StratCom on Campus

Muddying the Lines of Academic Rights & Responsibilities

by Tim Rinne, State Coordinator
Nebraskans for Peace

Since the attack of 9/11, U.S. Strategic Command has been spying on American citizens, operating a network of military bases stretching around the globe, planning and coordinating preemptive strikes on other nations, promoting the research and development of a new generation of nuclear weapons, waging the White House’s “War on Terror,” and seeking the military and economic domination of space.

It was only a matter of time, then, until StratCom worked its way onto campus and into the college classroom. And on March 2, 2007, StratCom formally celebrated its entrance into the academic world with its co-sponsorship of the “Space and TeleCom Law Conference” at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Law.

Dating back to last spring, I’d been hearing bits and pieces about this collaboration between StratCom and the UNL Law College with a growing sense of consternation. Just as a matter of principle, I’m not particularly pleased with our state-owned institution of higher education getting further in bed with the military. But that our UNL College of Law would actively seek the collaboration of a group that is dedicated to flouting the international rule of law by claiming a right of unprovoked “first-strike” assaults anywhere on earth, conducting constitutionally suspect “warrantless wiretaps” on our citizenry, and advocating the creation of new weapons of mass destruction—in flagrant violation of international treaties—frankly offended my sense of decency.

So when I discovered that members of the public like myself could pay the $100 registration fee and attend, I jumped at the opportunity to spend a morning with StratCom, see for myself what our publicly funded law school is getting mixed up in, and try to get a little better understanding of what StratCom is now up to.

The Lincoln Journal Star had published an op-ed piece by me chronicling StratCom’s current activities a week before the conference, in which I’d hinted we’d be there protesting that morning. As fate would have it though, March 2 was the day after the state’s first blizzard in more than a decade and it was icy and miserably cold. Even so, over a dozen peace activists braved the continued on page 3
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Latin America Briefs

**compiled by Christy Hargesheimer**

On the Road with President Bush

President Bush hopscotched across Latin America March 8-14, visiting Brazil, Uruguay, Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico, striving to offset the growing influence of Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez in the region. He also hoped to reverse the perception that the U.S. is ignoring Latin America, by promoting democracy, increased trade, and cooperation on alternative fuels. But many observers claimed that his attention and promises were “too little, too late” and that the trip accomplished little.

That Bush’s trip was unproductive can be in part due to the fact that, without control of Congress, he can make no promises to Latin America nor can he sign any binding agreements. Thus, his tour amounted to little more than a photo op.

What it did accomplish, however, was to underscore the increasing economic and political independence of Latin American governments as Latin America seeks to define itself as distinct from the United States. This strong regional movement can be regarded as positive and healthy.

His first stop, in Brazil, resulted in a weak agreement to explore the sharing of technology to develop alternative fuels such as ethanol. Brazil is self-sustaining in ethanol development, but it does need market access, which is blocked by a U.S. tariff on sugar-based Brazilian ethanol. President Lula de Silva followed up this trip by visiting the U.S. in late March to press Congress to repeal or scale back the 54-cent tariff. Environmentalists protested the biofuels agreement, fearing further loss of jungle to sugar cane production.

In Uruguay, Bush met with President Tabaré Vásquez, and they discussed a trade agreement that would in fact endanger Uruguay’s membership in MERCOSUR, the South American Common Market, which serves as a rival trade block to the U.S. Free Trade Area of the Americas. MERCOSUR, comprised of founding members Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, plus Venezuela, forbids the signing of bilateral trade accords with countries outside of that trading bloc. Analysts suggest that Uruguay will not jeopardize its place in MERCOSUR but was just being polite to guest Bush.

(The quote of the day from the Uruguayan press was when Bush made one of his characteristic flubs, referring to the great steak he had eaten in Montevideo as Venezuelan beef. He was probably addled by the presence across the river, in Argentina, of Hugo Chávez, who was leading an anti-Bush rally.)

The trip to Colombia should be an embarrassment to Bush, because he cozied up to his buddy President Álvaro Uribe, whose government is mired in corruption, violence and drugs. Colombia is the source of 90 percent of the cocaine in the U.S. Critics of the government receive death threats, union leaders are murdered, and drug barons and death squad leaders win amnesty. Colombia is the largest recipient of U.S. military aid, which actually supports the right-wing paramilitary death squads which have direct links to many members of Uribe’s government. So what did Bush do while there? Missing an opportunity to press Colombia on its dismal human rights record, as he had been urged to do by members of Congress, he instead praised the Colombian government for being such great allies in the war on drugs.

At the end of the trip, Presidents Óscar Berger of Guatemala and Felipe Calderón of Mexico denounced Bush’s approval of funding for the U.S.-Mexican border fence as a measure to keep out immigrants instead of addressing the economic problems. Berger was more than ready to take Bush on regarding his proposed immigration plan to allow for guest worker visas; as much as 10 percent of Guatemala’s population lives in the U.S., sending home an increasing amount of remittances every year. Bush apparently left more questions than answers on immigration reform, offering as excuse the inaction of the U.S. Congress, tying his own hands on this matter.

As an interesting postscript to the trip, following Bush’s visit to the Iximché archeological site in Guatemala, indigenous priests carried out a religious ceremony replete with votive candles and incense to cleanse the area of evil spirits, so that their ancestors may rest in peace.

Check out NFP’s snazzy new website @

www.nebraskansforpeace.org
freezing temperatures to stand outside the law school’s McCollum Hall before the conference began, holding signs opposing the planned attack on Iran and a big banner that read: “STRATCOM’S NEW MISSION IS OFFENSIVE — ‘Global Strike’ = Illegal Attack.”

About 8:30 a.m., I left the demonstrators standing on the sidewalk and headed in to pick up my conference materials. In terms of paying participants, there were probably as many people outside protesting as there were in attendance. However, by the time you factored in the faculty members, law students, conference presenters and undercover agents, there were probably 50 people in the classroom all told. Nebraskans for Peace can probably take credit for the undercover agents’ presence. The scuttlebutt before the conference had it that my registration and conference materials. In terms of paying participants, there were probably as many people outside protesting as there were in attendance. However, by the time you factored in the faculty members, law students, conference presenters and undercover agents, there were probably 50 people in the classroom all told. Nebraskans for Peace can probably take credit for the undercover agents’ presence.

The scuttlebutt before the conference had it that my registration and conference materials. In terms of paying participants, there were probably as many people outside protesting as there were in attendance. However, by the time you factored in the faculty members, law students, conference presenters and undercover agents, there were probably 50 people in the classroom all told. Nebraskans for Peace can probably take credit for the undercover agents’ presence. The scuttlebutt before the conference had it that my registration and conference materials. In terms of paying participants, there were probably as many people outside protesting as there were in attendance. However, by the time you factored in the faculty members, law students, conference presenters and undercover agents, there were probably 50 people in the classroom all told. Nebraskans for Peace can probably take credit for the undercover agents’ presence.

