

Published: The full text of the treatise

Mohammad Khatami's Mission for a Velvet Coup d'état

The full text of the treatise 'How did the project of civil society transform into civil society into civil struggle?' by Payam Fazlinejad is now published under the title *Mohammad Khatami's Mission for a Velvet Coup d'état*. This research treatise was published in 5 sections from 3rd to 9th June 2009 on page 14 of Kayhan newspaper and it created a great deal of reactions in the political circles of the country. In this treatise, for the first time, the hidden aspect of the mission of 'Mohammad Khatami' (the former president of Iran) is revisited in the project of velvet revolution and the role of the reforms government is explored as they have played a part in established an 'organised force' for a 'green coup d'état'.

Author: Payam Fazlinejad

Researcher at Kayhan Institute / author of 'Chevaliers of Cultural NATO' / The bestseller political book of 2008

Publisher: Kayhan Newspaper, Research Centre of Kayhan Institute, June 2009

Contents of the treatise:

Part I: Backgrounds of soft coup d'état; Part II: Strategists of Civil Disobedience in Tehran; Part III: The British Master Key; Part IV: What happened in the Ministry of Interior; Chapter V: Secrets and privileges of Khatami

Synopsis:

As of 1997, Mohammad Khatami established an 'organised force' for velvet coup d'état in the reform government and he organised and led them for the realisation of a 'green coup d'état' in Iran in 2009. Following the end of his term of presidency in 2005, he started his regular attendance in American and European lobbies and held meetings with leaders of intelligence missions (such as the Secretary General of the military organisation, the NATO) in his foreign trips for the purpose of overthrowing the Islamic regime. Since 2006, Khatami was employing

strategic codes and keywords of 'civil struggle' in his remarks. On xxx July 2009, in the 'cheapest and most ridiculous speech of his political life', Khatami said that the Islamic Republic regime has spilled the people's blood 'ruthlessly' in the face of the civil and progressive protests of citizens and the regime did not even allow the 'families of the martyrs' to hold memorial and funeral ceremonies ! As of xxx July 2009, he has officially played the role of the 'leader' of a 'militant opposition' and said, 'The Islamic Republic regime does not have any legitimacy with its own people and has failed.'

In 2002, Khatami assigned 'Abdolvahed Mousavi Lari' (the Interior Minister) to mobilise the 'organised force for velvet coup d'état in NGO's directed by the Ministry of Interior. In order to further this process, three thinking engines of the CIA and the MI-6 named Juergen Habermas, Richard Rorty and John Keane were giving advice to the reforms government. These three security and intelligence theorists, are the greatest philosophers and strategists of Europe and the US who have transformed the project of 'civil society' into 'civil struggle' in Iran. The theoretic centre of this project was the Bureau of Political Studies of the Interior Ministry' coordinated by Hossein Bashiriyeh, Saeed Hajjarian, Sohrab Razzaghi and Abdollah Ramezanzadeh. This project was closely affiliated with Mohammad Reza Khatami and Behzad Nabavi in the sixth Parliament and the 'Research Centre of the Parliament. In order to realise the 'velvet coup d'état', Abdolkarim Soroush started his close cooperation with the US State Department and he had a meeting with George Shultz (Former American Secretary of State) and Francis Fukuyama along with Hossein Bashiriyeh.

From 2002 onwards, Alireza Beheshti has had numerous meetings with Habermas along with Mohsen Kadivar in Tarbiat Modarres University to promote academic research regarding methods of 'transitioning the Islamic Republic to American democracy'. He was appointed in 2009 as the senior advisor to Mousavi for Civil Struggle with the regime. The organised force of the velvet coup d'état benefited from millions of dollars of budget approved by the American Congress and the Dutch parliament and received special trainings to implement the velvet coup d'état. Following the election of 24th June 2005, these budgets were increased thirty times. The Dutch parliament approved an annual budget of 15 million Euros in the name of 'Media

Pluralism in Iran' and the US Congress approved an annual budget of 75 million dollars for the velvet coup d'état project, which was raised to 108 million dollars in 2009.

Planning the green coup d'état project for the tenth presidential elections is a complicated process with several intelligence and strategic layers; however, among all different models of 'soft subversion' the political behaviour of reformists very much resembles Samuel Huntington's strategy. This process started after June 1997 with the 'pressure from below, negotiation on the top' theory and then ended in 'active resistance and pre-emption' strategy. In early January 2002, in a speech at the sixth parliament, Behzad Nabavi said that in order to impose the demands of reformists on the establishment, they have to bring people to streets. In June 2008, Mir Hossein Mousavi followed the same strategic model of the Islamic Revolution Mujahedin Organisation. On the morning of 11th June 2009, at the end of a breath-taking election campaign, in a meeting with a British envoy, Mir Hossein Mousavi declared the beginning of the 'Operative Phase of Civil Struggles' and as of 14th June he called on people for a 'civil struggle' against the establishment, which was also supported by Mohammad Khatami. Now, Mousavi, Khatami and Karroubi are following the green coup d'état project.

