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STOP THE ATTACK ON IRAN. No peacemaking is as important as opposing and trying to prevent a war. Speak up, write, call, donate, don’t give up on peace.
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THANK YOU AGAIN CONG. BARBARA LEE

We can't make another mistake like the Iraq War.

Dear Art,

As we approach the ninth anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, we once again see dangerous momentum for another irresponsible, unnecessary and costly war — this time with Iran.

Fear-mongering and propaganda aside, Iran is not an imminent threat to the United States — and we haven't yet exhausted all avenues for diplomacy to ensure Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon.

But as a result of the Iranian Revolution over 30 years ago, current law makes it very difficult for American diplomats to talk directly to representatives of the Iranian government.

That is why Congresswoman Barbara Lee has introduced legislation that, in her words, "directs the President to appoint a Special Envoy for Iran to ensure that all diplomatic avenues are pursued to avoid a war with Iran and to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon."¹

Click here to automatically sign the petition. Tell your member of Congress to co-sponsor Rep. Lee's bill to avoid an unnecessary and costly war with Iran.

Whether or not you think your representative will co-sponsor the bill, we need you to speak out.

Unfortunately, while the American people are opposed to another war of choice,² those pushing for war have been far more vocal and organized than the rest of us.

Our friends on the Hill have told us that congressional offices are hearing from people who want us to go to war, but not from those who would like to see a diplomatic solution.

Not only will your petition signature signal support for Rep. Lee's bill, it will also ensure that those howling for war are not met with a deafening silence on our side.
Our allies in Congress will know their constituents want them to remain steadfast, and other lawmakers will be put on notice that their constituents reject the dangerous saber-rattling that might bring our nation to the brink of war.

We can't afford to remain a silent majority. We must push back on the ever-increasing clamor for war.

Click here to automatically sign the petition. Tell your member of Congress to co-sponsor Rep. Lee's bill to avoid an unnecessary and costly war with Iran.

While there are no easy solutions to addressing the challenges we face with Iran, it is imperative that we pursue diplomacy.

We know all too well the consequences of starting an unnecessary war.

The war in Iraq was a catastrophic mistake and a tremendous moral failure.

But right now with Iran, all options are on the table except direct negotiations. That's a recipe for another needless war.

We can't wait for the first bombs to drop. We need to speak out now.

Tell your member of Congress to co-sponsor Rep. Lee's bill to avoid an unnecessary and costly war with Iran. Click the link below to automatically sign the petition:

http://act.credoaction.com/r/?r=5541954&id=36805-25501-RTDV7vx&t=10

Thank you for speaking out to stop another needless war.

Matt Lockshin, Campaign Manager
CREDO Action from Working Assets

1. Dear Colleague letter from Barbara Lee, dated 3-7-12
“Prevent an Iranian bomb by using peaceful means --NOT a military attack”

Dear friends,

The Shalom Center is joining with Tikkun magazine and the Network of Spiritual Progressives to oppose the pressure now rising in parts of America for a military attack on Iran. We ask you to help publish an ad to that effect in the New York Times.

You can view the ad's content and make a donation by clicking here.

Why is this urgent now? The Israeli press reports that when Prime Minister Netanyah meets with President Obama next week, he will push hard for the US to OK an Israeli attack.

Some Americans are calling for an attack out of genuine -- we think very badly mistaken -- fear. Some are as obsessed with brandishing US Military might as they -- the same people! -- were when they brought on the disastrous US attack on Iraq. Others are hoping to win political points and undermine the President in an election year.

So it is urgent for Americans to make clear that a majority of us see that a military attack on Iran would bring on disaster, and urge the President to resist all pressure to approve such an attack.

Why do we oppose such an attack? In a nutshell, because we think it --

(1) might delay but would not prevent Iran from making nuclear weapons; indeed, just the reverse: It would probably convince Iran's yet-undecided leadership that it must do so to deter future attacks;

(2) would bring retaliatory violence down on the heads of millions of Israelis and probably of Europeans and Americans as well;

(3) would definitively enrage the newly populist/ activist Arab nations against Israel and the US, utterly preventing peacemaking in the Middle East and dropping US influence in most Arab and Muslim states to zero;
(4) would push all grass-roots campaigns for change in the region to give up their criticisms of their own governments and unite against a foreign foe -- radically undermining both the efforts of Iranians to oppose their repressive government, and the efforts of Israelis to organize for a fairer, more just society;

(5) would risk that even governments with no desire for outright disastrous wars might find themselves embroiled in escalation into war as many governments did in 1914;

(5) would risk repeating the disastrous mistake of the Iraq War, not only failing overseas but making utterly impossible the investment in meeting domestic civilian needs that American society desperately thirsts for;

(6) would shatter international law against preventive war, esp. when there is no imminent threat, and tear to shreds our efforts to weave a fabric of peaceful community in the world.