As Commander Cartwright wound up his comments, he said (in an obvious reference to the banner the protesters had been holding outside) that, perhaps, he ought to mention something about “the offensive side” of StratCom. But then, he in fact didn’t.

As he wound up his extemporaneous comments, however, he did say (in an obvious reference to the banner the protesters had been holding outside) that, perhaps, he ought to mention something about “the offensive side” of StratCom. But then, he in fact didn’t.

He said nothing about CONPLAN 8022 and the Command’s mission of “full spectrum global strike,” authorizing StratCom to preemptively—and illegally under the UN Charter’s “Prohibition of Aggression”—attack any place on the face of the earth within two hours, if a threat to America’s national security is even suspected. (I don’t recall Iran’s name, the latest focus of this sort of unprovoked assault, coming up once.) Nor did he mention that to eradicate such a suspected threat, CONPLAN 8022 permits the offensive use of nuclear weapons—a patent violation of the International Court of Justice 1996 ruling that international law does not authorize even the threat of use of nuclear weapons. And not a word was said about the “warrantless wiretaps” conducted by the National Security Administration (a StratCom “component command”), which the White House claims are an essential arrow in StratCom’s quiver if it’s to effectively wage the “War on Terror.”

He did however cite the Chinese government’s decision in January to shoot down one of its own weather satellites, using that incident as a pretext for discussing the whole question of militarizing space: “Oftentimes I’m asked what kind of military capability we need to put in space as result of someone doing an [anti-satellite missile] test. I just don’t see the need to be official motto, “Peace Is Our Profession.”

And I realized that, no, these people probably wouldn’t know what NFP means by “Peace.”

I came away from the experience though surprised at some things. For example, I have a lot more respect for the political acumen of our native son, Vice President Dick Cheney, and our recently deposed Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. These are the two men most responsible for tapping the first Marine to ever hold the post, General James “Hoss” Cartwright, as StratCom’s new commander. The General is both articulate and bright. But I was unprepared for how personally engaging he turned out to be. The man is a public relations dream. After hearing him speak, even career peace activists like myself could have walked out of that classroom, thanking our lucky stars we’ve got a humanitarian installation like StratCom looking out for our global well-being.

Commander Cartwright’s talk highlighted StratCom’s non-military services to the world community (such as the round-the-clock tracking of 40,000 objects in the earth’s orbit—everything from the space station to satellites to space debris—to prevent costly collisions that could interrupt international telecommunications).

As the state coordinator of the oldest statewide Peace & Justice organization in the entire country, I confess to being fairly indignant at first about this security nonsense, asking myself, “Can’t these people read? What do they think the word ‘Peace’ in our name means?” On reflection, though, I recalled that for decades StratCom’s predecessor (the Strategic Air Command), whose mission of “Mutual Assured Destruction” threatened the nuclear annihilation of life on earth, had as its
Why Cheney Lost It When Joe Wilson Spoke Out...

by Ray McGovern

When Nebraskans for Peace publicly called for Dick Cheney’s impeachment in June 2004 on the occasion of the former son’s return to his hometown of Lincoln for a campaign fundraiser for Jeff Fortenberry, the state Republican Party dismissed it as yet another “gimmicky” from a group known for its “history of distasteful and bizarre behavior.” At the time, we were basing our impeachment call on the Vice President’s “pattern of deceit regarding the war in Iraq, his suspect business dealings, and his stonewalling of Congress over the fossil fuel and nuclear industries’ influence on our national energy policy.” We hadn’t even considered including the ‘outing’ of CIA agent Valerie Plame.

But as the following article by Ray McGovern, the career CIA analyst who was the keynote speaker at NFP’s 2004 Annual Peace Conference, so carefully recounts, the trial and conviction of Cheney’s former chief of staff, I. “Scooter” Libby, demonstrated why the normally stoic, phlegmatic Cheney went off the deep end?

Vice President Dick Cheney can be forgiven for feeling provoked. The Times, having been led by Cheney and others down a garden path littered with weapons of mass destruction that were not really there, did some retaliation of its own with the snide title it gave Wilson’s op-ed: “What I Did Not Find in Africa.” Adding insult to injury, Wilson chose to tell Washington Post reporters, also on July 6, in language that rarely escapes an ambassador’s lips, the bogus report regarding Iraq obtaining uranium from Niger “begs the question regarding what else they are lying about.” That threw down the gauntlet, and Cheney had to worry that others who knew about the lies might feel it safe to go to the press and spill the beans. Retaliation had to be swift and as unambiguous as possible.

Cheney had to worry that others who knew about the administration’s lies concerning Iraq’s nuclear weapons threat might feel it safe to go to the press and spill the beans. Retaliation had to be swift and as unambiguous as possible.

Wrong: the White House did not “twist” intelligence; the CIA made us do it. To prove that, Libby was given permission to release a passage buried on page 24 of the 90-page National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) of October 1, 2002, claiming that Iraq was “vigorously trying to procure uranium ore and yellowcake… A foreign government service reported that as of early 2001, Niger planned to send several tons of ‘pure uranium’ (probably yellowcake) to Iraq.”

Cheney intended this revelation to hoist Tenet on his own petard. Under great pressure from Cheney, Tenet and his timorous team had acquiesced in allowing the Iraq-Niger false into the NIE Tenet signed on October 1. It had already become the centerpiece of the administration’s cynical but successful effort to get Congressional approval, culminating in the October 10/11 vote for war.

In the midst of all this, Tenet was successful in getting the Iraq-Niger story out of President George W. Bush’s key speech on Iraq on October 7. Yes, you read that right. Tenet signed the NIE on October 1, and a few days later successfully insisted that this dubious intelligence be taken out of the president’s speech on October 7.

This piece of “intelligence” was free to say, well, the CIA made us do it. Cheney, on the other hand, could very well say, well, Cheney made it happen. Cheney smelled a rat. It was easy to jump to the conclusion that Valerie Plame and her knowledgeable colleagues would have seen right through the Iraq-Niger report. The embassy in Niger had poured cold water on it, and four-star Marine General Carlton Fulford, who visited Niger and spoke with Niger’s president and foreign minister on Feb. 24, 2002, came to the same conclusion. So here was Plame, and by extension her CIA colleagues, preparing to administer the coup de grace. The CIA would send a person with deep substantive expertise on the subject and also very good contacts in Niger (from previous service in Niger and other African countries, not to mention Baghdad).

Already, there was no love lost between Cheney and the CIA. And vice versa, Cheney having destroyed the agency’s reputation for objective analysis by insisting on the creation of a fraudulent NIE to get Congress to approve an unnecessary war. The CIA could not very well say, well, Cheney made us do it. Cheney, on the other hand, was free to say, well, the CIA misled us badly—and did say that.
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2008 Conference in Omaha to Spotlight StratCom Threat

StratCom's central role in the U.S.'s bid for the military domination of space was the impetus for Omaha becoming the host site for an international organizing conference and protest one year from now. Participants at the 2007 Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space annual gathering in Darmstadt, Germany, voted unanimously last month to hold their 2008 conference in the home of StratCom, which they designated as “the most dangerous place on the face of the earth.” The official dates for the weekend conference are April 11-13 (Friday night through Sunday noon). Nebraskans for Peace will serve as the local host for the event.