This treatise intends to revisit the strategies and tactical foundations of this project.

Part I: Backgrounds of soft coup d'état

In February 1996, the American Deputy Secretary of State wrote in the introduction to a report by the Council on Foreign Relations regarding the Civil Society project in Iran, "This movement [supporters of civil society] is part of a bigger movement in order to disintegrate the religious authority of the Islamic Republic... and it undermines the legitimacy of any religious government." This report was released at a time when Mohammad Khatami was heavily engaged in his election campaign for the 8th presidential elections and by mere accident his campaign slogan was 'Civil Society'!

Infrastructures of the Civil Society project started to be reproduced from 1988 at the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of Westminster in London by John Keane (the

theorist of the MI-6) and in the 90's it became the main project of Iranian secular intellectuals. The Foundation for Iranian Studies, which is now active under the supervision of Ashraf Pahlavi in Washington DC, was among the distinguished circles which adopted the Civil Society project from 1993 in the Iran Nameh quarterly from this British centre. They deemed the realisation of civil society a prerequisite for the ideological collapse of the Islamic Republic regime. Researchers of this foundation like Ali Banu Azizi and Houshang Amir Ahmadi believed that structures of civil society help promote secularism in Iran and the only force which have the capacity to carry out this 'mission' are the members of the Kiyān circle (known as religious intellectuals). Even militant groups such as *Fadaiyan Khalq Organisation* (minority branch) relinquished its terrorist methods and pretended to be supporting Civil Society. In an essay by Behrouz Khaleeq published in *Kaar* journal in the 5th August 1992 issue, they argued that the Civil Society project must be considered the beginning point for soft subversion in the Islamic Republic; this struggle is was this time the product of the 'intellectual developments among parts of the forces inside the regime like Mohammad Khatami'.

In the first half of the 1990's decade, a widespread consensus formed in European and American circles regarding the realisation of Civil Society in Iran and a powerful political camp supported it. The founding pillars of this camp were the British Centre for the Study of Democracy, the American Council on Foreign Relations and the German Association for Foreign Policy (?). They held regular meetings of consultation with people who were well-known as reformists. The hidden figure behind these consultations at that time was John Keane. He started his interactions with Hossein Bashiriyeh and Abdolkarim Soroush from 1995 in the guise of the Civil Society professor at the University of Westminster and travelled frequently to Tehran following the June 1997 elections. Soroush and Bashiriyeh had lived in the UK for many years and in the 1990s the regularly frequented the London research centre and the political circles inside Iran. As of 1993, Soroush was assigned to promote the Civil Society project as the major 'issue of Iranian intellectuals' and from 1994, Bashiriyeh started formulating in the framework of the Political Development Project in the Presidential Centre for Strategic Research.

The other purpose of this project was to transform the identity of the Islamic Republic from inside the regime and bring about Transition to Democracy. Out of these two circles (?), the 'Aeen' circle was born around the personality of Mohammad Khatami; Soroush, Bashiriyeh, Hajjarian, Tajzadeh, Abtahi, Kadivar and Mojtabeh Shabestari were among its main members. This circle later on formulated the slogans and policies of Khatami for his participation in the presidential elections of June 1997 around the idea of Civil Society Discourse. [Translator note: factually this is wrong. This was not Aeen; it was Kiyan. Aeen was formed after the end of his two terms of presidency].

Until 1996, prominent figures of these three circles made several trips to the US, UK and Germany in the guise of sabbaticals and research fellowships. The most controversial one of them was the confidential speech of Abdolkarim Soroush in the German Association for Foreign Policy in 1995. Revealing these secret consultations raised a lot of reactions inside Iran. Such activities were sometimes faced with the protest of some academic figures as well. For example, in February 1995, academics of the Steer College (?) in Virginia released a research in which they had said that "Iranian intellectuals have done a defective and erratic adaptation of the concept and foundations of civil society and that 'their theories lacked the minimum scholarly standards and valid philosophical principles'".

