

OMNI NEWSLETTER, 5th SPECIAL NO. ON **IRAN**  
OCTOBER 1, 2007. BUILDING A CULTURE OF PEACE BY  
PREVENTING WARS (No. 1 on Iran appeared Dec. 23, 2006; No. 2 March  
15, 2007; No. 3 April 3, 2007; No. 4, Sept. 3, 2007.)  
Ed. Dick Bennett

## SEEKING PEACE

UN CHARTER (a Treaty initiated by US and signed into US law)

**Article 2(4):** All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

These **images of Tehran** show the humanity of the



Images of Tehran  
(13.6 KB).msg

otherwise demonized Iranians.

## INTERVIEW WITH INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALIST SEYMOUR HERSH

SPIEGEL ONLINE - September 28, 2007, 11:58 AM

URL: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,508394,00.html>

[from Chris D]

### 'The President Has Accepted Ethnic Cleansing'

Investigative journalist Seymour Hersh has consistently led the way in telling the story of what's really going on in Iraq and Iran. SPIEGEL ONLINE spoke to him about America's Hitler, Bush's Vietnam, and how the US press failed the First Amendment.

**SPIEGEL ONLINE:** Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was [just in New York](#) for the United Nations General Assembly. Once again, he said that he is only interested in civilian nuclear power instead of atomic weapons. How much does the West really know about the nuclear program in Iran?

**Seymour Hersh:** A lot. And it's been underestimated how much the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) knows. If you follow what [\(IAEA head Mohamed\) ElBaradei](#) and the various reports have been saying, the Iranians have claimed to be enriching uranium to higher than a 4 percent purity, which is the amount you need to run a peaceful nuclear reactor. But the IAEA's best guess is that they are at 3.67 percent or something. The Iranians are not even doing what they claim to be doing. The IAEA has been saying all along that they've been making progress but basically, Iran is nowhere. Of course the US and Israel are going to say you have to look at the worst case scenario, but there isn't enough evidence to justify a bombing raid.

**SPIEGEL ONLINE:** Is this just another case of exaggerating the danger in preparation for an invasion like we saw in 2002 and 2003 prior to the

Iraq War?

**Hersh:** We have this wonderful capacity in America to Hitlerize people. We had Hitler, and since Hitler we've had about 20 of them. Khrushchev and Mao and of course Stalin, and for a little while Gadhafi was our Hitler. And now we have this guy Ahmadinejad. The reality is, he's not nearly as powerful inside the country as we like to think he is. The Revolutionary Guards have direct control over the missile program and if there is a weapons program, they would be the ones running it. Not Ahmadinejad.

**SPIEGEL ONLINE:** Where does this feeling of urgency that the US has with Iran come from?

**Hersh:** Pressure from the White House. That's just their game.

**SPIEGEL ONLINE:** What interest does the White House have in moving us to the brink with Tehran?

**Hersh:** You have to ask yourself what interest we had 40 years ago for going to war in Vietnam. You'd think that in this country with so many smart people, that we can't possibly do the same dumb thing again. I have this theory in life that there is no learning. There is no learning curve. Everything is tabula rasa. Everybody has to discover things for themselves.

[This is only the beginning of an excellent interview. SPIEGEL ONLINE - September 28, 2007, 11:58 AM

URL: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,508394,00.html>

## HOW WAR-MONGERS DISTORT STATEMENTS TO FOMENT HATRED

Dick,

This is by William O Beeman of Brown University to an Anthropology list-serve. He is repeating here what Haggai Ram of Ben-Gurion University said on our campus last year -- only here providing the original quote.

Many people have asked me about President Ahmadinejad's statement in 2005 in which he was purported to say that Israel "must be wiped off the map."

It is first important to note that this was not even Ahmadinejad's statement. He was quoting from Ayatollah Khomeini. Here is the exact text of his speech:

"Imam (Khomeini) goft (said) een (this) rezhim-e (regime) ishghalgar-e (occupying) gods (Jerusalem) bayad (must) az safheh-ye ruzgar (from page of time) mahv shavad (vanish from)."

"The Imam said this regime occupying Jerusalem must vanish from the page of time." - President Ahmadinejad October 25, 2005

As one can see, the entire thing has been massively misquoted. Best, Bill Beeman

One could presumably ask what Khomeini meant by "regime" -- and how he perceived it vanishing from "the pages of time." That is for Farsi speakers and Iran hands to handle. Professor Ram, who is a Farsi speaker and Iran specialist, reads the statement as indicating Khomeini's belief that Zionism's historical moment would soon come to an end. Marxists, less theologically inclined, prefer to consign outmoded ideologies to the "dustbin of history"; neo-cons, more dramatically, once spoke of the "end of history." Khomeini -- and surely Ahmadinejad -- would see justice in the Israeli "regime" collapsing. But nowhere has the latter spoken of acting on such an

historical understanding. A far cry from how his words have been translated -- and accepted -- here and in Israel.

## U.S. General – Talk of Iran War Not Helpful

"We should find ways through which we can bring countries to work together for the benefit of all .... It is not a good idea to be in a state of war. We ought to try and to do our utmost to create different conditions.... This constant drum beat of conflict is what strikes me which is not helpful and not useful."

~Adm. William Fallon, head of U.S. Central Command, talking about Iran. Find more [quotes supporting negotiations](#), not war, with Iran.

## What the Candidates Are Saying: Iran

Which presidential candidates support talking with Iran? Who thinks that a military strike should be on the table? FCNL is collecting the positions of the 2008 presidential candidates on Iran, as well as Iraq and nuclear weapons. [Find a summary](#) and read detailed quotes from the candidates.

### TOMLINSON EXAMINES BUSH/MAINSTREAM MEDIA WAR PROPAGANDA

#### Iran War Cheerleading is Terrifying

Cheerleading for Iran war has increased recently and, unlike Iraq, it could impact U of A students more directly. Evidence of desire to invade Iran began in 2002 when Bush labeled Iraq, Iran and North Korea the "Axis of Evil". Since then, we devastated oil-rich axis Iraq and Afghanistan, which both border oil-rich axis Iran, so it follows that Iran could be next.

After labeling Iran as evil, the sales pitch for Iran war has developed in a reminiscent manner to the Iraq war. The methodology is label leader X as evil, hype public fear of terrorism and WMD, and bomb. You recall their sales jingle of fear, "911, terrorism, WMD, buy this shock-and-awesome war now for zero down and no payments!" The fine print says, "\$9 trillion debt payments made by increased taxes on your grandchildren."