Founded in 1992, the Global Network is the only international organization focused exclusively on opposing the militarization and weaponization of space, with 130 affiliate members in over 20 countries around the world. Renowned nuclear disarmament activist Dr. Helen Caldicott, who was NFP’s 2003 Annual Peace Conference speaker, serves on the Global Network’s advisory board.

Traditionally, the annual conference is comprised of educational workshops, organizational strategy sessions and protests at military space facilities. At the recent conference in Darmstadt (located about 20 miles south of Frankfurt), a protest was held at a U.S. Space Command “listening station” that’s part of StratCom’s “Echelon” satellite surveillance system. As Global Network Coordinator Bruce Gagnon explained in his report on the 2007 conference, “These U.S. space facilities are now scattered all over the planet and many of them are being upgraded for participation in the Star Wars program.” Critical components in what StratCom describes as its “Operationally Responsive Space” program, they are designed, Gagnon said, to communicate directly with military war-fighting satellites, thereby expanding the U.S.’s ability to launch pre-emptive strikes around the world.

Holding the 2008 Global Network organizing conference and protest in Omaha will be Nebraskans’ best opportunity yet, the Global Network Coordinator stated, “to shine an international light on the Pentagon’s Strategic Command (StratCom) that is now in charge of Star Wars, satellite surveillance and reconnaissance, nuclear weapons targeting, and planning for global preemptive war.” Gagnon, in fact, is so intent on focusing public attention on StratCom, that he has personally committed to coming to Omaha already this fall for the Stratcom protests being organized around the “2007 Strategic Space and Defense” conference October 9-11.

Future Nebraska Report issues will provide further information on this unprecedented international gathering in our state. The weekend conference will be open to NFP supporters and others in the region interested in keeping space for peace. Mark your calendars now and start making plans to be on Omaha next year April 11-13.

StratCom, continued

Although I felt some disgruntlement about the General’s highly selective portrayal of StratCom’s role and mission, I was heartened by his comments about the ill-advisedness of militarizing space. In just minutes, though, I was to rudely discover that Commander Cartwright had simply played the ‘good cop’ to the ‘bad cop’ who spoke next.

By rights, Col. Rob Fabian from the Department of Defense-Space Policy Office was to have provided an “Introduction” for the panel discussion, but, presumably because of the weather, he had to cancel. Fabian, however, I have since learned by googling the internet, was hardly likely to have provided anything close to an objective perspective. A former speechwriter for the U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, whose career has also included ICBM maintenance, he won “Second Honorable Mention” in an October 2002 “Armed Forces Joint Warfighting Contest” for an essay entitled, “Storm Warnings: Cruise Missile Lessons from the Gulf War,” that included this statement: “Our forces should be prepared to employ theater missiles offensively [italics mine] and to defend against them.” If the internet is any guide, he’s more famous for writing devout “Catholic Science Fiction” with his wife than he is for his research.

Fabian’s absence, however, meant that Phil Meek, associate general counsel and director of space law for the U.S. Air Force General Counsel’s Office (and a former Staff Judge Advocate for the U.S. Space Command) led off the panel discussion on “Military Dimensions: System Protection, System Negation, and Using Military Power to Protect Civil, Commercial and Tourist Operations.” And Counsel Meek spent no time mincing words.

At present, he announced, the U.S. “enjoys an asymmetrical advantage in space,” which, in way, he stated, was actually something of a “liability,” in that it makes us a “target” for our weaker adversaries who covet what we have. Take our “first strike” policies, Meek said, for example. The Bush/Cheney Administration, he noted, is roundly criticized in the international community for its doctrine of preemption. But in contrast to our adversaries (e.g. Russia, China, even France), the U.S., he countered, is at least up front and “transparent” about its goal and policy (as if transparency somehow makes an unprovoked attack more excusable under international law).

It was international law—international space law, to be more precise—that the Air Force associate counsel specifically sought to address, however. Under the “regime” of current space treaties, he told the conference audience, there are no restrictions on the research into or the development, testing or operation of conventional weapons in space. In fact, as he interprets international law, only “aggression” from space is prohibited—not the militarization of space.

And with the Bush/Cheney Administration’s abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, he’s legally right. All of which speaks to the inadequacy of the existing regime of space treaty law and the need for additional international legislation, such as annually called for in United Nations’ “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space” (PAROS) resolution. Meek, however, took just the opposite view. The current situation (or, more accurately, ‘vacuum’) provides the U.S., he argued, with great “flexibility” in its plans and conduct in space—pretty much permitting the U.S. to do whatever it wants to.

For the U.S. to consent to any UN-backed proposals restricting or prohibiting the militarization of space, the Associate General Counsel for the U.S. Air Force warned at the StratCom conference, was equivalent to “U.S. disarmament.” These proposed treaties, he asserted, were in effect “tools of war” against the United States by our adversaries. They were, he spat out, “law-fare.”

The new “National Space Policy” released last October, Meek continued, essentially states that the U.S. has the right and prerogative to dominate space for itself and its approved allies. Defending this perspective as “National Security 101,” he said that, accordingly, there is no need for additional treaties. Not only is the status quo of U.S. space domination perfectly acceptable and justifiable, he warned that for the U.S. to consent to any UN-backed proposals restricting or prohibiting the militarization of space was equivalent to “U.S. disarmament.” These proposed treaties, he asserted, were in effect “tools of war” against the United States by our adversaries. They were, he spat out, “law-fare.”

The term hit me like a jolt. “Law-fare?”

Conclusion on page 9
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Global Network protesters at StratCom’s ‘spy station’ in Darmstadt, Germany, one of more than 15 such StratCom facilities operating across the globe.
by Byron Peterson
NFP State Board

The need to intellectually confront and practically counter global warming is before us. Denying the reality of global warming is no longer tenable. As Al Gore so plainly states in his Oscar-winning documentary, “An Inconvenient Truth”:

Number of peer-reviewed articles dealing with climate change published in scientific journals during the previous 10 years—928.
Percentage of articles in doubt as to the cause of global warming—0.

Indeed, for anyone who has seen the Gore film, the movie’s images, graphics and message convey a compelling argument not only the reality and immediacy of global warming, but for dedicated action, both personal and collective.

But as one first begins to grapple with this issue, it’s easy to be overcome by the vast—and almost intimidating—array of technological terms and concepts. To more traditional notions, like energy efficiency, CAFE standards for miles per gallon and recycling, have been added carbon emissions and greenhouse gases, ‘clean’ and renewable energy technologies ranging from wind, solar and biodiesel to gas/electric “hybrids,” hydrogen fuel cells, and carbon capture and political concepts like ‘wedges’ and ‘carbon trading.’