Kahyan newspaper used to follow this approach with a deeper sensitivity and in a more comprehensive manner during those years. Hossein Shariatmadari had often warned in his articles against propagandists of the worn out theory of Civil Society who had sacrificed scholarly debates for their political gains and ambitions. He had revealed at that time that the intellectuals who supported Khatami had even faked letters of great scholars of Islamic studies in order to fake some academic reputation for themselves and their political project. Hamed Algar, one of the greatest scholars of Islamic studies and a professor at Berkley University, sent a letter to Shariatmadari on 7th August 1996 to endorse his approach to the issue and wrote: "These people [in Kiyan journal] are actually intending to overthrow the foundations of the Islamic Republic in the guise of intellectual work, modernity and religious reforms."

Responses to these comments were quickly published in the 'Par' journal (published in the US) in its summer special issue; this journal was run by Iranian Zionists such as Roya Hakkakian, Ramin Ahmadi and others who are publicly affiliated with Israeli intelligence lobbies in the US in order to bring about a soft subversion in the Islamic Republic. This journal wrote in its 127th issue that in the Civil Society project followed by secular intellectuals in Iran, scholarly and philosophical debates are not relevant at all. It did not matter whether they were 'illiterate' or not; what mattered was the ultimate end of their project, "because it had many unintended, dormant and dangerous consequences for the Islamic government in Iran."

In the heat of these debates, the candidacy of Mohammad Khatami became public in the summer of 1996 and following his victory on 23rd June 1997, the Civil Society project gained its political prominence. The political team accompanying Khatami were members of the three above circles and members of the Islamic Revolution Mujahedin Organisation who formed the majority of this team, were assigned to institutionalise the discourse of Civil Society using the means and facilities of the reforms government. However, crisis very quickly engulfed reformists in 2001 and they faced remarkable loss of popularity. It was as if they remembered the famous sentence of Lenin: "What should we do?"

Part II: Strategists of Civil Disobedience in Tehran

Based on the 'social capital' theory of Francis Fukuyama which was released in the summer of 1997 in the US, radical reformists tried to create some sort of a social grounding for the Civil Society project; this social grounding was meant to become the organised force for reformists in Iran and have the power to 'mobilise the masses' for the interest of their projects. Therefore, in 1998, Saeed Hajjarian asked Mohammad Khatami to issue the decree of holding elections of 'Islamic Councils for Cities and Villages' promptly. They had declared their objective for reviving this election to be the creation of a 'participatory democracy' and the promotion of the 'culture of civil society'; however, they were in fact intending to confiscate the larger resources of urban and rural economy and outlets of the society to spread secularism at all social and cultural levels. Although prominent figures of reforms like Abdollah Nouri and Saeed Hajjarian

were leading this project in the first round of the councils, after 2001, opinion polls showed a significant drop of popularity for the Civil Society discourse among people.

Saeed Hajjarian has quoted a private conversation with Mohammad Khatami in 2001 when he had told Khatami that reform is on the verge of collapse because of 'lacking social force'. He had requested the president of the reforms government to play simultaneously the role of the 'leader of the opposition' such that 'the movement does lose its head' and die. Khatami says in response to Hajjarian that he fears the fate of Bani Sadr may be repeated for him, "I do not want to become like Bani Sadr, because Bani Sadr was saying that in the entire world I am the only person who is both the president and the leader of the opposition." Following this meeting, a task force was set up in the Bureau of Political Studies of the Ministry of Interior to analyse the future of Civil Society in Iran with Hossein Bashiriyeh and Sohrab Razzaghi. Bashiriyeh suggested that the government must approve an independent budget for 'civil modern institution building' to organise a social force for the objectives of the reforms projects through NGOs. Yet, Bashiriyeh concluded that 'quiet' transition to democracy for the realisation of Civil Society is not possible and the political regime of Iran must be transformed by the reformist politicians in a peaceful way. Sohrab Razzaghi who was in this task force as a member of Khatami's ministry of interior, later confessed that he had received 436000 Euros from the Dutch government's budget in order to 'train civil society activists in Iran'; this budget was allocated for the formation and training of an 'organised force' to further the goals of the velvet coup d'état project in Iran.

From 2002 onwards, reports from CIA's research centre, the NED, were indicating the failure of reformists in Iran. Therefore, from 2002 to 2004, two great philosophers from Europe and America came to Iran to assess the prospects of civil society. It was about April 2002 that Juergen Habermas first came to Iran hosted by the reforms government for a 10 days visit. He is the most distinguished German philosopher and the most famous theorists of 'civil disobedience'; he has scanned China to Iran in order to assess the conditions of the American project of 'transition to democracy'. On the evening of 16th April 2002, he went to Mohsen Kadivar's residence in Qeytariyeh in Tehran to consult reformists in a private meeting with

Saeed Hajjarian, Mohammad Mojtahed Shabestari and others; in this meeting, Mohammad Khatami was also expected to attend. He had also met a number of times with Alireza Beheshti who became the senior advisor to Mir Hossein Mousavi and played a role in the events of the 12th June elections for the project of reformists' civil struggle. Habermas had questioned about the decisions of reformists for establishing a non-religious government in Iran and they said they are moving ahead 'step by step'. The title of 'hopeless revolutionaries' was one given to these reformists (from Saeed Hajjarian to Alireza Beheshti) by Habermas and he believes that they have lost faith in the Islamic revolution. In an assessment he had given to Ataollah Mohajerani (a representative of President Khatami), he had said, "unrest will gradually engulf Iran" and reformists must gather their forces through 'democratic institution building' to prepare for a civil struggle!

