Fouling Our Own Nest
The Nuclear Threat to Nebraska’s Environment

by Paul A. Olson

We have all seen the horrendous films of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of the Pacific atolls destroyed by hydrogen bomb tests, of the lands and lakes in Central Russia wasted by the Soviet Union’s tests there. We know what nuclear war can do to the environment. We do not know as well what a nuclearized peace can do. It may present an equally difficult choice to Nebraskans.

Greenpeace and other like organizations have taken up their cudgels against the repetition of the Hiroshimas and Nagasakis. However, the environmental community has not spoken with one voice about the threat of nuclearized peace to America and the world.

We have seen pictures of natural parks, wildlife refuges, and national forests where a nearly pristine ecosystem seems to survive. In Nebraska, consider the Crescent Lake National Wildlife area or the Nine Mile Prairie or a hundred other ‘perfect’ places. But are such places all that we seek as environmentalists? The great poet and farmer Wendell Berry has long criticized the Sierra Club and other environmental organizations for trying to make perfect places for ‘the wild’ without working equally hard to make the so-called domesticated landscape work with the wild. We are stewards of the domesticated, and what we do with it both affects us and the wild:

I decided not long ago that I would not endorse any more wilderness-preservation projects that do not seek also to improve the health of the surrounding economic landscapes and human communities. Whatever its difficulties, my decision to cooperate no longer in the separation of the wild and the domestic has helped me see more clearly the compatibility and even the coherence of my two allegiances. The dualism of domestic and wild is, after all, misleading. It has obscured for us the domesticity of the wild creatures. More important, it has obscured the absolute dependence of human domesticity upon the wildness that supports it and in fact permeates it…

Berry is right. We have to look to how we foul our own nests and not just to how the fowl in our neighborhoods can have unencumbered nests.

When Berry writes that what is utterly alien to both is a corporate industrialism that is without affection for the places in which it lives and without respect for the materials it uses, he does not mention the hub of corporate industrialism—the Military-Industrial Complex. There are no groups that have less affection for the places where they ‘live’ and less respect for the materials they use than the American military.

I wish to examine this issue of military fouling in Nebraska in detail, first looking at

StratCom is in and of itself a potential target for terrorist attack. Its proximity to the Ft. Calhoun and Cooper Station nuclear reactors, though, makes for a particularly dangerous combination.
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Moving? Send Us Your New Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (print)</th>
<th>Old Address</th>
<th>New Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City ________ State ________ Zip __________</td>
<td>City ________ State ________ Zip __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Phone #</td>
<td>New Phone #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NFP Chapter & Affiliate Contact Information

Crete Chapter .................. Pat Wikel .................. 402-826-4818
Lincoln Chapter .................. State Office .................. 402-475-4620
Omaha Chapter .................. Mark Welsch .................. 402-453-0776
Scottsbluff Chapter .............. Byron Peterson .............. 308-783-1412
Southwest Nebraska Chapter .... Dennis Demmel .............. 308-352-4078
Wayne/Wayne State College Chapter .... Sayre Andersen ............. 402-375-3794
Central Nebraska Peace Workers ........ Charles Richardson ........ 402-462-4794
(Grand Island, Hastings, Kearney)

Contact the NFP State Office for information on the UNL, UNO, UNK, Creighton and Nebraska Wesleyan University and Hastings & Doane College Chapters.

Latin America Briefs

compiled by Christy Hargesheimer

Focus on Colombia

On May 29, U.S. ally Alvaro Uribe was re-elected as president of violence-torn Colombia, having amended the Constitution to allow himself to run for a second four-year term. While he claims to have reduced violence in his first four years, the record still indicates grave problems.

This year there has been a surge in death threats against defenders of human rights in Colombia. Union representatives, religious leaders, journalists, Afro-Colombian and indigenous community leaders, and members of national and local human rights groups have received threats for their work. A number of these threats have resulted in assassinations or disappearances. To respond to this crisis, U.S. Reps. Jim McGovern (D-MA) and Joseph Pitts (R-PA) circulated a congressional letter to help protect Colombian human rights defenders.