Helpmate to find your way in this new world and to understand its jargon can be found in Lester Brown’s book Plan B 2.0: Rescuing a Planet Under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble and the Rough Guide to Global Warming, as well as Gore’s own hardcover version of the film, An Inconvenient Truth. Periodicals such as Mother Earth News, Mother Jones, Sierra Magazine, Scientific American and Popular Science all afford ready access to information and stimuli for what each of us, individually, can do to live more ‘green’.

As a good starting point, you might want to take Seth Zuckerman’s September/October 2006 Sierra Magazine article to heart. Zuckerman points out the environmental necessity for aggressively following a “low carbon diet.” With our present population levels, he notes, the Earth can handle a maximum nine-pound/person/per day carbon emission load. Current American energy consumption patterns, he goes on to explain, though, are creating a 65-pound/person/per day emissions hit. So, to embark on serious “carbon dieting,” what would we be looking at on our plate?

Well, entrees could include the following 16 items, to make sure we’re getting our ‘greens’:

1. Replacement of incandescent light bulbs with compact florescents. They last ten times longer, draw 75 percent less current and yield a 25-40 percent per year return on one’s investment. Communities can be urged to do the same. Denver replaced its traffic signal lights and took a giant leap into a better future. If everyone simply did bulb replacements, hundreds of coal-fired power plants could be closed.

Conclusion on page 10

---

Why Cheney Lost It, conclusion

Cheney would have seen the daggers out for him, with the Plame/Wilson team commissioned to administer the coup de grace. For was in better position to know how spurious the Iraq-Niger report was than the woman professional leading the clandestine effort to collect intelligence on precisely that subject? The agency, Cheney must have thought, was out to knock down his favorite report, the premium “evidence” that Iraq was “reconstituting” its nuclear weapons program, for what it was—a fraud.

The Worst of Times

Wilson’s op-ed of July 6 could not have come at a worse time for the White House. Barely four months into invasion of Iraq, the “justifications” had already evaporated.

CIA analysts were still insisting, correctly, that there were no meaningful ties between al-Qaida and Iraq, despite Tenet’s acquiscence to Powell’s request that Tenet sit behind him on camera as Powell wove his web of half- and un-truths at the UN. (Watching Tenet sit impassively as Powell spoke of a “sinister nexus” between al-Qaida and Iraq was a tremendous blow to the morale of the courageous analysts who had resisted that particular recipe for cooking intelligence. As for their colleagues working on WMD, most of them had long since been pressured to cave in to Cheney’s pressure during the dozen visits he made to CIA headquarters and were not as incensed.)

No trace had been found of weapons of mass destruction. In some quarters (even in the corporate press) the casus belli had morphed into a casus belli-chaug. Reports in Fox News that Saddam had somehow transported his WMD to Syria undetected (or maybe buried them in the desert) elicited widespread ridicule. Constant reminders of how difficult it is to find something in such a large country as Iraq—“the size of California”—were wearing thin. The attempt to associate uranium enrichment with the (in)famous aluminum tubes had, well, gone down the tubes. And the “mobile biological weapons laboratories,” initially applauded by the president himself as proof the administration had found the WMD, turned out to be balloon-making machines for artillery practice. The Iraqis had said it was getting very embarrassing.

So this new challenge from Joe Wilson and his obnoxiously expert wife as payback by honest CIA professionals for all the crass arm-twisting they had experienced at the hands of himself and kemosabe Libby. Cheney readily saw this challenge from Joe Wilson and his obnoxiously expert wife as payback by honest CIA professionals for all the crass arm-twisting they had experienced at the hands of himself and kemosabe Libby.

Cheney readily saw this challenge from Joe Wilson and his obnoxiously expert wife as payback by honest CIA professionals for all the crass arm-twisting they had experienced at the hands of himself and kemosabe Libby. Cheney clearly felt that something had to be done—anything. It seems a mark of desperation that this is the best thing Cheney could come up with. It is hard to believe that the best thing Cheney could come up with was to out Wilson’s wife. It is not even clear that this is what he had in mind. It may have been no more than a decision to name her, irrespective of her cover status, in order to suggest that she had been responsible for sending her husband to Niger on an expenses-paid “boondoggle”—that somehow nepotism was involved—as if that would somehow impeach Wilson’s negative findings regarding the Iraq-Niger fable. Cheney clearly felt that something had to be done—anything. It seems a mark of desperation that this is the best thing they could come up with. They may have concluded that launching a hardknuckle campaign against Wilson might at least deter others from becoming patriotic truth tellers of the kind Joseph Wilson has modeled so well. Initially, this tactic succeeded. More recently a cottage industry of patriots with taken shape, and perhaps some among the mainstream media have given them ink and air time.
Raining on the Corn-Ethanol Parade

I hate to rain on the ethanol parade here in the Cornhusker State. The price of corn shot up from $1.90 to $3.75 a bushel between 2006 and 2007 because of the heavy buzz over ethanol, and a large number of farmers are loving the fact that the era of cheap corn has ended. In his 2007 State of the Union message, President George W. Bush vowed to reduce the United States’ consumption of imported oil, calling for a five-fold, government-mandated increase in ethanol and other renewable fuels as matter of “energy security.”

Corn-derived ethanol is not such a good idea environmentally, however. Sugar cane is better. Brazil has been presented as a first-class example of ethanol in action. That country uses sugar cane, a much more powerful source of ethanol than corn. Researchers at the University of Minnesota have estimated that converting the entire U.S. corn crop to ethanol would replace only one-eighth of U.S. gasoline consumption, New York Times columnist Paul Krugman wrote in January (“The Sum of All Ears,” 1/29/07). In addition, corn must be grown and transported, after which ethanol must be manufactured. Replacing a gallon of gasoline with a gallon of ethanol does not save a gallon of gasoline because most of the energy that goes into corn comes from fossil fuels. The real savings, Krugman noted, is more like a quarter of a gallon—so make that a 3 per cent savings in gasoline consumption for the entire U.S. corn crop.

But then, what would we eat? The rising price of corn is already raising the price or tortillas out of the poor’s reach in Mexico.

Bush Sides with the Polar Bears—Under Duress

The Bush Administration has decided to propose listing the polar bear as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, placing the U.S. government on record as saying that global warming could drive one of the world’s most recognizable animals out of existence. The Bush people didn’t do this because they wanted to, of course. Pesky environmental lawyers forced his hand.

The administration’s proposal stems from the fact that rising temperatures in the Arctic are shrinking the sea ice that polar bears need for hunting.