As Martin Buber said in 1919, criticizing the early Russian Communists' use of the "red terror" against their opponents -- "I don't know what it means to claim they will achieve good ends by using evil means -- but I can tell you this: the means we use in the present will become the goals we actually reach in the future." The history of the Soviet Union proved him right.

THE GOAL OF PEACE CAN BEST BE ACHIEVED BY USING PEACEFUL MEANS.

For the sake of peace, it is desirable to prevent Iran from making nuclear weapons. How? The US might offer Iran economic carrots -- not only sticks -- as the US is doing with North Korea. The US might work out ways to treat the Iranian people with the dignity and respect it craves. The US and Israel and the whole Arab/Muslim region might explore the possibility of a nuclear-free Middle East, in the context of a regional peace settlement and security for Israel.

Whether you agree with these specific explorations or not, the immediate need is to oppose a military attack on Iran. So please click here where you can donate to make this ad possible.

https://salsa.democracyinaction.org/o/525/p/salsa/donation/common/public/?donate_page_KEY=8382

With blessings of shalom, salaam, solh (in Farsi), peace, healing, wholeness -- Arthur

The Shalom Center / web: www.theshalomcenter.org / email: office@theshalomcenter.org

mail: 6711 Lincoln Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19119, USA / tel: (215) 844-8494

SWANSON, DON'T IRAQ IRAN
RootsAction, David Swanson info@rootsaction.org 9:58 AM (16 minutes ago) ʁjbennet
Dear Dick,

A full page ad in yesterday's Washington Post quotes former top U.S. military officials opposing an attack on Iran.

But Israel's conservative government wants an attack, ...and President Obama's speech at the AIPAC conference on Sunday was highly praised by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Tell President Obama: Not Another War!

AIPAC is the powerful "Israel-right-or-wrong" lobby and it is backing Senate legislation (authored by Lindsay Graham and Joe Leiberman) that seeks to require an attack.

Meanwhile, President Obama wants to increase to $3.1 billion the weapons that you and I buy for Israel next year, while continuing to protect Israel from accountability at the United Nations or elsewhere.

Tell Congress and the President to avoid another war, and to do so right now.

A military attack on Iran would be disastrous for Iranians, Israelis, the region and the world -- perhaps even worse than the Iraq invasion.

This time, unlike a decade ago, let's heed informed voices of restraint (like the signers of the Post ad) and not the frenzied voices of war.

Don't Iraq Iran!

Signed,

Aimee, David, Jeff, Sarah and the Roots Action Team

Resources

A Tiny Revolution: Openly Lying the World into War Is Always an Option

Washington Post Ad: Mr. President: Say No to War of Choice with Iran
March 6, 2012

Dear Dick,

Yesterday, eight former officials, including a Bush administration National Intelligence Council chairman, a former national intelligence officer for the Near East and South Asia, Colin Powell’s chief of staff and five retired generals wrote to President Obama:

The U.S. military is the most formidable military force on earth. But not every challenge has a military solution… Preventing a nuclear armed Iran is rightfully your priority and your red line. **Fortunately, diplomacy has not been exhausted and peaceful solutions are still possible.** Military action at this stage is not only unnecessary, it is dangerous – for the United States and for Israel. We urge you to resist the pressure for a war of choice with Iran. **Please write President Obama today, urging him to heed this advice and pursue diplomacy with Iran.**

The letter also included important quotes from current national security officials, including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey and Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, outlining the disastrous consequences of a military strike on Iran.

Experts agree that a strike has little chance of success, and yet GOP candidates continue to trip over themselves to prove that they are more willing to use military force than their opponents.

Just today, Mitt Romney attempted to distinguish himself from the President’s current course of action, **arguing that** if he were President, he would combine a diplomatic approach “with a military option that will persuade the ayatollahs to abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Mitt might not realize, but this is exactly the path President Obama has chosen.

“My policy here is not going to be one of containment,” Mr. Obama said before his meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu on Monday. “My policy is prevention of Iran obtaining nuclear weapons.” He added, “When I say all options are on the table, I mean it.”

Other candidates have been even more inflammatory than Romney. Newt Gingrich has said that if Iran took actions to disrupt the flow of oil through the Straits of Hormuz the U.S. should “eliminate” the Iranian government.

We encourage you to take a few minutes and write President Obama, urge him to stay the course and push for a diplomatic solution over military action.

