

CounterPunch

JAN. 16-31, 2010

ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

VOL. 17, NO. 2

Iran and Russia Battle U.S. - Sanctioned Heroin Plague They Fight Alone

By Peter Lee

For Iran, the struggle against Afghan opium is a national epic, inspiring the expenditure of thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of dollars to build a massive, 1,000-kilometer bulwark of troops, berms, and 14-foot-deep trenches against smuggled drugs on its eastern border. At the same time, Russia's leadership considers the war against Afghan heroin as part of its struggle to preserve the Russian nation against demographic and social collapse. However, thanks to America's desire to isolate and ignore the regimes in Tehran and Moscow, they are forced to fight their battles alone.

Because Afghanistan's burgeoning drug industry is one of the few effective levers available to Washington in a chaotic warzone that has resisted all efforts to pacify it, the Obama administration has taken an apparent back step in its Afghan control efforts, at Russia and Iran's expense. And there are signs that Washington regards the losses and suffering inflicted upon its antagonists in Iran and Russia as acceptable "collateral damage" – or, perhaps, even a fringe benefit – of its war in Afghanistan.

Both Iran and Russia regard Washington's blithe tolerance of the Afghan opium industry with resentment and despair. The resultant stew of anger, suspicion and antagonism – and also addiction, crime, and insurgency – will probably poison Central Asia long after the United States has closed the books on its mission in Afghanistan.

Americans are aware that Afghan opium production has skyrocketed since the U.S.-led invasion of 2002, soaring from 185 tons in the last year of Taliban rule (an artificial low: opium production

LEE CONTINUED ON PAGE 5 COL. 2

How the CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University Campuses Silent Coup

By David Price

Throughout the 1970s, '80s and '90s, independent grassroots movements to keep the Central Intelligence Agency off American university campuses were broadly supported by students, professors and community members. The ethos of this movement was captured in Ami Chen Mills' 1990 book, *C.I.A. Off Campus*. Mills' book gave voice to the multiple reasons why so many academics opposed the presence of the CIA on university campuses: reasons that ranged from the recognition of secrecy's antithetical relationship to academic freedom, to political objections to the CIA's use of torture and assassination, to efforts on campuses to recruit professors and students, and the CIA's longstanding role in undermining democratic movements around the world.

For those who lived through the dramatic revelations of the congressional inquiries in the 1970s, documenting the CIA's routine involvement in global and domestic atrocities, it made sense to construct institutional firewalls between an agency so deeply linked with these actions and educational institutions dedicated to at least the promise of free inquiry and truth. But the last dozen years have seen retirements and deaths among academics who had lived through this history and had been vigilant about keeping the CIA off campus; furthermore, with the attacks of 9/11 came new campaigns to bring the CIA back onto American campuses.

Henry Giroux's 2007 book, *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial Academic Complex*, details how two decades of shifts in university funding brought increased intrusions by corporate and military forces onto university. After 9/11, the in-

telligence agencies pushed campuses to see the CIA and campus secrecy in a new light, and, as traditional funding sources for social science research declined, the intelligence community gained footholds on campuses.

Post-9/11 scholarship programs like the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP) and the Intelligence Community Scholarship Programs today sneak unidentified students with undisclosed links to intelligence agencies into university classrooms (both were first exposed by this author here in CounterPunch in 2005). A new generation of so-called flagship programs have quietly taken root on campuses, and, with each new flagship, our universities are transformed into vessels of the militarized state, as academics learn to sublimate unease.

The programs most significantly linking the CIA with university campuses are the "Intelligence Community Centers for Academic Excellence" (ICCAE, pronounced "Icky") and the "Intelligence Advance Research Projects Activity". Both programs use universities to train intelligence personnel by piggybacking onto existing educational programs. Campuses that agree to see these outsourced programs as nonthreatening to their open educational and research missions are rewarded with funds and useful contacts with the intelligence agencies and other less tangible benefits.

Even amid the militarization prevailing in America today, the silence surrounding this quiet installation and spread of programs like ICCAE is extraordinary. In the last four years, ICCAE has gone further in bringing government intelligence organizations openly to American university campuses than any previous

PRICE CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

intelligence initiative since World War Two. Yet, the program spreads with little public notice, media coverage, or coordinated multicampus resistance.

When the New Infiltration Began

In 2004, a \$250,000 grant was awarded to Trinity Washington University by the Intelligence Community for the establishment of a pilot “Intelligence Community Center of Academic Excellence” program. Trinity was, in many ways, an ideal campus for a pilot program. For a vulnerable, tuition-driven, struggling financial institution in the D.C. area, the promise of desperately needed funds and a regionally assured potential student base, linked with or seeking connections to the D.C. intelligence world, made the program financially attractive.