According to Juliet Eilperin, writing in the Washington Post (“U.S. Wants Polar Bears Listed as Threatened,” 12/27/06), “identifying polar bears as threatened with extinction could have an enormous political and practical impact. As the world’s largest bear and as an object of children’s affection as well as Christmastime Coca-Cola commercials, the polar bear occupies an important place in the American psyche. Because scientists have concluded that carbon dioxide from power-plant and vehicle emissions is helping drive climate change worldwide, putting polar bears on the endangered species list raises the legal question of whether the government would be required to compel U.S. industries to curb their carbon dioxide output.”

Ice in Canada’s western Hudson Bay now breaks up two-and-a-half weeks earlier than it did 30 years ago, giving polar bears less time to hunt and build up fat reserves that sustain them for eight months before hunting resumes. As local polar bears have become thinner, female polar bears’ reproductive rates and cubs’ survival rates have fallen, spurting a 21 percent population drop from 1997 to 2004.

Phytoplankton Biomass Depleted by Warming

The media missed this one... But, gosh, how newsworthy is half the photosynthesis on Earth when Britney Spears is shaving her head? Phytoplankton may seem rather prosaic until one realizes that they are at the base of the oceanic food chain.

Warmer ocean surface temperatures correspond to lower oceanic phytoplankton biomass and productivity, the source of half the photosynthesis (“net primary production”) on Earth (and the base of the oceanic food chain), according to a survey of nearly a decade’s worth of satellite data compiled by Michael J. Behrenfeld and colleagues in the December 7, 2006 issue of Nature (“Climate-driven Trends in Contemporary Ocean Productivity”). The scientists argue that this is a result of changes induced by warming in ocean circulation that reduce supplies of nutrients required for photosynthesis. Many of these nutrients are conducted through the ocean by upwelling of cold, nutrient-rich water. The mass of phytoplankton can vary by 100 times in various parts of the ocean, depending on local conditions, including the degree of mixing and deposit of wind-borne iron from the continents. Ocean mixing is inhibited by warming water. Satellites have made possible surveys of plankton biomass over large areas of the world ocean. The amount of plankton biomass is also sensitive to the El Nino/La Nina cycle, decreasing as waters warm, and increasing as they cool.

"Extrapolating the satellite observations into the future suggests that marine biological productivity in the tropics and mid-latitudes will decline substantially, in agreement with climate-model simulations" (Scott C. Doney, “Plankton in a Warmer World,” Nature, 12/7/06). Productivity probably will increase at higher latitudes.

Al Gore’s Ten-Point Plan

Former Vice President—and Academy Award winner—Al Gore presented the following ten-point ‘blueprint’ on combating global warming to Congress on March 21, 2007

1. Immediately freeze carbon at the existing level; then implement programs to reduce it 90 percent by 2050.
2. Reduce taxes on employment and production, instead taxing pollution (especially CO2). These pollution taxes would raise the same amount of money, but make us more competitive by encouraging employment while discouraging pollution.
3. A portion of the revenues must be earmarked for low-income and middle-class people who will have a difficult time making this transition.
4. Negotiate a strong global treaty to replace Kyoto, while working toward de facto compliance with Kyoto. Move the start date of this new treaty forward from 2012 to 2010, so the next president can start to act immediately, rather than wasting time trying to pass Kyoto right before it expires. We have to try to get China and India to participate in the treaty. If they don’t immediately participate, we have to move forward with the treaty regardless, trusting that they will join sooner rather than later.
5. Impose a moratorium on construction of any new coal-fired power plant not compatible with carbon capture and sequestration.
6. Develop an “electranet”—a smart grid that allows individual homeowners and small businesses to create green power and sell their excess power to the utility companies at a fair price. Just as widely distributed information processing led to a large new surge of productivity, we need a law that allows widely distributed energy generation to be sold into the grid, at a rate determined not by the utility companies, but by regulation. The goal is to create a grid that does not require huge, centralized power plants.
7. Raise CAFE standards for cars and trucks as part of a comprehensive package. Cars and trucks are a large part of the problem, but coal and buildings must be addressed at the same time.
8. Set a date for the ban of incandescent light bulbs that gives industry time to create alternatives. If the date is set, industry will meet this challenge.
9. Create Connie Mae, a carbon-neutral mortgage association. Connie Mae will defer the costs of things like insulation and energy-efficient windows that cut carbon but are often not used by builders or renovators because they add to the upfront costs of homes, only paying for themselves after several years of energy savings.
10. The Securities and Exchange Commission should require disclosure of carbon emissions in corporate reporting.

Source: AlGore.org

Another Reason to Love Dogs

A generation ago, the Inuit used dogs to travel over sea ice. Now they use snowmobiles, which are faster and more convenient, but don’t sense thin ice like dogs do, according to Barry Smit, a University of Guelph researcher and the Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Change. “As ice becomes more unpredictable with climate change, this is becoming a serious problem. Degradation of the permafrost is affecting travel on the land and the stability of some structures,” Smit told the Environment News Service (“Eminent Scientists Warn of Disastrous, Permanent Global Warming,” 2/19/07). Smit travels to Inuit communities such as Arctic Bay, at the north end of Baffin Island, to study how the Inuit are adapting to climate change.

Note: My publisher, Praeger, has asked me to write a new book on personal solutions to global warming. Toward this end, I’m asking readers to send me descriptions of what they are doing in their daily lives to impede global warming: bjoehansen@mail.unomaha.edu.

APRIL 2007 NEBRASKA REPORT, P.7
In March, the Nebraska Report featured an article by Dr. Waskar Ari, the promising Bolivian historian hired by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln two years ago, but who has thus far been barred from entering the country by the federal government.

To date, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has failed to act on the university’s H1-B employment visa application on behalf of Dr. Ari, citing unspecified “security checks” under the terror-related provisions of the USA PATRIOT ACT. Responding to these charges, Ari recently wrote, “I have never had any connection with terrorism, terrorist organizations, or organizations that support terrorism in any way, and I am adamantly opposed to terrorism and terrorists no matter what.” The case is troubling, given the broader trend of academic exclusion after 9/11, and has led some to speculate that it might actually be related to political and economic tensions between Bolivia’s President, Evo Morales, and the Bush Administration. Like President Morales, Dr. Ari, is a member of the Aymara indigenous group, which has been historically oppressed in Bolivia. In a passionate defense of Dr. Ari, the President of the American Historical Association, Dr. Barbara Weinstein, wrote, “Even in our post-9/11 world, it seems unthinkable that we have arrived at the point where scholars from nations or ethnic communities that criticize U.S. policies may be summarily barred from entering the United States or teaching at U.S. universities. Has the definition of ‘national security’ been stretched so far as to exclude anyone associated with any group that has manifested unhappiness with the U.S. role in world affairs?”