From Habermas' perspective, universities and political parties were the two main pillars to prepare the grounds for civil struggles and transition to democracy. Therefore, reformists changed the study of the process of democratisation to an official academic project! Hossein Bashiriyeh in the University of Tehran and Alireza Beheshti and Mohsen Kadivar in Tarbiat Modarres University carried out a part of this project. For example, in 2004, the PhD thesis of Javad Etaat in political sciences in the School of Law and Political Sciences of Tehran University was devoted to the study of how democratic change was possible through elections campaigns, which was a pseudo-academic copy of the 'legal subversion strategy' At that time, Etaat who was an advisor to the then Minister of Interior, Mousavi Lari, moved from the Etemaad Melli Party in 2009 to Mousavi's campaign in order to realise this strategy. On the other hand, the Participation Party of Iran held 40 meetings for designing the new model of transition to democracy at the suggestion of Hajjarian. These meetings were held with the presence of members of Nehzat Azadi and the Melli-Mazhabi dissident groups under the title of 'Towards Democracy' from February 2003 and resulted in the compilation of an operative plan for civil institution building and democratisation.

As of 2004, the American Council on Foreign Relations was in search of providing a new model for the reforms project in Iran and this model was influenced by the pragmatism

philosophy of Richard Rorty. Rorty is known as the greatest American philosopher, but he is in fact one of the oldest leaders of covert operations of the CIA in the field of thought, who joined the CIA in its managing staff for a project known as 'dirty wars of intellectuals' in the 1950s. Ali Mirsepasi (member of the editorial board of Kankash journal, published in New York) was the first person who explained the pragmatist strategy of Rorty for the Participation Party of Iran with the purpose of understanding America's new policies. In 2002, Khashayar Deyhimi appeared as the propagandist of the strategies of this old spy for the collapse of Iran with translations of the entirely fascist theories of Rorty in Tarh-e-No Publishers (run by Hossein Paya).

Eventually, on Friday 12th June 2004, Richard Rorty entered Tehran for a 2 days visit to assess closely the situation of reformists with Daryoush Shayegan and Ramin Jahanbeglou. When he came to Iran, he faced two failures of the reformists in elections of the second round of City Councils and the 7th parliament. In fact, it was the Civil Society project which had failed. Rorty told reformists that transition to democracy is not a product of intellectual and philosophical debates about the reconstruction of tradition and religious reforms, but it requires complete dependence on American traditions and following the philosophy of pragmatism. From Rorty's perspective, they would have to train an organised social force for civil struggles through democratic institutions such that at 'a historic moment' [coup d'état], they could establish the American democracy. Western strategists helped reformists come to a consensus regarding their strategies on civil struggle. However, the master key to this project was in the hands of a British theorist. Will he also come to Tehran?

Part III: the British Master Key

Within the 9 months leading to the 24th June 2005 elections, at least 8 security and intelligence authorities from UK, US, the Netherlands etc entered Tehran in the guise of academic, media and diplomatic roles. Their mission was to restructure the civil society activists for the victory of reformists in the ninth presidential elections.

If in June 2004, Richard Rorty had been the guest of reformists as the brain of the CIA and the greatest American philosopher, this time it was Professor John Keane who had come to Iran to convey the latest instructions of the 'velvet coup d'état' to Saeed Hajjarian; he is the one who is also known as the brain of the British MI-6 and is also known as 'a thinker who has been most influential on British political theory'. Keane has had many important foreign missions in his security and intelligence record, which includes participation in the operations for the collapse of the governments of Eastern European governments.