More than half of Colombians—some 22 million people, according to the United Nations in 2006—live below the poverty line. The poorest 20 percent of Colombians receive only 3 percent of national income, while the wealthiest 20 percent receive 62 percent. This hardship is most strongly felt in the rural sector, which is also where coca and poppy cultivation make Colombia the principal supplier of cocaine to the world market. Because of drug violence, rural areas are the source of most of Colombia’s internally displaced persons (IDPs), a group in which women, children and Afro-Colombians are disproportionately represented. After Sudan, Colombia has the second-largest number of IDPs in the world, with an estimated 3.6 million people displaced by political violence between 1985 and 2005. Violence and threats by right-wing paramilitary forces, left-wing guerrilla forces and conflict between the army and insurgent groups are mostly responsible.

During his first term, Uribe discounted reports of an armed conflict or humanitarian crisis and instead focused attention on the narco-terrorist threat—which played well in Washington. He did demobilize more than 30,000 paramilitary fighters following an accord with the paramilitary leadership. However, the beginning of his second term has been marked by recent scandal. In late November, three congressmen from Uribe’s coalition were arrested on charges of supporting right-wing militias. One is accused of financing the paramilitaries, another of being involved in a massacre of peasants and the third of helping to organize a militia group. In an interview, one of the congressmen claimed that he and some 40 other politicians were ordered by paramilitary strongmen to attend a meeting in which they were forced to sign a document pledging support for a paramilitary group. These developments are weakening Uribe’s Wall Street-backed efforts to expand Colombia’s tax base and attract investment. It is likely that many more government officials will be implicated following investigation.

Meanwhile, the U.S. House defeated a amendment to the foreign aid bill that tried to shift aid to Colombia away from the failed drug policy—instead giving increased attention to human rights problems. It was argued that massive spraying of coca under “Plan Colombia” had not decreased the drug trade, and that the money would be better spent by providing alternative development programs for small farmers.

The Senate version of the foreign aid bill included an additional $30 million for the emergency refugee and migration account. This move may have been in response to the Colombian government’s wrist-slapping of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), when it only partially renewed the UNHCHR office’s mandate for one year, rather than a full four years. The one-year limitation reflects the Colombian government’s disapproval of the UNHCHR Office’s independent and objective reporting on human rights issues. In response to Uribe, 78 members of the U.S. Congress signed a House letter in support of the UNHCHR Office this past summer. (Colombia’s complexities can only be hinted at in a short article. See the “Latin American Working Group” for more information.)

Recent Election Updates:

Venezuela’s elections on December 3 completed an intense voting cycle in Latin America that covered 11 countries in 13 months. Hugo Chávez won reelection handily. In Ecuador, left-wing populists Rafael Correa easily won the presidential run-off. Nicaragua saw the return of a ‘new’ Daniel Ortega as president. Brazil re-elected Lula. Alán García narrowly defeated leftist candidate Ollanta Humala in Peru. Felipe Calderón was inaugurated in a midnight ceremony in Mexico, while López Obrador had his own shadow inauguration in the public plaza, the Zócalo.
Leaving Iraq, Honorably

In a guest editorial published in the November 26, 2006 Washington Post, Sen. Chuck Hagel spelled out the absolute necessity for ending the Bush/Cheney Administration’s military venture in Iraq. While we don’t concur with the alleged “honorable intentions” for the war, there is no arguing with Hagel’s astute analysis of the crisis America now faces.

There will be no victory or defeat for the United States in Iraq. These terms do not reflect the reality of what is going to happen there. The future of Iraq was always going to be determined by the Iraqis—not the Americans. Iraq is not a prize to be won or lost. It is part of the ongoing global struggle against instability, brutality, intolerance, extremism and terrorism. There will be no military victory or military solution for Iraq. Former secretary of state Henry Kissinger made this point last weekend.