In a bold move, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln filed suit against the Department of Homeland Security on March 2, 2007, in an attempt to compel DHS to act on the university’s visa petition. The American Civil Liberties Union, which brought similar legal action on behalf of the prominent Swiss Islamic scholar, Tariq Ramadan, after the U.S. government revoked his visa to teach at the University of Notre Dame in 2004, is also tracking Ari’s case, along with a number of others across the country. The ACLU reports that many exclusions appear ideologically motivated and that academics are increasingly being interrogated about their political beliefs when they apply for visas. According to Michael Maggio, Ari’s lead attorney, “the First Amendment, academic freedom, and an unlawful approach to background checks for foreign academics are at the heart of the lawsuit.” The federal government has 60 days to respond to the complaint.

While the legal process advances, it is important for readers of the Nebraska Report to understand that this is ultimately a political issue. If Dr. Ari is to get a fair hearing and the legal suit is to be successful, the federal government needs to hear from concerned citizens. To that end, I want to encourage you to write to Secretary Michael Chertoff at the Department of Homeland Security, Secretary Condoleezza Rice at the Department of State and Nebraska Senators Chuck Hagel and Ben Nelson. Please spread the word about Dr. Ari’s plight and encourage others to support his cause, as well.

This case raises disturbing questions about the free-flow of ideas and people in the post-9-11 era, questions that get at the heart of due process and human rights. This is happening right here on the edge of the Great Plains, not in some distant place. This is our fight. Join me and Nebraskans for Peace in standing up for Dr. Ari and academic freedom. If not now, when?

For more information, please visit www.history.unl.edu/news/ari/ari.html.

Dr. Waskar Ari

Nebraskans for Peace
StratCom & UNL, conclusion

Taken in the context in which it was spoken, the word apparently meant ‘war-making’ by means of ‘law-making.’ But having been taught in my training that war and law were polar opposites, the concept was news to me.

Meek summed up by stating that of all the nations of the earth, the U.S. had the most to lose and least to gain from any new space treaty. Therefore, we shouldn’t pursue any.

And that’s where the discussion ended.

As Meek’s comments had become progressively more contentious, I’d started wondering who at this state-sponsored law conference was going to provide the rebuttal to his arguments. The next panelist actually worked at StratCom. His presentation, though, focused on a ruling in a maritime lawsuit that might have some applicability to potential legal conflicts in space, and didn’t address space policy. The person who was to have been the third panel member, a Canadian military officer who serves as a Judge Advocate General, also ended up not making it to Lincoln in time for the morning panel because of the snowstorm. What he might have said is unclear. Although he’s a graduate of McGill University’s Space Law Program, hours of surfing on the internet produced nothing indicating where his views on space policy might lie, and the Center for Defense Information in Washington, D.C. was completely unfamiliar with him.

So as it all played out, Meek’s hegemonic, hyper-nationalist views essentially wound up framing the debate and standing as the legal benchmark for the panel discussion. I should state that he had prefaced his comments with the obligatory, throw-away line about “speaking for himself, and not as a representative of the Air Force.” But that was no sooner out of his mouth, than he chuckled, “But I would hope the Air Force and the Department of Defense would back me up.”

In his summary comments, the panel moderator, Dr. Eligar Sadeh, the co-editor of Astropolitics, said he agreed with most of Meek’s comments, but that a qualitative shift in thinking had taken place between the publication of the 1997 National Space Policy prepared by the Clinton Administration, and the version just leased from the Bush/Cheney White House. Acknowledging the U.S. advantage in space, the Clinton document outlined a number of concerns that would have

the United Nations cast its annual vote on the PAROS resolution, 160 nations voted in favor and one country—Israel—abstained. The U.S., however, shocked the assembly by actually voting against the resolution. In previous years, it had also abstained. The results of 2006 UN vote were essentially identical to 2005’s.

Speaking as an alumnus—and advocate—of UNL, the content of this conference did not seem intellectually possible. This isn’t Bob Jones University or a German university of the 1930s. It’s the University of Nebraska, which, with a few exceptions, has had a good record of academic freedom. So where, at this space conference, was the give-and-take in the marketplace of ideas, the free and open exchange of viewpoints, and the academy’s commitment to presenting both sides of an issue in the pursuit of truth? Where were the voices, with unimpeachable standing in the academic and legal community, representing the views and concerns of the other 160 nations of the world that are concerned, as the PAROS resolution reads, that “the prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security” and that the current “legal regime applicable to outer space does not in and of itself guarantee the prevention of an arms race in outer space” and that “there is a need to consolidate and reinforce that regime and enhance its effectiveness and that it is important to comply strictly with existing agreements, both bilateral and multilateral”? If a public university is presuming to be an academic institution, it has a pedagogical and ethical duty to present all sides of the issues. Otherwise, what one has is mere advertising dressed in an academic garb.

What I saw March 2 was a college of law, dodging not only an authentic debate about space policy, but letting slide the compelling legal issues of StratCom’s entire mission array.

What I saw March 2 was a college of law, dodging not only an authentic debate about space policy, but letting slide the compelling legal issues of StratCom’s entire mission array.

UN President J.B. Milliken to be addressed before the U.S. entered into a new international agreement. Those concerns respecting the U.S. advantage become, in the Bush/Cheney policy however, a pretext for not wanting any new treaties, period. Just as Meek himself was counsel-

ing. As a U.S. State Department official stated on January 21 of this year, “Arms control is not a viable solution for space.”

It’s worth noting at this point just how far out of the mainstream of world opinion the U.S. is with this attitude. In 2005, when
**American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America**  

Chris Hedges is a graduate of Harvard Divinity School and was a foreign correspondent for nearly 20 years for the New York Times. In writing this book on the Christian Right, he attended classes, rallies and workshops led by evangelicals. He read Christian school textbooks and conducted interviews and delved into personal histories to better understand this movement.

The book begins with an examination of this religious faith, which stands in stark contrast to Jesus’ call to “love your enemies.” Like all fascist movements, the Christian Right adores leadership and invokes the moral and physical supremacy of a master race, i.e. American Christians. Hedges examines how they have redefined words like truth, wisdom, liberty and love—in a way that would have even impressed George Orwell.

Although the Christian Right is estimated to comprise no more than 7-12 percent of the population, their influence far exceeds their numbers, as witnessed by their present political power. Repudiating the real world of science and rationality, they despairingly blame America’s economic decline—not on corporations or capitalism— but on welfare, homosexuals and liberals.

Hedges also addresses the sexist emphasis of the movement. There is a strict gender-based hierarchy, with women expected to submit to their husbands. The prescribed image is one of male assertiveness within a strict authoritarian system that’s very pro-military and, given the rigid sex roles, very anti-gay. But the husbands too are expected to in turn show obedience to the male religious hierarchy.

Of special interest is the chapter entitled, “The War on Truth.” Hedges describes the “Creation Museum” at Petersburg, Kentucky to illustrate the attack on science’ mentality so indicative of their worldview. The museum opens with two life-sized figures of children in a stream a few feet from two towering Tyrannosaurus Rex models—these of course are depicted as living peacefully side by side. One of just several such museums, these are places, Hedges says, “where lies become true, where people can believe what they want to believe” (p. 115). The real result of creationism, he warns, is the destruction of the core values of an open society—the ability to think for oneself and express dissent. As you would expect, they of course deny global warming and its science.