In the era of the Cold War, CIA and MI-6, in a joint strategy, had created a 'single security system' in order to overthrow 'anti-capitalist' regimes whose leadership centre was the PSB (Council for Psychological Planning) in the US. As of the 1980s, this council adopted the slogan of 'enhancing civil society' in order to overthrow communist governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc. They tested its impact for the first time in the propagandas of the 'Solidarity Movement of Poland'. The Council for Psychological Planning (PSB) was in search of a new model for Civil Society; a model which could be a 'free zone' for the investment and infiltration of the West through which governments incompatible with the capitalist system would annihilated. John Keane was assigned to this mission. He had spent the years 1973 and 1975 in Czechoslovakia. In 1985, in a book he wrote, John Keane depicted the image of a 'peaceful leader' and a 'non-violent militant' from a spy like Vaclav Havel. Then, in order to control and assess the project of Civil Society in the subversion of the Polish government, he often travelled to Poland. In 1988, with the publication of *Democracy and Civil Society*, he gave the model of a militant civil society. One year later, the communist Czechoslovakia and Poland. In fact, the term Civil Society had returned to the political philosophy of the West after 130 years of silence and absence, this time for being used in the project of soft subversion.

John Keane founded the project of Iran Civil Society at the CSD from 1994 onwards [sic in Persian: 'from 1994']. He came to Tehran during the presidency of Mohammad Khatami after the 9th July 1999 riots. However, this trip coincided with two other important events. On the one hand, the Kiyani circle and the serial newspapers had launched an unprecedented attack on the religious foundations and examples of Iranians and this attack was at its peak. In an

interview with the Express journal, Abdolkarim Soroush had said that he had asked Mohammad Khatami to allow solid religious principles to be criticised and if necessary denied in universities and in the press such that Civil Society could be established. And by chance, this was actually happening. The Rah-e No weekly wrote, “Scholarly opposition to religion is not heresy” and the Kiyān journal considered apostasy ‘the natural right of every person’. On the other hand, the project of creating a Muslim Ghandi and the Vaclav Havel of Iran had already started and Iranian reformists saw these titles befitting Mohammad Khatami.

A senior intelligence authority has revealed the hidden side of John Keane’s trip under such circumstances. According to documents released by Michael Brant (and ex-vice chairperson of CIA) in his book ‘A Plan to Divide and Desolate Theology’, at that time the CIA and the MI-6 had a joint project called ‘The project for subverting Shiism until 2010’ and its immediate target was the collapse of the Islamic revolution of Iran. An amount of \$40 million from its \$900 million budget for this project was allocated to ‘academic exchanges’ in centres for Islamic studies in the West to have contacts with seminaries and Islamic universities. The purpose of these exchanges was collecting vital information, identifying and hunting spies, infiltrating religious centres and enhancing liberal intellectuals to transform Shiism into a ‘school of complete poverty’ until 2010. One of the aims of this project in Iran was to create a widespread wave of propaganda about ‘historical distortions in Islam’, the ‘non-political identity of Shiism’ and ‘the relation between religion and civil society’ in order to convey this message to the faithful that it is only secular Islam which can guarantee civil society.

It seems that John Keane was the man for these joint projects. He entered Tehran in the guise of academic exchanges between the CSD and Mofid University. On 19th October 1999, he went to meet Ayatollah Abdolkarim Mousavi Ardebili in Qom. Keane has had meetings of consultation with advisors to President Khatami, authorities of the Participation Party of Iran, members of the Kiyān circle and some other reformist clerics, but details of these negotiations have remained confidential. When he returned to Tehran, Abdolkarim Soroush and Hossein Bashiriyeh had just returned to Iran from a meeting with George Shultz (former American

secretary of state) and Francis Fukuyama (Pentagon Strategist). Out of these meetings, the American authorities intended to promote the project of 'Polandising Iran'; this project was adopted from the model of 'Poland Solidarity Movement' and of course now its British theorist was in Tehran.

In autumn 2004, John Keane came to Iran with the mission to create a 'mother nucleus' for a velvet coup d'état and did a workshop in Iran too. In the database of the National Research Institute for Science Policy, this workshop is recorded as 'Training workshop for transition to democracy'. He had several meetings with leaders of the Participation Party of Iran, but had a long meeting and conversation with Saeed Hajjarian. In this meeting, Keane conveyed the latest instructions for soft subversion and models of democratisation to Hajjarian. Keane's strategies for Hajjarian were so surprising that when he was explaining them in one of the meetings of the Participation Party, he said, "We are even backward in our theories of democracy!"

Keane was more than anything else interested in 'legal subversion' through elections. He suggested that the government should conquer the public sphere (the society) as quick as possible by giving special sponsorship to NGOs, independent media and civil institutions in whatever way possible. He believed that each NGO is a 'small laboratory' for Civil Society which not only does not raise any suspicions, but through them one can have a margin of safety for work. One these small laboratories increase in number, the state faces a challenge and gradually would have to give in to them. If the state project of civil society is defeated by the regime, these NGOs can start a civil struggle against the regime and engage in action [velvet coup d'état]. Keane believed that beside this force, reformists must create a complicated network of internet media and other things to be able to harness the elections by hijacking public opinion.