Our former all-boys school head cheerleader president is again delivering familiar bellicose sales pitches. He gave a fear-inspiring speech to the American Legion, saying Iran is spreading a "shadow of nuclear holocaust". He then stated his casus belli, "To protect our troops-I have authorized our military commanders to confront Tehran's murderous activities." Although Bush claims Iranian involvement in Iraq, several US military officials said there is no evidence to support these accusations.

Regarding Bush's WMD argument, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) recently verified nuclear material in Iran "remains in peaceful use" and arranged inspection timetables. The IAEA head, Mohamed ElBaradei stated this agreement was "a significant step forward". However, the Bush Administration called Iran's cooperation insincere. In response, ElBaradei said these accusations "are completely untrue. It's not possible to manipulate us." Furthermore, most experts agree Iran is 10 years away from actually making a bomb.

Evidence of Bush's invigorated propaganda campaign recently surfaced in The Telegraph, which reported senior intelligence and defense officials from America saying the Bush Administration is escalating the case for war. One intelligence official said, "Over the next few weeks and months the US will build tensions and evidence around Iranian activities in Iraq." He said war would occur by first declaring Iranian meddling in Iraq justifies cross border raids, provoking Iranian retaliation, which would then justify larger US bombings and war. The larger bombing campaign would consist of over 2,000 targets already identified by the Pentagon.

Conservative media and think tanks are also increasing pro-war propaganda. Respected Afghanistan expert Barnett Rubin from New York University wrote, although unconfirmed, that his friend from a neoconservative institution was given "instructions from the Office of the Vice-President to roll out a campaign for war with Iran in the week after Labor Day; it will be coordinated with the American Enterprise Institute, the Wall Street Journal, the Weekly Standard, Commentary, Fox, (etc.)." The goal is to boost public support for war to 35-40%, which is "plenty". This report has since been partially confirmed by these institutions publishing pro-war commentary. Fox News reported serious discussion within the Bush Administration about Iran war within eight to 10 months.

Many politicians are also cheering for war including presidential candidates McCain and Giuliani, but loudest is Senator Joseph Lieberman. Lieberman recently introduced amendment SA 3017 to the 2008 Defense Authorization Bill giving Bush stealth approval for Iran war. Interestingly, the amendment was passed with Hillary Clinton and Mark Pryor joining Republicans in voting yea.

Major foreign powers are also escalating pro-war rhetoric and actions. Notably, French Foreign Minister Kouchner recently said "prepare for the worst ... which is war". Israel recently took pro-war action farthest by mysteriously bombing Syria, which is believed to be a rehearsal for further attacks on Syria and Iran.

What are consequences of war? First, a draft is highly likely because our forces are overstretched in Iraq. According to BBC and Harpers, another very serious consequence is oil immediately spiking to over \$120 per barrel and \$5 per gallon for gas with disastrous economic ramifications. There are countless other domestic and global consequences, which collectively make this war insanely dumber and scarier than Iraq.

We can, however, find hope of resistance in Obama saying, "Iran poses a grave challenge, but we hear eerie echoes of the run-up to the war in Iraq. Bush and Cheney must hear - loud and clear - from the American people and Congress: you don't have our support or authorization for war."

**In the News: U.S. Focus on Ahmadinejad Puzzles Iranians While Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad grabs headlines in the U.S. and around the world, back in Iran he is increasingly isolated politically because of his go-it-alone style and ineffective economic policies, the [New York Times](#) reported this week.**

Act now to prevent more destruction and suffering.

## Mohamed El Baradei says war drums beating for Iran like they did in the run up to the Iraq war (Washington Times)

Article published Sep 8, 2007

Nuke watchdog defends Iran deal

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070908/FOREIGN/109080042/1001>

September 8, 2007

By David R. Sands - The United Nations' top nuclear cop yesterday slammed critics of a new inspection deal with Iran as "back-seat drivers" trying to justify a war with Tehran in the same way they cleared a path for the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Mohamed ElBaradei, director-general of the nuclear watchdog International Atomic Energy Agency, named no names in a briefing for reporters at the IAEA's headquarters in Vienna, Austria. But his harsh words reflected the depth of suspicion and distrust between the Egyptian diplomat and critics in the United States, both inside and outside the Bush administration.

Pleading for time to allow a new Iranian inspection plan to work, Mr. ElBaradei said, "I hear war drums that are basically saying that the solution is to bomb Iran. It makes me shudder because some of the rhetoric is a reminder" of the run-up to the Iraq war.

"There have been back-seat drivers putting in their five cents saying this is not a good working arrangement," he said, according to an account by the Reuters news agency.

"I tell them: Please, leave the driving to us and we will let you know where we are in November."

The official U.S. response to the IAEA chief's comments was measured, but U.S. officials also made it clear that Iran must do far more than meet the IAEA's goals to put to rest questions about its suspect nuclear programs.

"I would certainly hope that [Mr. ElBaradei's] comments would not refer to the United States, because they certainly wouldn't be true," State Department spokesman Tom Casey said.

Mr. Casey and the U.S. Ambassador to the IAEA, Gregory Schulte, said they back the IAEA's efforts to clear up "historical" questions about Iran's secret nuclear programs. But they added that the United States and its allies still demand that Iran suspend key activities, such as uranium enrichment, or face new international sanctions.

Mr. Schulte said late last month that the IAEA inspection agreement with Tehran has "real limitations" because key military and manufacturing sites inside the Islamic republic would not be covered.

Mr. ElBaradei has U.S. critics outside the Bush administration as well. A Washington Post editorial this week dubbed him a "rogue regulator" who is "undermining" the U.S.-led effort to curb Iran's nuclear programs.

Yesterday, Mr. ElBaradei said the U.S. press was rushing to discredit him.

"If you look at some of the American newspapers today, there is a coordinated, orchestrated campaign to undermine the process, undermine the agency, undermine me," Reuters quoted him as saying.

The Bush administration and Mr. ElBaradei had some tense exchanges before the Iraq war over the extent of dictator Saddam Hussein's nuclear weapons programs. The IAEA could not verify U.S. claims of a major Iraqi nuclear effort, and postwar analyses largely upheld the U.N. agency's work.