In the last chapter, Hedges treats apocalyptic themes and how this outlook glorifies violence and promotes condemnation of other peoples, such as Muslims and “secular humanists.” Dialogue and compromise, he states, are not options with them. Our only option, he warns, is to stand firm and forthrightly defend the rights of Muslims, Jews, immigrants, gays, women, scientists and others, and to continue to perform little deeds of love. The real danger, he points out, will come with a national economic collapse, another major terrorist attack, or other tragic national event. These American fascists, he says, will quickly seek to take advantage of the ensuing fear and panic to enforce their own viewpoint on our government.

---

**Getting Our Greens, conclusion**

utility bill reduction.

1. Adding a solar water heating panel to your roof to reduce your water heating bill by as much as 70 percent.
2. Choosing to forgo a high-definition TV to avoid an associated 64-percent-energy use uptick.
3. Consulting *Mother Earth News* for information on a variety of solar heat collectors you can create to help heat your home.
4. Bike or walk to work for your health and that of the world. A bicycle not only triples one’s natural mobility gain but makes you look and feel smart and downright gallant moving through space on an engineering marvel weighing as little as 28 pounds. Author Lester Brown notes tripping a seven-mile distance on the energy of just one potato.
5. Choose to reduce your weekly car travel pattern by just 20 miles per week to reduce your global warming emissions by more than one-fourth in just a year. Reportedly, the average American uses 1.3 gallons of gas per day for transport, and since each gallon of gas burned emits approximately 21 pounds of unwelcome CO2 into the atmosphere—well, there you have it—a 27.3 pound per day hit on Mother Earth’s integrity.
6. If like most Americans, your average daily commute is 25 miles or less, ponder the satisfaction in fomenting the creation, acquisition and wide-scale deployment of total electric or super-efficient gas/electric hybrid vehicles equipped with additional battery storage and plug-in capacity to enable short daily gasoline-free commutes for yourself and others. At three cents an electric mile vs. 12 cents a gas mile, plus the avoidance of spewing out an average 27 pounds of CO2 daily on the environment, the choice makes for a generous payoff. If you grow tired of waiting for such a commuter electric vehicle, why not find a ‘donor’ car and do a conversion. ‘Do it yourself’ guides such as *Convert it* by Michael Brown & Shari Pranger and *Build Your Own Electric Vehicle* by Bob Brands await you.
7. If you feel you must travel beyond your own territory, drive vs. fly, as air travel creates more than half a pound or almost twice the amount of CO2 per passenger mile. And drive at 55 instead of 65. If everyone did, 3 million gallons of gasoline per day could be saved. Try too to pick an eco-friendly city to experience (Consult sustainlane.com for ideas.)
8. Forgo beverages in non-returnable/ refillable containers to reduce energy use patterns by 90 percent and relieve the litter and load on the waste stream. That includes bottled water. Packaging and trucking it vs. simply drawing it from the nearest tap (boiled or filtered if needed) is recommended by the World Wide Fund for Nature who also cite the claim that the alleged benefits of bottled water are not supported (*Plan B 2.0, p. 242*).
9. Buy plastic products made from recycled rather than virgin plastic to reduce production energy use by 90 percent and the avoidance of a 2-3 lb. vs. 1 lb. CO2 emission dump into the atmosphere.
10. Shop for local foodstuffs. Most of what we eat is shipped in from a distance of more than 2,000 miles or flown in fresh from South America.
11. Advocate the shifting of the $210 billion global fossil fuel subsidy to the research, development and expanded use of wind and other renewable resources. Applaud Congress for its recent repeal of a $14 billion portion of this amount.
12. Tax gas-powered vehicles to induce the use of more eco-friendly transportation like bus, rail and bicycle. The City of Chicago, for example, charges a higher vehicle registration fee for SUVs.
13. Urge your city to form an ‘Environmental Committee’ like Charlotte, South Carolina did, to seek out environmental efficiencies and alternatives.
14. Ask your utility company to offer you the “green power” option, i.e. the opportunity to purchase wind- or solar-generated power, vs. coal-generated electricity, in exchange for having the additional cost added to your monthly bill (usually from 3-15 percent).
15. Reduce your new clothing appetite. One pound of toxics are used to grow the cotton in just three shirts.
16. And last but not least, ponder the statement by Olympia Brown, first ordained woman minister in America, who said, “We can never make the world safe by fighting.” Lester Brown cites recent yearly world military expenditures of $975 billion. He advocates budgeting a mere $161 billion to enable “building a global society that is environmentally sustainable and equitable and one that restores hope for everyone.”
Paul Olson, conclusion

full knowledge (and, since we continued to support Iraq, the tacit approval) that Saddam Hussein was using weapons of mass destruction against the Kurds and Iranians—crimes for which he was subsequently hanged. Nor did we stint on the support. After Reagan Secretary of State Alexander Haig told the Senate that we could thwart the Soviets by improving our ties to Saddam, we sent five Boeing jetliners and an assistant Secretary of State to Baghdad for talks. We took Iraq off the terrorism list, even though we knew that Abu Nidal was based there, and we gave the regime a $400 million credit line www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/ShalomIranIraq.html. We pressured the World Bank to extend credit to the country and used our intelligence assets to support its war efforts.

However, the White House concluded Iran too merited help in the war, lest it become “Sovietized.” So the administration conceived the Iran-Contra strategy to sell arms to Iran to help it fight the Iraqis, while Iran in turn paid for the weapons needed by the Nicaraguan Contras, whom Congress had refused to fund. In short, we backed both sides in an eight-year war that took nearly a million lives. That was how we taught democracy—by countermanding an act of Congress through secret deals and arming both combatants. (Some critics believe that Saddam Hussein’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait, which led to the first Gulf War, derived from his need to acquire more resources to service debts he’d accumulated from buying weapons to fight the Iraq-Iran war.)

Twelve years after Gulf War I, we took our campaign to democratize the Middle East to an unprecedented level, when we attacked and destroyed this same Iraqi nation for allegedly harboring weapons for mass destruction. The Iraqi government had repeatedly insisted it had no WMD. The UN inspection teams had found no evidence of WMD. France, Germany, Russia and China all opposed military intervention over the unproven case for WMD. But we knew better. In a flagrant violation of international law, we preemptively invaded Iraq and caused the deaths of lots and lots of people. And it turned out there were no WMD. The mission of ‘democratizing’ the Middle East now also covers unprovoked attack, illegal occupation and civil war.

Fresh from having destroyed one Muslim nation, the Bush/Cheney Administration is readying, even as we speak, to carry its democratic crusade in the Middle East one step further... and back to where this ‘democratic’ movement originally began. In the last few months, the U.S. has deployed several aircraft carriers off the coast of Iran as part of a coordinated effort to force that country abandon its nuclear program. The world’s only remaining superpower, boasting the most sophisticated nuclear arsenal on the face of the earth, is now threatening to preemptively attack yet another Muslim nation—possibly with nuclear weapons—to prevent that country from even developing nuclear power, for fear it might at some point make weapons of mass destruction.