Upon the return of the master key to London, a huge shock occurred. Would this shock help reformists return to power?

Part IV: What happened at the Ministry of Interior?

On xxx February 2004, *New Statesman*, the British weekly, published a special issue titled “Iran: whatever you want to know now”. In the third essay of this special issue, Guy Dinmore, the diplomatic correspondent at *Financial Times* wrote: “Washington is confused about military invasion of Iran; however the best solution is the internal collapse of the regime of the Islamic Republic. Condoleeza Rice is after a long process of erosion in the Iranian regime which starts with supporting those who oppose the Iranian regime.” Who were the people that the US had put its hopes in for collapse from within?

In the reforms government, Mohammad Khatami enhanced the premises and capacities for ‘collapse from within’ and the Ministry of Interior delivered a ‘social network’ to the United Nations Information Centre. This network which was known as the Centre for Enabling Organisations of Civil Society was created by Abdolvahed Mousavi Lari in July 2003 in the Ministry of Interior. This centre enjoyed all the facilities, communications and massive financial support from the United Nations Information Centre in Tehran. Sohrab Razzaghi was appointed as the director of this centre. During Khatami’s presidency, he was Director General of the Bureau of Political Studies of the Ministry of Interior and a member of the Political Commission of the Cabinet; he was strongly supported by Abdollah Ramezanzadeh (Khatami’s spokesman) and Saeed Hajjarian (Khatami’s political advisor).

The project of this centre was formed around the idea of civil training to citizens according to UN standards of Iran’s transition to a democratic regime. Until 2005, this centre used to hold workshops in small and big cities for young girls and boys and through its contacts with Kian Tajbakhsh (CIA spy) benefited from experiences and resources of the George Soros Foundation. The main focus of this centre was enhancing secular feminists, laic human rights activists and creating media infrastructures for civil society. The structure of this centre was created according to the theories of CIA and MI-6 thinkers, i.e. Juergen Habermas, Richard Rorty and John Keane. Razzaghi greatly benefited from the facilities of the Sixth Parliament’s Research Centre and reformist representatives to further his research missions. This multi-polar network was seen as a potential for creating an organised force by Americans in order to carry out the velvet coup d’état in Iran.

The interactions of this network with anti-revolutions resident in the Netherlands officially brought the Netherlands into the process of soft subversion in Iran alongside the CIA and MI-6. On xxx April 2005, Farah Karimi (the Green Party representative at the Dutch parliament) entered Iran in the guise of a diplomatic visit to consult with senior authorities of the reforms government in the days running up to the ninth presidential elections. Karimi, who had been a member of the military branch of the dissident terrorist group Mojahedin Khalq Organisation in 1980s, had ties with Iran Newspaper (the official newspaper of Khatami's government). During this visit, he met with Rajabali Mazrui and other directors of the Trade Association of Iranian Journalists. She then signed an agreement with them to hold a workshop of civil struggle (in the guise of modern journalism training courses) in Amsterdam (the capital of the Netherlands). She has had more than three private meetings with Saeed Hajjarian and leaders of the Participation Party of Iran; however, her main consultations were with radical feminist activists.

During these meetings, Farah Karimi provided Shirin Ebadi with a comprehensive plan and suggested that feminist women should follow the civil society strategy which had been illustrated in the Greater Middle East Plan of the US. Karimi's comprehensive plan led to the One Million Signature Campaign which was in a way openly in the service of producing and distributing naked prostitution in Iran. Following Farah Karimi's trip, the Dutch parliament approved an annual budget of 15 million Euros for supporting media pluralism in Iran and expenditures of institutions supporting soft subversion. 436000 Euros of this amount was given to Sohrab Razzaghi (a former authority at the Ministry of Interior) by Hivos Institute (the liaison of the Dutch Intelligence organisations and civil institutions). About one million Euro of this amount was paid to one of the people close to Mohammad Khatami who was in charge of preparing news bulletins for the president for many years and now is in charge of the electronic Rooz Online in Europe making his living from the budget which was allocated for subversion by the Dutch government.

As the Dutch parliament approved its budget, Richard Butcher (speaker of the US State Department) also announced that the US government has allocated a \$3 million budget for

NGOs and Civil Society institutions inside Iran. However, following the defeat of reformists on 24th June 2005, suddenly the process of financial supports of the Americans for former forces of Khatami's government became stronger. On 16th February 2006, Condoleeza Rice asked for a \$75 million budget increase for Soft Subversion in Iran. She said \$10 million of this budget would be spent on 'enhancing Iran's civil society' and 'civil training' for trade unions and political groups inside Iran. The American secretary of state declared their model for bringing democracy to Iran is the experience of Poland and the Solidarity Movement.