The United States briefly tried to block Mr. Elbaradei's reappointment to the IAEA post in 2005, but found no support from the nearly three dozen nations that sit on the Vienna agency's board.

Meeting with a small group of reporters in Vienna yesterday, Mr. ElBaradei said his inspectors have uncovered little so far to back up charges Iran has developed a military nuclear capability. Iranian officials say their program is designed for peaceful energy uses.

"We have not seen any weaponization of their program, nor have we received any information to that effect —

no smoking gun or information from intelligence," Mr. ElBaradei said.

Mr. ElBaradei suggested yesterday that critics should give his inspectors until the end of the year to do their work.

"This is a reasonable time in our view to resolve a number of complex issues," he said.

But Jacqueline Shire and David Albright, nuclear specialists at the private Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security, said in an Aug. 30 report that the IAEA inspection deal signed with Iran on Aug. 27 is "limited in scope" in a number of key areas.

"The IAEA has also not been able to determine whether Iran has undeclared nuclear facilities," they wrote. "Iran may be installing centrifuges at a secret, undeclared plant."

- This article is based in part on wire service reports.

## 'A Coup Has Occurred' *By Daniel Ellsberg*

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article18456.htm>

09/26/07 "[ICH](#)" -- -- September 26, 2007 (Text of a speech delivered September 20, 2007) -- - - *I think nothing has higher priority than averting an attack on Iran, which I think will be accompanied by a further change in our way of governing here that in effect will convert us into what I would call a police state.....*

After describing impeachable offenses by other presidents, and arguing that they did not intend to permanently alter the Constitution, Ellsberg describes the totalitarian aim of Bush and Cheney. A sample paragraph: "It is increasingly clear with each new book and each new leak, that Richard Cheney and his new chief of staff David Addington have had precisely that in mind since at least the early 70s.... have believed in Executive government, single-branch government under an Executive president – elected or not – with unrestrained powers."

### JEWISH VOICE FOR PEACE

#### JVP News Roundup, September 30, 2007

[Click here for printer-friendly version](#)

The United States' military action in Iraq as well as the simmering conflict between Israel and Syria, the worsening situation with the Palestinians and on top of last summer's war between Israel and Hezbollah have greatly increased the instability in the never-stable Middle East. The prospect of an attack on Iran would greatly magnify the already considerable instability even by Mideast standards. While a strike on Iran is still much less likely than one might believe from the headlines, those pressing for such an attack have increased their efforts greatly, so the possibility is greater than ever.

When Iranian president [Mahmoud Ahmadinejad came to Columbia University](#) and the United Nations in New York this week, the response was powerful. Many protests and calls for Ahmadinejad to be barred from entering the country were heard. Columbia president Lee Bollinger embarrassed both the university and

the country with his scathing attack on Ahmadinejad when he was supposed to be introducing him to the audience. No matter how deep the enmity is for a visiting foreign dignitary, this was inappropriate behavior. [Either don't invite him or maintain an air of civility](#). Bollinger need not have praised Ahmadinejad, but his behavior was unnecessary and, in the end, [it didn't stop petitions from circulating that he be fired](#) for having allowed Ahmadinejad to speak at Columbia anyway.

On September 21, Iran challenged the international community to [devote the same scrutiny to Israel's nuclear arsenal](#), the worst-kept secret in the world, as it does to Iran's nuclear efforts. One actually wonders what took Iran so long to issue this challenge. Israeli officials responded by not responding, simply repeating that Iran just hates Israel and should not be heeded, but [not denying its own nuclear ability nor admitting that it escapes standard scrutiny](#).

In the end, the hysteria over Ahmadinejad is misplaced; whatever he is or is not (and it is obvious that the man is a loose cannon, a Holocaust denier, and dogmatic but not very learned religious fundamentalist), he does not control Iran's military or its foreign policy. [That is left to Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khomeini](#). Moreover, Iran has never attacked another country directly, and its posture against Israel, while certainly hostile, [has remained within the confines of defensive statements](#). The oft-repeated threat to "wipe Israel off the map" [was a mistranslation](#) and, while the statement (which was actually Ahmadinejad quoting the Ayatollah Khomeini) was certainly belligerent, it was not a threat. In any case, the Iranian president does not have the power to back any of this up and both history and current actions indicate that Iran's political elite, which disapproves of Ahmadinejad in any case, [has not changed its historically defensive orientation](#).

For a more detailed exposition of the tensions with Iran, [click here](#).

## SEEKING WAR

### AHMADINEJAD : WHAT DID HE SAY?

#### **Anti-Semitism. Don't settle for imitations.**

"The cleanliness of this people, moral and otherwise, I must say, is a point in itself. By their very exterior you could tell that these were no lovers of water, and, to your distress, you often knew it with your eyes closed. ... Added to this, there was their unclean dress and their generally unheroic appearance. ... Was there any form of filth or profligacy, particularly in cultural life, without at least one Jew involved in it? ... nine tenths of all literary filth, artistic trash, and theatrical idiocy can be set to the account of a people ... a people under whose parasitism the whole of honest humanity is suffering, today more than ever: the Jews."

Now who can be the author of such abominable anti-semitism? a) Hasan Nasrallah, leader of Hezbollah in Lebanon;

b) John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, authors of "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy"; c) Osama bin

Laden; d)Jimmy Carter; e)Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, President of Iran; f)Norman Finkelstein, author of "The Holocaust Industry".

Each one has been condemned as anti-Semitic. Are you having a problem deciding?

Oh, excuse me, I forgot one -- g)Adolf Hitler.[1] Does that make it easier? I'll bet some of you were thinking it must have been Ahmadinejad.

The Webster's Dictionary defines "anti-Semite" as "One who discriminates against or is hostile to or prejudiced against Jews." Notice that Israel is not mentioned.

The next time a critic of Israeli policies is labeled "anti-semitic" think of this definition, think of Adolf's charming way of putting it, then closely examine what the accused has actually said or written.

It may, however, be past the time for such a rational, intellectual pursuit; ultra-heated polarization reigns supreme with anything concerning the Middle East, particularly Israel.

