey for positions in the Carter administration.

On Nov. 11, the Committee on the Present Danger, composed of elite foreign and military policy advisers from business and government, held a press conference here to warn that if Carter does not increase the defense budget "we'll soon be no. 2 in defense posture." The group did not call for any specific increase, but its minimum demand corresponded closely to the amount that Ford is said to support.

Three days after the committee press conference another policy-adviser group issued a study proposing a "freeze on



In These Times cartoon by David Hereth

U.S. and Soviet military spending and non-nuclear force levels as a first step toward controlling the worldwide arms race in conventional weapons."

The study was sponsored by the U.N. Assn. and financed by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Key members included Cyrus Vance, the former deputy defense secretary, Prof. Richard Gardner of Columbia University and lawyer Paul Warnke.

One common feature of both groups is that they are jammed with prospective Carter foreign-policy advisers. The two appear to represent the acceptable extremes of defense-spending debate in the scramble for positions in the new administration. ■

John Markoff is a writer based in Oregon, where he is an associate of the Pacific Northwest Research Center. For the last few months he has been in Washington researching defense issues.