In 2005, the first ICCAE centers were installed at ten campuses: California State University San Bernardino, Clark Atlanta University, Florida International University, Norfolk State University, Tennessee State University, Trinity Washington University, University of Texas El Paso, University of Texas-Pan American, University of Washington, and Wayne State University. Between 2008-2010, a second wave of expansion brought ICCAE programs to another twelve cam-

puses: Carnegie Mellon, Clemson, North Carolina A&T State, University of North Carolina-Wilmington, Florida A&M, Miles College, University of Maryland, College Park, University of Nebraska, University of New Mexico, Pennsylvania State University, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

But the CIA and FBI aren’t the only agencies from the Intelligence Community that ICCAE brings to American university campuses. ICCAE also quietly imports a smorgasbord of fifteen agencies – including the National Security Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and Homeland Security.

ICCAE’s stated goals are to develop a “systematic long-term program at universities and colleges to recruit and hire eligible talent for IC [Intelligence Community] agencies and components,” and to “increase the [intelligence recruiting] pipeline of students ... with emphasis on women and ethnic minorities in critical skill areas.” Specifically, ICCAE seeks to “provide internships, co-ops, graduate fellowships and other related opportunities across IC agencies to eligible students and faculty for intelligence studies immersion,” and to “support selective international study and regional and overseas travel opportunities to enhance cultural and language immersion.” ICCAE’s aim is to shower with fellowships, scholarships and grants those universities that are adapting their curricula to align with the political agenda of American intelligence agencies; also to install a portal connecting ICCAE campuses with intelligence agencies, through which students, faculty, students studying abroad, and unknown others will pass. While ICCAE claims to train analysts, rather than members of the clandestine service, the CIA historically has not observed such boundaries.

ICCAE-funded centers have different names at different universities. For example, at the University of Washington (UW), ICCAE funds established the new Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER), Wayne State University’s center is called the Center for Academic Excellence in National Security Intelligence Studies, and Clark Atlantic University’s program is the Center for Academic Excellence in National Security Studies.

With the economic downturn, university layoffs became a common oc-

currence. Need breeds opportunism, as scarcity of funds leads scholars to shift the academic questions they are willing to pursue and suspend ethical and political concerns about funding sources. Other scholars unwilling to set aside ethical and political concerns are keenly aware of institutional pressures to keep their outrage and protests in-house.

Covering Up Dissent

Despite a lack of critical media coverage of ICCAE programs, traces of campus dissent can be found online in faculty senate records. When Dean Van Reidhead at the University of Texas-Pan American (UTPA) brought a proposal for ICCAE to establish a center on campus, some faculty and graduate students spoke out against the damage to academic freedom that the program would likely bring. Senate minutes record that faculty “representatives spoke against and for UTPA submitting a proposal to compete for federal money to establish an Intelligence Community Center for Academic Excellence.” At this meeting, graduate students “listed the following demands: 1) inform the community via press release about the possible ICCAE proposal, 2) release the proposal draft for public review, 3) establish a community forum on ICCAE, and 4) abolish the process of applying for ICCAE funds.” At Texas-Pan American, as at other ICCAE campuses, administrators noted these concerns but continued with plans to bring the intelligence agencies to campus, as if hearing and ignoring concerns constituted shared governance.

The minutes of the University of Washington’s Faculty Senate and Faculty Council on Research record shadows of dissent that are so vaguely referenced that they are easily missed. The minutes for the December 4, 2008, meeting gloss over the issues raised when the American Association of University Professors, University of Washington chapter, had issued a strongly worded statement by Executive Board representative Christoph Giebel, requesting information concerning UW’s INSER contacts with the Intelligence Community. The minutes simply read: “... both Giebel and Jeffry Kim [INSER director] answered a series of good questions that resulted in a fair, tough and serious conversation.” What these “good questions” were and the nature of this “tough and serious

CounterPunch

EDITORS

ALEXANDER COCKBURN

JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

ASSISTANT EDITOR

ALEVTINA REA

BUSINESS

BECKY GRANT

DEVA WHEELER

DESIGN

TIFFANY WARDLE

COUNSELOR

BEN SONNENBERG

CounterPunch

PO Box 228

Petrolia, CA 95558

1-800-840-3683

counterpunch@counterpunch.org

www.counterpunch.org

All rights reserved.