In March, at a conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in Washington, one of the speakers, an American "Christian Zionist", asserted: "It is 1938, Iran is Germany and Ahmadinejad is the new Hitler." The audience responded with a standing ovation, one of seven for his talk.[2]

Then, in May, former Israeli Prime-Minister and current Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu declared that "It's 1938 and Iran is Germany. And Iran is racing to arm itself with atomic bombs. ... [While Ahmadinejad] denies the Holocaust he is preparing another Holocaust for the Jewish state." [3]

Not to be outdone in semi-hysterical propaganda, Israel's president, Shimon Peres, has compared an Iranian nuclear bomb to a "flying concentration camp". [4]

So why hasn't Iran at least started its holocaust by killing or throwing into concentration camps its own Jews, an estimated 30,000 in number? These are Iranian Jews who have representation in Parliament and who have been free for many years to emigrate to Israel but have chosen not to do so.

For your further apocalyptic enjoyment here are a couple more of Zionism's finest envoys speaking about Iran. Former Speaker of the House in the US Congress, Newt Gingrich: "Three nuclear weapons is a second Holocaust. We have enemies who are quite explicit in their desire to destroy us. They say it publicly, on television, on Web sites. [They are] fully as determined as Nazi Germany, more determined than the Soviet Union, and these enemies will kill us the first chance they get." [5]

And Norman Podhoretz, leading neo-conservative editor of Commentary magazine, in an article entitled "The Case for Bombing Iran": "Like Hitler, [Ahmadinejad] is a revolutionary whose objective is to overturn the going international system and to replace it in the fullness of time with a new order dominated by Iran and ruled by the religio-political culture of Islamofascism. ... The plain and brutal truth is that if Iran is to be prevented from developing a nuclear arsenal, there is no alternative to the actual use of military force -- any more than there was an alternative to force if Hitler was to be stopped in 1938." [6]

Though so often condemned, Hitler actually arrived at a number of very perceptive insights into how the world worked. One of them was this:

"The great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather than consciously and purposely evil ... therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds, they more easily fall a victim to a big lie than to a little one, since they themselves lie in little things, but would be ashamed of lies that were too big." [7]

Ahmadinejad arrived in New York September 24 to address the United Nations. At Columbia University he was introduced by the school's president as a man who appeared to lack "intellectual courage", had a "fanatical mindset", and may be "astonishingly undereducated". [8] How many people in the audience, I wonder, looked around to see where George W. was sitting.

"If I were the president of a university, I would not have invited him. He's a holocaust denier," said Hillary Clinton, once again fearlessly challenging the Bush administration's propaganda. [9]

The above is but a small sample of the hatred and anger spewed forth against Ahmadinejad for several years now. A number of people on the American left, who should know better, have joined this chorus. I therefore would like to repeat, and update, part of something I wrote in this report last December, which was entitled "Designer Monsters".

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is a man seemingly custom-made for the White House in its endless quest for enemies with whom to scare Congress, the American people, and the world, in order to justify the unseemly behavior of the empire. The Iranian president, we are told, has declared that he wants to "wipe Israel off the map". He has said that "the Holocaust is a myth". He held a conference in Iran for "Holocaust deniers". And his government passed a new law requiring Jews to wear a yellow insignia, à la the Nazis. On top of all that, he's aiming to build nuclear bombs, one of which would surely be aimed at Israel. What right-thinking person would not be scared by such a man?

However, like with all such designer monsters made bigger than life during the Cold War and since by Washington, the truth about Ahmadinejad is a bit more complicated. According to people who know Farsi, the Iranian leader has never said anything about "wiping Israel off the map". In his October 29, 2005 speech, when he reportedly first made the remark, the word "map" does not even appear. According to the translation of Juan Cole, American professor of Modern Middle East and South Asian History, Ahmadinejad said that "the regime occupying Jerusalem must vanish from the page of time." His remark, said Cole, "does not imply military action or killing anyone at all"[10], which of course is what would make the remark sound threatening.

At the December 2006 conference in Teheran ("Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision"), the Iranian president said: "The Zionist regime will be wiped out soon, the same way the Soviet Union was, and humanity will achieve freedom." [11] Obviously, the man is not calling for any kind of violent attack upon Israel, for the dissolution of the Soviet Union took place peacefully.

Moreover, in June 2006, subsequent to Ahmadinejad's controversial speech, Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, stated: "We have no problem with the world. We are not a threat whatsoever to the world, and the world knows it. We will never start a war. We have no intention of going to war with any state." [12]

As for the Holocaust myth, I have yet to read or hear words from Ahmadinejad saying simply, clearly, unambiguously, and unequivocally that he thinks that what we know as the Holocaust never happened. He has instead commented about the peculiarity and injustice of a Holocaust which took place in Europe resulting in a state for the Jews in the Middle East instead of in Europe. Why are the Palestinians paying a price for a German crime? he asks. He argues that Israel and the United States have exploited the memory of the Holocaust for their own purposes. And he wonders about the accuracy of the number of Jews -- six million -- allegedly killed in the Holocaust, as have many other people of all political stripes, including Holocaust survivors like Italian author Primo Levi. (The much publicized World War One atrocities which turned out to be false made the public very skeptical of the Holocaust claims for a long time after World War Two.) Ahmadinejad further asks why European researchers have been imprisoned for questioning certain details about the Holocaust.

Which of this deserves to be labeled "Holocaust denial"?

The conference gave a platform to various points of view, including six members of Jews United Against Zionism, at least two of whom were rabbis. One was Ahron Cohen, from London, who declared: "There is no doubt whatsoever, that during World War 2 there developed a terrible and catastrophic policy and action of genocide perpetrated by Nazi Germany against the Jewish People." He also said that "the Zionists make a great issue of the Holocaust in order to further their illegitimate philosophy and aims," indicating as well that the figure of six million Jewish victims is debatable. The other rabbi was Moshe David Weiss, who told the delegates: "We don't want to deny the killing of Jews in World War II, but Zionists have given much higher figures for how many people were killed. They have used the Holocaust as a device to justify their oppression." His group rejects the creation of Israel on the grounds that it violates Jewish religious law in that a Jewish state can't exist until the return of the Messiah. [13]

Another speaker was Shiraz Dossa, professor of political science at St. Francis Xavier University in Canada. In an interview after the conference, he described himself as an anti-imperialist and an admirer of Noam Chomsky, and said that he "was invited because of my expertise as a scholar in the German-Jewish area, as well as my studies in the Holocaust. ... I have nothing to do with Holocaust denial, not at all." His talk, he said, was "about the war on terrorism, and how the Holocaust plays into it. ... There was no pressure at all to say anything, and people there had different views." [14]

Clearly, the conference -- which the White House called "an affront to the entire civilized world" [15] -- was not set up to be a forum for people to deny that the Holocaust literally never took place at all.

