

June 9, 2004

Dear Editor,

Let me see if I can get this straight. The Attorney General of the United States and his legal staff review the Nuremberg decisions and subsequent legal precedents including the Geneva Conventions, and these legal scholars decide that torture and degradation of prisoners (ordered by any leader under any circumstances) is immoral and illegal, unless said orders are given by the President of the United States?

Unbelievably, according to internal Department of Justice memos, available to the press (but not to Congress because John Ashcroft has refused to provide them to the committee members), the use of Nazi-like interrogation tactics is vile, depraved and evil, unless these tactics are being performed by U.S. personnel under the orders of George Bush.

So based on this line of thinking at the highest levels of our government, should we conclude that our present administration is a greater champion of human rights than the government of the former Iraqi regime, because our troops haven't tortured, degraded and killed as many men, woman and children as Saddam Hussein once ordered? I hope not, but it would appear to me that those now in power have decided, long before entering office, that the "ends justify the means", so long as it is their "ends" that are being attained. Operation Iraqi Liberation (O.I.L.) makes one proud to be an American- doesn't it?

John Donovan  
Eugene, OR