There is no conclusive evidence that Iran’s uranium-enrichment program is intended for anything other than the generation of energy for civilian purposes. Friends of mine who are physicists tell me that no serious nuclear bomb maker would now go for enriched uranium, anyway, as that’s the element used to fuel electricity generation—which under the terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (of which Iran is a signatory) is perfectly legal. No, according to my friends, the element of choice for nuclear weapons is plutonium.

That said, the Iranian leadership, has undoubtedly been carefully pondering the example of its neighbor and fellow oil-rich Muslim state, Iraq. Under international pressure, Saddam Hussein’s government dutifully gave up its ambitions to develop nuclear weapons, and was summarily destroyed for its efforts. What could Iran reasonably expect from the ‘democratically minded’ U.S. if it were to give up its nuclear program? Probably another Shah. After decades of instruction in the ways of ‘democracy,’ even the most skeptical among us has to admit that the Iranians might be a little reluctant to go down that road again.

Joe Volk, who was here recently representing the Friends Committee on National Legislation and a group of religious leaders who went to Iran, spoke with President Ahmedinajad. The President told the group: (1) Iran does not gain from continuing civil war in Iraq because instability always spills beyond the borders of states in his region; (2) the Israeli-Arab crisis has to be solved politically, not militarily; and (3) Iran would accept international inspections of its facilities after good faith negotiations with the international community and the U.S., i.e., no efforts to overthrow his government.

We may not like Ahmedinajad very much. We certainly do not like his Holocaust-denial tendencies, or his intemperate remarks about Israel and Zionists. But he is an elected president. His party, of late, has been suffering losses both at the ballot box and in the polls, and the democratic process may itself get rid of him soon. Were that to happen, that actually sounds a little like the way democracy, as I was taught it in Wahoo, is supposed to work.

Given the history of our two countries the last 55 years, however, I wouldn’t presume to teach President Ahmedinajad about how a representative democracy is supposed to work. Here in America, we’ve got a hard enough time just getting our own political leaders to practice it.
speaking our peace

by paul olson, unl professor emeritus

when i was a teenager in the '40s attending wahoo's luther junior college, i met my first iranian or persian person. his name was hussein zadig zadig osqui, i believe. he came to luther out of nowhere, for no apparent reason, remained very quiet and devout in an islamic way and admired the shah fervently. he prayed without ceasing and told us that his father owned 40 villages. i was impressed. i certainly didn't know anyone else whose father owned 40 villages. later, he went as quietly as he came.

the shah that hussein so admired was mohammed reza pahlavi, the fellow whom the british made shah in 1941, after they decided that his father might side with the nazis as rommel marched across africa. the shah was the sort of monarch the son of a 40-village landowner could admire. he pursued a policy lurching from autocracy to democracy until mohammed mossaedd, the leader of the national front, came to power in the early '50s and established a fully democratic government that, for a time, ended britain's domination of iran's oil. under mossaedd, democracy flourished and the shah was overshadowed by an elected government. but in 1953, years after hussein had left wahoo, i read to my surprise in the omaha world-herald that a coup had toppled mossaedd. the soviet union, seeking access to iran's oil, had been backing mossaedd. hence the coup. the shah was back again, in his full monarchical glory. more than four decades would pass before secretary of state madeleine albright

let slip that it was in fact the cia who had really ousted mossaedd. the british had persuaded the eisenhower and cia chief john foster dulles that mossaedd was a "communist" who had to be removed to save the oil. and through a complex set of maneuvers, the u.s. engineered the overthrow of democratically elected prime minister and the reinstatement of the shah. i can remember one of my iranian colleagues in the english department explaining to me, at the time of the iran hostage crisis in 1979, that when the cia brought down the mossaedd government and reinstalled the shah, the monarch had tried to make iran a western power. he allowed british and other outside interests to slurp the country's oil, sought to secularize iran's culture and to repress its local religious groups. he established the savak security service whose mastery of torture came from israeli and cia operatives, and tapped the agency's expertise as military planners. this was the democracy we taught iran.

amnesty international in 1976 observed that iran had the "highest rate of death penalties in the world, no valid system of civilian courts and a history of torture which is beyond belief. no country in the world has a worse record in human rights than iran." these were the fruits of democracy for the iranian people.

economic life in iran suffered a similar fate. the bustling markets of the local bazaars were replaced with corrupt monopolies dominated by the shah and his cronies. to appease his increasing vanity, the shah poured the national treasury into the construction of lavish palaces and celebrations of himself, to recreate, through dress-up parties at persepolis, the grandeur of the old persian empire. when we overthrew mossaedd and embraced a despot, we showed the middle east what was really meant by democracy.

then in the 1970s, the ayatollah khoemeini launched his challenge to the shah's government. he reminded the iranians through clandestinely circulated audiotapes that british oil and the cia were responsible for the shah's tyranny. encouraging the iranian people to call for elections and use the power of the ballot box, it was the ayatollah ironically who paved the way for democratic leaders like medic bazargan and abol-hassan banisadr. and even when the constitutional changes installing the theocracy as the final arbiters of iranian policy came to be approved in a plebiscite, these changes still did not entirely eliminate elections or constitutional guarantees (though admittedly they were considerably curtailed). the results of the plebiscite, however, clearly showed that the iranians had had enough of secularist rule in the style of the shah.

the modern age of u.s./iranian relations began with the occupation of the american embassy by iranian students in november, 1979, and ensuing hostage crisis that dragged on for over a year. nebraskans for peace sent father darrell rupiper with other americans to talk with the hostages and the hostage takers, and fr. darrell came back with positive reports on iran's new regime despite the hostage situation. however, it was clear from his reports that the new governmental system iran was creating was not a traditional western-style republic. it was a republic framed by a theocracy. over the previous quarter of a century, we'd promoted such a perverted concept of democracy that we'd fostered the creation of a theocratic state.

but at that time, we ourselves didn't have much of a traditional western-style, open form of government either. we had a republic framed by secret negotiators. the alleged negotiations between reagan campaign operative william casey and khoemeini representatives in paris before the 1980 presidential election—to delay the resolution of the hostage crisis and thus prevent an "october surprise" by president carter—utterly undermined the democratic process. the electoral climate that fall was so superheated by the hostage situation that a rational choice was impossible, and ronald reagan ended up winning by a nose. that was how we taught both iran and ourselves democracy.

apparently not having learned a thing, but hell-bent on keeping the oil from the mideast flowing, our government continued its twisted democratic teachings by supporting both big oil neighbors—iran and iraq—in their war on each other from 1980-88. we mostly supported iraq in the eight-year war. we did so with the