As to the yellow star story of May 2006 -- that was a complete fabrication by a prominent Iranian-American neo-conservative author, Amir Taheri.

Ahmadinejad, however, is partly to blame for his predicament. When asked directly about the Holocaust and other controversial matters he usually declines to give explicit answers of "yes" or "no". I interpret this as his prideful refusal to accede to the wishes of what he regards as a hostile Western interviewer asking hostile questions. The Iranian president is also in the habit of prefacing certain remarks with "Even if the Holocaust happened ... ", a rhetorical device we all use in argument and discussion, but one which can not help but reinforce the doubts people have about his views. However, when Ahmadinejad himself asks, as he often has, "Why should the Palestinians have to pay for something that happened in Europe?" he does not get a clear answer.

In any event, in the question and answer session following his talk at Columbia, the Iranian president said: "I'm not saying that it [the Holocaust] didn't happen at all. This is not the judgment that I'm passing here." That should put the matter to rest. But of course it won't. Two days later, September 26, a bill (H. R. 3675) was introduced in Congress "To prohibit Federal grants to or contracts with Columbia University", to punish the school for inviting Ahmadinejad to speak. The bill's first "finding" states that "Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has called for the destruction of the State of Israel, a critical ally of the United States."

That same day, comedian Jay Leno had great fun ridiculing Ahmadinejad for denying that the Holocaust ever happened "despite all the eye-witness accounts".

How long before the first linking of Iran with 9-11? Or has that already happened? How long before democracy and freedom bombs begin to fall upon the heads of the Iranian people? All the charges of anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial, along with other disinformation, are of course designed to culminate in this new crime against humanity.

I wonder, in discussing these matters, if I'm running the risk of once again being called "anti-Semitic" by some Internet readers. No one is safe from such charges these days. It should be noted that Hugo Chavez, president of Venezuela, was accused last year of anti-semitic behavior by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency of New York and the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, important members of the Israel lobby. The accusation was based on a highly egregious out-of-context reading of some remarks by Chavez.[16] One doesn't have to be particularly conspiracy minded to think that this was done in collusion with Bush administration officials. As the Reagan administration in 1983 flung charges of anti-Semitism against the Sandinista government of Nicaragua, led by Daniel Ortega, who heads it again today.[17] Stay tuned. Daniel, watch out.

One final thought. On the Democratic Party's failure to stand up to the Bush fascist tide. Here, from the first-person account of a German living under Hitler in the 1930s, his observation about the leading German political party, the Social Democrats, the Democratic Party of its time: The Social Democrats, he wrote, "had fought the election campaign of 1933 in a dreadfully humiliating way, chasing after the Nazi slogans and emphasizing that they were 'also nationalist'. ... In May, a month before they were finally dissolved, the Social Democratic faction in the Reichstag had unanimously expressed their confidence in Hitler and joined in the singing of the 'Horst Wessel Song,' the Nazi anthem. (The official parliamentary report noted: 'Unending applause and cheers, in the house and the galleries. The Reichschancellor [Hitler] turns to the Social Democratic faction and applauds.')[18]

## HOW DID THE US GET TO THIS POINT?

"A Culture of Violence" by Stephen Lendman

<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=72&ItemID=13882>

### SENATE WAR RESOLUTION

Lieberman-Kyl's Iran amendment passes.

<http://thinkprogress.org/2007/09/26/breaking-lieberman-kyls-iran-amendment-passes/>

(Hillary, Reid, and Pryor voted for it. Obama abstained. Lincoln opposed.)

This is an important piece on the implications:

Lieberman-Kyl vs. the Evidence

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-gareth-porter/liebermankyl-vs-the-evi\\_b\\_66020.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-gareth-porter/liebermankyl-vs-the-evi_b_66020.html)

## 4 SENATORIAL WARMONGERS

excerpt from National Review Online:

"Within the next few days, four senators will introduce legislation that faces these facts unflinchingly and calls on America to win.

The resolution an amendment to a defense appropriations bill is sponsored by Jon Kyl, Joseph Lieberman, Norm Coleman, and Lindsey Graham. It expresses the sense of the Senate that the U.S. should combat, contain, and roll back Iran's violent activities and destabilizing influence inside Iraq. It counsels doing so through the prudent and calibrated use of all instruments of [U.S. power], including diplomatic, economic, intelligence, **and military instruments**. It also urges the administration to designate the Revolutionary Guards a terrorist organization."

<http://article.nationalreview.com/print/?q=NzcyNGM1YjJjZDE0MzUwYWNmYTY5ZGM3YzI4Yzk5ZjI=>

[Discuss this story](#) [Print This Post](#) [E-Mail This Article](#)

Published on Wednesday, September 26, 2007

### Senate Approves Symbolic Rebuke of Iran

#### How did your US Senators Vote?

Click [here](#) for the roll call.

WASHINGTON — The Senate on Wednesday overwhelmingly approved a measure sending another rebuke to Tehran, this one aimed at sending a message to the Islamic regime to end military tactics targeting U.S. forces in Iraq.



The Senate on Wednesday overwhelmingly approved a measure sending another rebuke to Tehran, this one aimed at sending a message to the Islamic regime to end military tactics targeting U.S. forces in Iraq. It was sponsored by Sens. Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., and Joe Lieberman, D-Conn.

The measure's opponents, which include Sen. Jim Wehr

The vote came one day after Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad told international leaders gathered at the U.N. General Assembly that Iran only seeks a peaceful nuclear program, and said that the conversation on the Iranian nuclear program "is now closed."

The Senate, showing it was not convinced by Ahmadinejad's proclamations, approved the

**The measure's opponents, which include Sen. Jim Webb, D-Va., said the language is too open-ended, and could be construed as Senate authorization to use force against Iran.**

nonbinding measure on a 76-22 vote. It was sponsored by

Sens. Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., and Joe Lieberman, D-Conn.

The measure — an amendment to the Defense Authorization bill under consideration in the Senate — is in response to growing concerns over Iranian support for insurgent activity in Iraq. Military officials say Iranian weapons have been discovered in insurgent hands, and U.S. officials have captured agents with alleged Iranian ties.

The amendment calls on the State Department to designate Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as "a foreign terrorist organization." The designation would allowed for more economic sanctions to be set against the country.