A short while after the remarks of Rice, the Baran Foundation became a centre for drafting and analysing the strategy of Polandising Iran and indigenising theories of velvet coup d'état; this is the same foundation established by Mohammad Khatami for which is still the director. From this point on, propaganda centres and operation circles became more active for preparing grounds for the velvet coup d'état. Before this, the Rozaneh Publisher had released a book of Samuel Huntington in 2004, which is famous for being the Bible of subversion fans. In 2004, Mohammad Javad Mozaffar published the translation of a book by Paul Brooker, which was in fact a roadmap for operations of soft subversion. Nashr-e Nigah Moaser which used to publish theories of making democracy by Hossein Bashiriyeh, published three other books by him until 2008, which were all about overthrowing non-democratic regimes. In 2007, Mohammad Ali Kadivar started translating a history of theories of collapse from withing for Gam-e No Publishers and published 'Gozar be Democracy' (Transition to Democracy). In the meantime, publishing a book titled 'Civil Society, Civil Sturggle' by Roshangaran and Women Studies publishers is indeed amazing. This book is a summary and selection of the works of Gene Sharp (the father of velvet coup d'états) and Robert Holloway (CIA agent), translated by Mehdi Kalantarzadeh under the supervision of Shahla Lahiji.

From 2005 to 2007, more than 4 workshops were held for reformists in Amsterdam, Dubai and New Delhi and the budgets for them were provided by the Netherlands and the US. 21 members of the Jouranlists Union – some of whom were special journalists of Khatami – travelled to Amsterdam in October 2006 to attend a workshop run by Farah Karimi and Elizabeth Cheney (Dick Cheney's daughter) and learn the latest techniques of Soft Wars. On

27th January 2006, three feminist activists who were active in the campaign to spread prostitution (the One Million Signature Campaign!), intended to travel to New Delhi to meet with a member of the terrorist group Fadaiyan Khalq called Mina Sa'dadi.

Part V: Secrets and privileges of Khatami

Planning the green coup d'état project for the tenth presidential elections is a complicated process with several intelligence and strategic layers; however, among all different models of 'soft subversion' the political behaviour of reformists very much resembles Samuel Huntington's strategy. This process started after June 1997 with the 'pressure from below, negotiation on the top' theory and then ended in 'active resistance and pre-emption' strategy. In early January 2002, in a speech at the sixth parliament, Behzad Nabavi said that in order to impose the demands of reformists on the establishment, they have to bring people to streets. In June 2008, Mir Hossein Mousavi followed the same strategic model of the Islamic Revolution Mujahedin Organisation; he was the same person who had been absent from politics for 20 years and no one knew why he had been put in hiding for such a long time. On the morning of 11th June 2009, at the end of a breath-taking election campaign, in a meeting with a British envoy, Mir Hossein Mousavi declared the beginning of the 'Operative Phase of Civil Struggles' and as of 14th June he called on people for a 'civil struggle' against the establishment, which was also supported by Mohammad Khatami. Now, Mousavi, Khatami and Karroubi are following the green coup d'état project.

The starting point of the Civil Struggle project is elections in most of the model countries and the defeated candidate plays the role of the leader of the opposition as the representative of the pro-West group. This candidate challenges the republican element of the regime because of his defeat and accuses rulers of cheating and betraying. The challenge to the republican side of the regime must also be interpreted, according to them, as a legitimacy crisis for the public opinion so that they are psychologically prepared for civil struggles. In order to prepare this background, they would need the support of a powerful media camp to increase false social excitements in the propaganda war. Psychological warfare must lead to a 'psychological coup d'état' against people's political intelligence such that a group of people lose the opportunity and the power to

analyse current events. The purpose of the psychological coup d'état, is to mobilise social forces – even at a minimal level of pretension – for civil struggle such that this project is faked and publicised as an organised force. However, the main force of this velvet coup d'état in the existing models, is often the organised trained force rather than a social mass. This social force which ranges from seculars to mobs is the same group of people who have learnt the operation techniques of soft subversion in training courses and workshops in the guise of civil institution building. Organised forces of subversion, shout the slogans of civil behaviour and democratic ethics but they are in fact only implementing operations of vandalism, terrorism and creating crisis. These forces benefit from their previous influences in sensitive centres and creating a series of street riots in order to paralyse the nervous system of the country. This nervous paralysis must lead to the collapse of the rule of a regime and then and a point of time which is called the 'historic moment of transition', organised forces must bring to an end the coup d'état mission in the name of velvet revolution.