**Tell the President that you support his decision to press for a diplomatic solution in Iran.**

We appreciate all that you do. Thank you again, John Isaacs and Guy Stevens

---

Make sure you receive livableworld.org email updates. Add advocacy@chw.org to your approved senders list.
“Upping the Ante in Iran Propaganda—A nuclear threat—and terrorism too!”

By Peter Hart

Claims that Iran has a nuclear weapons program are allegations, not facts (Extra!, 1/12)—but are treated as established background material in the corporate media: “The president, as you know, has been trying to force Iran to give up its nuclear weapons program,” explains CBS Evening News anchor Scott Pelley (2/6/12). The Washington Post editorializes (1/11/12) that Iran’s “drive for nuclear weapons continues.”

At the end of January, another provocative claim emerged: Iran was ready to unleash terrorism against the United States.

ABC World News (1/31/12) featured a blatantly propagandistic report on the Iranian threat. “America’s top spy warns that Iran is willing to launch a terrorist strike inside the U.S.,” announced anchor Diane Sawyer at the top of the program. “We’ll tell you his evidence.”

The ABC report was actually very light on evidence, but heavy on incendiary allegations from government officials—without the skeptical scrutiny that should be journalism’s primary function. The report was pegged to that day’s Senate testimony by James Clapper, director of national intelligence, who told lawmakers that the U.S. intelligence community believes that Iran may be “now more willing to conduct an attack in the United States in response to real or perceived U.S. actions that threaten the regime.”

Sawyer amplified Clapper’s allegation by setting up the report with the assertion that Iran is “more determined than ever to launch an attack on U.S. soil.” Correspondent Martha Raddatz, claiming that the “the saber-rattling coming from Iran has been constant,” told viewers that Clapper delivered “a new bracing warning.... Iran may be more ready than ever to launch terror attacks inside the United States.”

In its effort to substantiate Clapper’s claim, ABC could provide only the flimsiest evidence: Raddatz announced that Clapper “pointed specifically to last year’s plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and to reports that Iran has been supporting Hezbollah cells in Latin America.”

From the beginning, there have been serious questions about the ambassadorial assassination plot (IPS, 10/17/11; FAIR Blog, 10/12/11). As University of Michigan professor Juan Cole (Informed Comment, 10/12/11) pointed out, the claim that the Iranian government tried to hire a Mexican drug gang to kill a diplomat “makes no sense.” The Wall Street Journal (2/1/12) quoted Karim Sadjadpour of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace saying, “If that’s the only data point, I think it’s a stretch to conclude that the regime is now looking to commit acts of terror on U.S. soil.” But in ABC’s report, it’s unquestioned fact.

The idea that Iran is supporting Hezbollah cells in Latin America has been challenged as well—as PolitiFact noted (11/22/11), the State Department determined there are actually no such groups in our hemisphere. Still, ABC milked the propaganda value of Latin America, running footage of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad visiting other Official Enemies of the United States: “Ahmadinejad
recently traveled there, meeting leaders like Hugo Chávez of Venezuela and Fidel Castro who have little love for the U.S.” (Note: The original ABC broadcast had Ahmadinejad meeting with farmworker organizer César Chávez).

ABC also illustrated the supposed Iranian threat with stock footage of weaponry and soldiers from an Iranian military parade—suggesting without spelling it out that viewers ought to feel threatened by a military force roughly \( \frac{1}{40} \)th the size of the United States’ armed forces.

ABC may have laid the propaganda on thicker than most, but few could resist running with the notion that Iran is an emerging threat to the United States. CNN host Wolf Blitzer (1/31/12) declared, “Key U.S. intelligence officials now warning Iran may be preparing to launch a terrorist attack right inside the United States.” On NBC Nightly News (1/31/12), anchor Brian Williams announced: “Iran’s threat. Not just the nuclear program. Tonight, U.S. intelligence warns Iran may be prepared to strike on American soil.”

On ABC’s Good Morning America (2/3/12), Raddatz was still hitting that point, saying that “what is really worrying” U.S. officials is “an attack on the homeland.” As she explained:

I have never heard the intelligence chief say anything like that, that Iran could actually move into America, that there might be sleepers here willing to attack if Israel attacks Iran. That’s why there’s so much concern.

Some pundits, like Newsweek’s Niall Ferguson (2/13/12), could hardly wait for war:

War is an evil. But sometimes a preventive war can be a lesser evil than a policy of appeasement. The people who don’t yet know that are the ones still in denial about what a nuclear-armed Iran would end up costing us all. It feels like the eve of some creative destruction.