The measure's opponents, which include Sen. Jim Webb, D-Va., said the language is too open-ended, and could be construed as Senate authorization to use force against Iran.

One portion of the amendment reads: "It is the Sense of the Senate ... that it should be the policy of the United States to combat, contain, and roll back the violent activities and destabilizing influence inside Iraq of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, its foreign facilitators such as Lebanese Hezbollah, and its indigenous Iraqi proxies."

"This proposal ... is Dick Cheney's fondest pipe dream. It's not a prescription for success. At best, it's a deliberate attempt to divert attention from a failed diplomatic policy. At worst, it could be read as a back-door method of ... gaining congressional validation for action without one hearing or without serious debate," Webb said Tuesday.

At the urging of Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin, Lieberman and Kyl took steps Tuesday to remove the most controversial parts of their measure.

Lieberman said Webb was off-base on his interpretation of his proposal.

"Our colleague (Webb) has given the darkest possible interpretation ... There is no intention of declaring war," Lieberman said.

The House on Tuesday also passed a measure calling for greater economic sanctions against Iran. That bill, passed on a 397-16 vote, would block foreign investment in Iran, especially its energy sector, and would bar the president from waiving U.S. sanctions.

The motions out of Congress come on a highly anticipated week in which President Bush and international foe Ahmadinejad appeared at the same podium, only hours apart at the U.N.'s annual meeting on Tuesday. The drama also followed a contentious appearance by Ahmadinejad at Columbia University in New York.

On Tuesday, Bush announced new sanctions against the government of Myanmar and called on world leaders to fight oppression from contries like

those of Iran. Ahmadinejad spoke at length about "arrogant powers" illegally imposing sanctions on his nation.

*FOX News' Trish Turner and The Associated Press contributed to this report.*

© 2007 FOX News Network, LLC

**The 'proxy war': UK troops are sent to Iranian border British soldiers return to action as tensions between US and Iran grow - Exclusive by Kim Sengupta in Baghdad Published: 12 September 2007 [http://news.independent.co.uk/world/middle\\_east/article2953462.ece](http://news.independent.co.uk/world/middle_east/article2953462.ece)**

British forces have been sent from Basra to the volatile border with Iran amid warnings from the senior US commander in Iraq that Tehran is fomenting a "proxy war".

In signs of a fast-developing confrontation, the Iranians have threatened military action in response to attacks launched from Iraqi territory while the Pentagon has announced the building of a US base and fortified checkpoints at the frontier.

The UK operation, in which up to 350 troops are involved, has come at the request of the Americans, who say that elements close to the Iranian regime have stepped up supplies of weapons to Shia militias in recent weeks in preparation for attacks inside Iraq.

The deployment came within a week of British forces leaving Basra Palace, their last remaining base inside Basra city, and withdrawing to the airport for a widely expected final departure from Iraq. Brigadier James Bashall, commander of 1 Mechanised Brigade, based at Basra said: "We have been asked to help at the Iranian border to stop the flow of weapons and I am willing to do so. We know the points of entry and I am sure we can do what needs to be done. The US forces are, as we know, engaged in the 'surge' and the border is of particular concern to them."

The mission will include the King's Royal Hussars battle group, 250 of whom were told at the weekend that they would be returning to the UK as part of a drawdown of forces in Iraq.

The operation is regarded as a high-risk strategy which could lead to clashes with Iranian-backed Shia militias or even Iranian forces and also leaves open the possibility of Iranian retaliation in the form of attacks against British forces at the Basra air base or inciting violence to draw them back into Basra city. Relations between the two countries are already fraught after the Iranian Revolutionary Guards seized a British naval party in the Gulf earlier this year.

The move came as General David Petraeus, the US commander in Iraq, and Ryan Crocker, the US ambassador to Iraq, made some of the strongest accusations yet by US officials about Iranian activity. General Petraeus spoke on Monday of a "proxy war" in Iraq, while Mr Crocker accused the Iranian government of "providing lethal capabilities to the enemies of the Iraqi state".

In an interview after his appearance before a congressional panel on Monday, General Petraeus strongly implied that it would soon be necessary to obtain authorisation to take action against Iran within its own

borders, rather than just inside Iraq. "There is a pretty hard look ongoing at that particular situation" he said.

The Royal Welsh battle group, with Challenger tanks and Warrior armoured vehicles, is conducting out regular exercises at the Basra air base in preparation for any re-entry into the city. No formal handover of Basra to the Iraqi government has yet taken place and the UK remains responsible for maintaining security in the region.

The Iraqi commander in charge of the southern part of the country, General Mohan al-Furayji, said he would not hesitate to call for British help if there was an emergency.

While previous US military action has been primarily directed against Sunni insurgents, it is Shia fighters, which the US accuses Iran of backing, who now account for 80 per cent of US casualties.

For the British military the move to the border is a change of policy. They had stopped patrols along the long border at Maysan despite US concerns at the time that the area would become a conduit for weapons into Iraq.

The decision to return to the frontier has been heavily influenced by the highly charged and very public dispute with the United States. British commanders feel that they cannot turn down the fresh American request for help after refusing to delay the withdrawal from Basra Palace. They also maintain that the operation will stop Iranian arms entering Basra.

Brigadier Bashall said: "We are not sitting here idly at the air bridge. The security of Basra is still our responsibility and we shall act where necessary. We are also prepared to restore order in Basra City if asked to do so."

The US decision to build fortifications at the Iranian border, after four years of presence in Iraq, shows, say American commanders, that the "Iranian threat" is now one of their main concerns.

Maj-Gen Rick Lynch, commander of the US Army's 3rd Infantry Division, said 48 Iranian-supplied roadside bombs had been used against his forces killing nine soldiers. "We've got a major problem with Iranian munitions streaming into Iraq. This Iranian interference is troubling and we have to stop it," he told The Wall Street Journal this week.

Meanwhile at a conference in Baghdad on regional co-operation, Iran claimed the US was supporting groups mounting attacks from Iraqi territory in the Kurdish north.

Said Jalili, Iran's deputy foreign minister, last night said: "I think [the US and its allies] are going to prevaricate with the truth because they know they have been defeated in Iraq and they have not been successful. And so they are going to put the blame on us, on the other side."