This process was the plan of a project which failed for a variety of reasons. However, the US and Britain were once again tempted to run another coup d'état in Iran. If American newspapers like LA Times and Washington Post speak of Khatami as a source of inspiration for pro-West people in 1997, in 2009 it was the President of the USA who spoke of Mousavi as a source of inspiration for pro-west people and praised his struggle. Can we ignore the contributions of Mohammad Khatami in these policies and praises?

Khatami created the organised force for soft subversion in the reforms government and as of 2002, assigned Abdolvahed Mousavi Lari in the Ministry of Interior to organise then in the NGOs. This force, supported by millions of dollars of budget approved by the American congress and the Dutch parliament, provided special trainings for engaging in operations of the velvet coup d'état. The media camp of the coup d'état not only started a dirty war on the internet using this organised force, but was also fed by satellite networks from abroad like the BBC and the VOA TV. Mohammad Khatami started a new series of activities from 25th June 2005. In August 2006, he received a special visa from George Bush and went to the US. Then in October 2006 he went to the UK. Khatami's speeches in these two countries were unusually

welcome and received sanctifications and praises from the West as he believed “there is only one civilisation and that is the Western civilisation” and “secularism is a great achievement for humanity”. When Khatami travelled to India early 2007 to make a speech in the India Today conference, it was as if he is repeating Gene Sharp’s strategy for civil struggle and copying Ghandi’s non-violent method. By delineating Ghandi’s worldview, Khatami claimed that “Eastern man is thirsty for realist and innovative western reason”!

In the past 2 years, Khatami has been using in his speeches the keywords and strategic codes of civil struggle, but his approach did not cause much sensitivity. On xxx January 2007, in an interview with El Pais newspaper he proposed the model of a ‘religious democratic regime’ instead of the Islamic Republic of Iran and on xxx November 2008 he said “we are at the historic moment of transition”. Three days after his remarks, he organised a seminar titled “Oil, Development and Democracy” with the collaboration of the illegal Nehzat Azadi group and his speeches were like always a copy of the American economic and political theories for transition from dictatorship to democracy. Khatami, for any reason which is not known to anyone, is closely related with international lobbies. Just 6 days after he quit his candidacy in the interest of Mousavi, he started his foreign travels. From the end of March 2009, which was the peak of Mousavi’s election campaign, Khatami was away from Iran for about a third of this time (20 days).

In the early days of April, he went for an 8 days trip to Australia. After this visit, he only stayed in Iran for one week and they went to Turkey to meet the General Director of the military organisation the NATO! This meeting coincided with Barack Obama’s presence in Turkey! In early days of May, he went for a 5 days trip to Saudi Arabia. The most controversial trip of Mohammad Khatami which will allegedly be the lost piece of the puzzle is his four days trip on xxx May to Tunisia. By pure chance (!), the last two days of this visit coincided with the US president’s visit to Egypt.

Well-informed sources say that during the same time that Barack Obama was in Egypt with a high ranking delegation of American authorities, Khatami had travelled to Egypt to discuss the possibility of Mir Hossein Mousavi’s defeat and the events after the elections. Although the

news about this meeting was – like always in a very rational way! – ‘denied’ in just one sentence, these series of trips still remain enigmatic; these trips were taking place during the busiest and most painstaking days of elections and the whole issue seems to be very weird. Can one justify the 20 days absence of Khatami with repetitious and boring sentences of denial or would the secret behind the lost piece of this puzzle regarding the failed project of civil struggle and the reason for the praises of the American president for reformists be revealed? This would be revealing what is already evident!

On 14th June 2009, after Mousavi clearly called on people in his statement to participate in a civil struggle, Khatami used terms such as demonstrations, civil protests seven times in a statement of 15 lines. On 1st July 2009, Khatami made the cheapest political speech of his life and claimed by projecting the situation that the regime has orchestrated a velvet coup d’état against people! He said that the regime has spilled the blood of people ‘ruthlessly’ for a ‘civil, reasonable and peaceful protest’ and the regime has ‘suppressed and humiliated’ the ‘progressive movement of the people’. In this half hour speech, Khatami accused our Islamic regime 11 times of suppression, spilling people’s blood and extreme violence and concluded that ‘the regime has failed’. By unreservedly defending all rioters and coup organisers, he used the phrase ‘the project of repentant making’, ‘TV show’ and ‘untrue and false confessions’ 8 times and emphasised 4 times that the regime has used ‘poisonous propaganda’ in the state TV to provoke people. In these 30 minutes, Khatami spoke 5 times about a security atmosphere and ultra-intelligence atmosphere after the elections and claimed that the regime has lost its popular backing by suppressing people! However, Khatami did not even show one single shred of evidence to support his claim of fraud in elections and did not say anything about the paradox of talking about the rule of law and calling on people for street riots.