But even those with less obvious glee for war still managed to echo the logic of the Iraq invasion. ABC’s Raddatz explained on the February 3 World News broadcast:

Well, I think it could be avoided, but you have to say it’s up to Iran. Israel has to see something concrete. They have to see Iran shutting down its nuclear weapons program.

Iran must, in other words, give up the thing they claim does not exist.

SIDEBAR: Disappearing Weapons

On January 5 the New York Times reported on “a recent assessment by the International Atomic Energy Agency that Iran’s nuclear program has a military objective.” Contrary to much of what you might pick up from the corporate media, there is no such IAEA report.
The *Times* promptly changed the Web version of the article—removing the relevant paragraph but without noting the error. *Times* public editor Arthur Brisbane (1/10/12) agreed with FAIR activists who wrote to the paper: “The *Times* hasn’t corrected the story but it should, because this is a case of when a shorthand phrase doesn’t do justice to a nuanced set of facts.”

It’s one thing to quietly delete an error. The PBS *NewsHour* did something very different—editing out an inconvenient fact.

*NewsHour* correspondent Margaret Warner told viewers on January 9 that

the Iranian government insists that its nuclear activities are for peaceful energy purposes only, an assertion disputed by the U.S. and its allies. On CBS yesterday, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta repeated international demands that Iran stop enriching uranium.

Viewers then saw Panetta saying this:

But we know that they’re trying to develop a nuclear capability, and that’s what concerns us. And our red line to Iran is, do not develop a nuclear weapon. That’s a red line for us. They need to know that, if they take that step, that they’re going to get stopped.

What came before the word “But”? Panetta had said this: “Are they trying to develop a nuclear weapon? No.”

So Panetta’s statement—that Iran is not building a nuclear weapon—is being used to argue that the United States disputes Iran’s long-standing contention that it is not building a nuclear weapon.

That was how FAIR saw it (*FAIR Blog*, 1/10/12), and PBS ombud Michael Getler agreed (1/12/12), up to a point. Getler called it a “good journalistic catch,” then argued that

the logical understanding that NewsHour viewers—and anyone who has been following this subject—would draw from the portion of the Panetta quote that was used is that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon but that they are developing a “nuclear capability” and that the U.S. warning, as Panetta expressed it, is not to cross “our red line” and actually develop a weapon.

So viewers who are paying close attention to Iran coverage (the accurate portions, that is) would know that when Panetta was saying, “We know that they’re trying to develop a nuclear capability,” he meant that they were not trying to develop a nuclear weapon—even though the program had set up his statement by saying the U.S. doesn’t believe that, and edited out his very straightforward explanation of what is actually known about the state of Iran’s nuclear program.

It’s a curious argument. One of the things that made Panetta’s comment so revealing was that it represented a break from the usual chatter about Iran—even within the Obama administration. That’s precisely what made it newsworthy. PBS seems to think its viewers should have to read between the lines in order to arrive at the accurate assessment about Iran’s nuclear program that was left on the cutting room
“IRAN VS. HONDURAS” by Michael Corcoran & Stephen Maher.
*Extra! (August 2009).* Opponents of Iran’s government, protestors in the streets, are championed by US mainstream media. When the U.S.-backed Honduran army abducted the elected president, accused of being a leftist aligned with Chavez of Venezuela, and the people demonstrated for his reinstatement, mainstream US media were quiet. [This is an example of political information control in the US which I demonstrate in *Control of Information in the U.S. and Control of the Media in the U.S.*]

PAY ATTENTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE
Climate change calls all nations to focus their energy and money on mitigating and adapting. The US needs a ManhattanApolloProject. But the US illegal, unnecessary, brutal wars distract us and deplete our response to extreme weather. An aspect not often discussed: Our wars have been illegal; an attack on Iran would be another Iraq (Guatemala, Panama, Grenada, etc.) as Swanson stresses. That is, the wars, this war, violate the UN Charter, which prohibits not only invasions but threats of attack. The Charter is the bedrock of international law regarding national wars. If we are to develop international laws for coping with warming, the US must cease shredding the UN Charter. See Chomsky’s essay next. Thanks, Dick

CHOMSKY
Noam Chomsky, “What Are Iran's Intentions?”
Chomsky writes: "The media resound with warnings about a likely Israeli attack on Iran while the US hesitates, keeping open the option of aggression – thus again routinely violating the UN Charter, the foundation of international law. The people of the world, however, tend to see matters rather differently."
READ MORE http://readersupportednews.org/opinion2/290-139/10279-what-are-irans-intentions