PROTEST, RESIST THE ATTACK

CODE PINK

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Nada Sehnaoui](mailto:nada@nadasehnaoui.com)

**To:** [nada@nadasehnaoui.com](mailto:nada@nadasehnaoui.com)

**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 8:00 AM

**Subject:** What you can do to STOP the NEXT WAR NOW!

September 26, 2007

Dear [Nada](#),



This week, everyone is buzzing about Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's visit to New York. [CODEPINK was outside](#) both his talk at Columbia and his address to the UN General Assembly. While we don't agree with many of the things he said, we want to remind everyone that

Ahmadinejad, doesn't represent the Iranian people just as President Bush doesn't represent us. So what do we as citizens do when our leadership fails us so miserably? **We rise up. We take action. We show that citizen diplomacy can be the voice of reason that forces leaders to talk to each other and prevent war.**

**CODEPINK has created a [Prevent War with Iran](#) page filled with simple, effective actions you can do to help stop the next war now. We are highlighting two of those actions this week:**

➤➤[Download our No War With Iran sign](#) and place it in your window at home and work, or carry it out on the street, to remind people that we have the power to prevent this war.

➤➤Write a Letter to the Editor, using [our sample letter](#) or your own heart-felt message, to make your desire for peace heard in a public forum.

We also urge you to call your Reps early and often (House and Senate, 202 224 3121) and tell them to **vote NO on bombing Iran**. There is some scary legislation on the table (especially the [Kyl-Lieberman amendment](#)) that could lead to an imminent attack; we need to quash it immediately.

Other actions on our [Iran page](#) include getting your town to pass a resolution encouraging diplomacy, not war, with Iran; inviting someone from our speakers bureau to speak about Iran in your community; going on a citizens' diplomacy trip to Iran; and signing our petitions to Congress and the UN Security Council.

Whichever actions you choose to take, be sure to educate yourself with [Phyllis Bennis' talking points about why we shouldn't attack Iran](#). The more we understand the issue, the more we'll be able to reach people, to change minds and prevent war.

**Thank you for helping us Stop the Next War Now!**

With ever-renewed determination and hope,  
[Dana, Desiree, Farida, Gael, Gayle, Jodie, Karin, Liz, Medea, Nancy, Pamela, Patricia, Rae, Samantha, and Vanessa](#)

P.S. Be a walking billboard for peace by wearing our [Stop the Next War Now shirts](#), available in unisex tees and [sheer jersey cap sleeves](#). And to learn even more strategies for how to prevent future conflict, order our book [Stop the Next War Now](#).

**ACTION ALERT!**

[Visit our Prevent War with Iran page](#)

[Download our No War With Iran sign to put in your window or hold on the street](#)

[Write a Letter to the Editor](#)

Call your Reps (House and Senate, 202 224 3121) and tell them to vote NO on bombing Iran



[unsubscribe from this list](#)

## AND WAR WITH IRAN DRAWS NEARER

[See my article on Mediachannel about the media coverage.](#) So far, largely uncovered is this development reported by Mike Hirsh:

What are we going to do about it?

Will the US attack Iran? Why not a sense of Congress vote against it? Why not a public outcry against the next horrendous, illegal, immoral, self-defeating war?

How can anyone vote for a Senate resolution seeking international doom? This story isn't covered at all. That's why the neocons feel (know?) they can act with impunity. I'm tired of playing defense and I'm tired of arguing about how best to protest / end a war that should never have started. I don't want to spend the next five or ten years protesting against another war we should work together to prevent. What are we doing about it now?

"Bush's Iran War Plans" By Matthew Rothschild, Editor, *The Progressive*, October 2007

He's got the war plans ready. A recent study by two British arms experts shows the magnitude of the assault that Bush could wage.

"The U.S. has made military preparations to destroy Iran's WMD, nuclear energy, regime, armed forces, state apparatus, and economic infrastructure within days, if not hours, of President George W. Bush giving the order," says the report by Dan Plesch, director of the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy at the University of London, and Martin Butcher, the former director of the British American Security Information Council.

"U.S. bombers and long-range missiles are ready today to destroy 10,000 targets in Iran in a few hours," the study says. "Such a strike would take 'shock and awe' to a new level."

It seems unbelievable that Bush would wage another war, given the disaster he has already created in Iraq. But it's only unbelievable if you assume Bush is sane, rational, and humane. If you consider that he is not in the reality-based community, then he could do just about anything. He's got Cheney whispering in one ear that he is the only President tough enough to take on the Iranians. And he thinks he's got God whispering in the other ear that he must rid the world of evil. With that peculiar iPod, Bush is raring to go.

"In the absence of an imminent threat (with the Iranians at least several years away from having a nuclear arsenal), the attack would be a unilateral act of war. If undertaken without formal Congressional declaration, it would be unconstitutional and merit the impeachment of the President."

â€” Zbigniew Brzezinski, Former National Security Adviser

### **Bush Administration War Plans directed against Iran**

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=20070916&articleId=6792>

From the What Can Be Done? Section of the article (no small order):

***To reverse the tide requires a massive campaign of networking and outreach to inform people across the land, nationally and internationally, in neighborhoods, workplaces, parishes, schools, universities, municipalities, on the dangers of a US sponsored war, which contemplates quite explicitly the use of thermonuclear weapons. The message should be loud and clear: As confirmed by the IAEA report, Iran is not the threat.***

***Debate and discussion must also take place within the Military and Intelligence community, particularly***

**with regard to the use of tactical nuclear weapons, within the corridors of the US Congress, in municipalities and at all levels of government.**

**Ultimately, the legitimacy of the political and military actors in high office must be challenged.**

**The corporate media also bears a heavy responsibility for the cover-up of US sponsored war crimes. It must also be forcefully challenged for its biased coverage of the Middle East war.**

**For the past two years, Washington has been waging a "diplomatic arm twisting" exercise with a view to enlisting countries into supporting its military agenda. It is essential that at the diplomatic level, countries in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America take a firm stance against the US military agenda.**

**What is needed is to break the conspiracy of silence, expose the media lies and distortions, confront the criminal nature of the US Administration and of those governments which support it, its war agenda as well as its so-called "Homeland Security agenda" which has already defined the contours of a police State.**

**The World is at the crossroads of the most serious crisis in modern history. The US has embarked on a military adventure, "a long war," which threatens the future of humanity**

**From Edrene M**

DEFENSE OF AHMADINEJAD AND IRAN BY IRANIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS .

**ISNA - Tehran**

Service: Foreign Policy

TEHARN, Sep. 25 (ISNA)-In response to the insulting remarks of the Columbia university president against Mahmoud Ahamadinejad, Iran's university presidents raised their objection to Lee Bollinger.

Ahmadinejad was elected in a free two-level election and by the nation's direct votes they announced in a letter to Lee Bollinger.

"Your insulting words to the president of 72 million people who have 7000 years of rich civilization and culture is embarrassing. Although apparently you have stated those hateful words under great pressure of the media it is disgraceful and surprising to see that the Media direct university president's words."

In this letter they have put 10 questions to Lee Bollinger with the purpose of clearing up the ambiguities between the two countries.

1-Why did American media put you under pressure to call off Ahmadinejad's speech at Columbia University? Why do they broadcast hours of programs and news against him and do not allow him to answer the accusations? Isn't it against freedom of speech?

2-Why did the U.S. government oust the nation-based government of Mosaddegh with the aid of Iran's dictator, Shah in 1953?

3-Why did the U.S. support Saddam who used chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers and even his own nation during the imposed war?

4-Why doesn't the U.S. recognize Palestine's government which was elected with Palestinian's vote? Why does it pressurize the Palestinian's government? Why is the U.S. against Iran's proposal on solving the 60-year old problems of Palestine through referendum?

5-Why couldn't the U.S. army find Bin Laden despite all of its equipments? How do you justify the old friendship between the



Bin Ladens and the Bushs and their cooperation on oil? How do you justify Bush's spoiling the investigations over the 9/11? 6-Why does the U.S. government back the terrorist group of Mujahedine Khalq Organization (MKO) while it has claimed responsibility over many bloody bombings in public places of Iran and Iraq? Why doesn't it allow the Iraqi government to evacuate the MKO base in Iraq?

7-Did the U.S. invade Iraq based on international vote and with the permission of international organizations? What was the real purpose of occupying Iraq which has left hundred thousands of its people dead? Where are the weapons of mass destruction which the U.S. claimed were stored in Iraq?

8-Why are the extremely undemocratic states with absolute monarchy regimes the U.S. best friends in the Middle East?

9-Why did the U.S. disagree with the "Middle East free of nuclear weapons project" issued in the board of governors while all countries agreed with it but Israel?

10-Why is the U.S. displeased with Iran and the IAEA agreement and why does it disagree with negotiations within the framework of international regulations for solving Iran's nuclear issue?

At the end they have announced that they were ready to host Columbia University president and other faculties who were interested in seeking the truth to know about this nation without the filtering of the West media.

End Item

News Code: 8607-02107

---

<<http://www.homestead.com/homefront/NethPhilAttack.html>>

<<http://radicalnotes.com/content/view/55/39>

<<http://rizalarchive.blogspot.com>>

<<http://www.countercurrents.org/juan150507.htm>

### **CONTACT YOUR CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES**

Meredith Oakley in *ADG* (8-26-07) writes encouragingly of citizen engagement, "Government: What We Make It." She quotes Ben Franklin among others on our system of government: Asked what kind of government we had, he replied: "A republic, if you can keep it." We, the People!

--Senator Blanche Lincoln: Web Site (they have contact links): [www.lincoln.senate.gov](http://www.lincoln.senate.gov);  
<http://www.lincoln.senate.gov/index.cfm>; <http://www.lincoln.senate.gov/webform.html>

Washington Office: 355 Dirksen Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510-0404

**Phone: (202) 224-4843 Fax: (202) 228-1371.**

**Fayetteville office: 251-1380.** Lincoln's staff is better informed than Boozman's (see below), but obviously (her vote to join Bush in appropriating \$95 billion more to keep the occupation going and her vote to further extend warrantless phone taps)) they need a lot of education. **Call her and her staff.**

#### **Getting to her office:**

Northwestern Regional Office

4 South College Avenue, Suite 205, Google Maps puts the marker 308 feet south of Meadow Street.

Fayetteville, AR 72701

(479) 251-1224; FAX (479) 251-1410

**Staff members:**

Community Affairs Specialist: John Hicks, Tamika S. Edwards and Kim Mullen,  
Office Manager\Special Projects Coordinator Cydney Pearce

**State Central Office**

912 West Fourth Street

Little Rock, AR 72201

TEL: (501) 375-2993

FAX: (501) 375-7064

Donna Kay Yeargan

State Director

Rod Sweetman

Arkansas Military Liaison\Caseworker (Academy Appointments, Immigration, Military, Prisons (Federal), and Veterans)

--Senator Mark Pryor: Web Site (see contact link): [www.pryor.senate.gov](http://www.pryor.senate.gov) ;

<http://pryor.senate.gov/contact/> Pryor has no office in NWA, so call or write him and his staff in DC: **Washington Office: 217 Russell Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510-0403.**

**Phone: (202) 224-2353 Fax: (202) 228-0908**

Main District Office: 500 Pres. Clinton Ave., Suite 401, Little Rock, AR 72201.

**Phone: (501) 324-6336 Fax: (501) 324-5320.**

--Congressman John Boozman, District 3, 12 counties from Benton to Washington

**Lowell office: 479-725-0400.** 213 W. Monroe, Suite K, 72745. Boozman's new office in Lowell is located at 213 West Monroe in Lowell between I 540 and Business 71. Go there, talk to Boozman's staff members. They need your explanation of reality and values. To reach that office take Exit 78 off I - 540 and go east on Hwy 264 which is also West Monroe. The office is in the Puppy Creek Plaza, past the McDonald's on the right. His suite is in the back of the complex to the left. Or write or call. **Ms. McClure** is Assistant Chief of Staff for the Lowell office, Ms. Breazeal focuses on gangs, and Ms. Stacy Davis is constituent staff member.

**Ft. Smith office: 479-782-7787;** 30 South 6th St. Rm 240, Ft. Smith 72901.

**Harrison office: 870-741-6900;** 402 N. Walnut, Suite 210, Harrison 72601.

**DC address: 1708 Longworth House Office Bldng., Washington, DC 20515; 202-225-4301. Leslie Parker, appointments secretary: 202-225-4301.** (Or she was, let me know if it's now someone else.)

END OF NEWSLETTER #5 ON IRAN

Dick Bennett

[jbennet@uark.edu](mailto:jbennet@uark.edu)

(479) 442-4600

2582 Jimmie Ave.

Fayetteville, AR 72703