The time for more U.S. troops in Iraq has passed. We do not have more troops to send and, even if we did, they would not bring a resolution to Iraq. Militaries are built to fight and win wars, not bind together failing nations. We are once again learning a very hard lesson in foreign affairs: America cannot impose a democracy on any nation—regardless of our noble purpose. We have misunderstood, misread, misplanned and mismanaged our honorable intentions in Iraq with an arrogant self-delusion reminiscent of Vietnam. Honorable intentions are not policies and plans. Iraq belongs to the 25 million Iraqis who live there. They will decide their fate and form of government.

It may take many years before there is a cohesive political center in Iraq. America’s options on this point have always been limited. There will be a new center of gravity in the Middle East that will include Iraq. That process began over the past few days with the Syrians and Iraqis restoring diplomatic relations after 20 years of having no formal communication.

What does this tell us? It tells us that regional powers will fill regional vacuums, and they will move to work in their own self-interest—without the United States. This is the most encouraging set of actions for the Middle East in years. The Middle East is more combustible today than ever before, and until we are able to lead a renewal of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, mindless destruction and slaughter will continue in Lebanon, Israel and across the Middle East.

We are a long way from a sustained peaceful resolution to the anarchy in Iraq. But this latest set of events is moving the Middle East in the only direction it can go with any hope of lasting progress and peace. The movement will be imperfect, stuttering and difficult.

America finds itself in a dangerous and isolated position in the world. We are perceived as a nation at war with Muslims. Unfortunately, that perception is gaining credibility in the Muslim world and for many years will complicate America’s global credibility, purpose and leadership.
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We are a long way from a sustained peaceful resolution to the anarchy in Iraq. But this latest set of events is moving the Middle East in the only direction it can go with any hope of lasting progress and peace. The movement will be imperfect, stuttering and difficult.

There are, as nearly everyone now acknowledges, no simple solutions or harm-free options for extricating ourselves from the mess the Bush/Cheney Administration has created in Iraq. But a voice from Nebraskans for Peace’s past has been promoting a very sensible—and accountable—exit strategy. Rich Littleton, a former NFP State Coordinator during the 70s who now lives in Washington state, is circulating a proposal first floated by Rep. Dennis Kucinich during the 2004 presidential campaign.

Short and to the point, the proposal calls for the U.S. to leave Iraq as the U.N. enters, and the U.S. pays the bill. Here are the three points in detail:

a. The U.S. should commit to withdrawing U.S. troops from Iraq (1) on a timetable to be determined by the U.N. after the U.N. agrees to this plan, (2) on the condition that the United Nations brings in troops from other nations to replace the withdrawing U.S. troops; and

b. The U.S. should commit to limiting all command decisions to the withdrawal of U.S. troops and to relinquishing all other control to the United Nations and

c. The U.S. should commit to paying the cost of such a U.N. peacekeeping operation and all war-related reconstruction in Iraq war until (1) the U.N. declares that the war has ended and (2) that war-related reconstruction is complete.

This strategy answers the charge that the U.S. can’t set deadlines or “cut and run”—which, according to the White House neo-cons, would surrender Iraq to the terrorists. It prevents the creation of a security vacuum inside Iraq, thus retaining some semblance of civil order and preventing the inflow of dangerous and isolated position in the world. That is what is at stake over the next few months.

An Honorable Exit Strategy for Iraq
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Terror & Nuclear Threats

The first places to look for possible environmental damage from our war machine are our nuclear plants, these run by the Energy Department, which also makes our nuclear weapons—and not by the Department of Defense. Nuclear energy plants were brought into being by President Eisenhower to be the first line in our production of nuclear fuels for nuclear weapons www.neis.org/literature/Brochures/weapon.htm). Nebraska has three of these nuclear plants, all in the metropolitan areas of Eastern Nebraska.

Over two years ago, Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist for the Nuclear Information and Resource Service in Washington, D.C. noted in the Nebraska Report that the 1984 book, Nuclear Power Plants as Weapons for the Enemy, called for “alternative reactor siting—underground and/or in very remote locations [as well as] improvements in containment effectiveness... [as well as] an end to centralized energy facilities in general and nuclear power plants in particular... In the long run, this may be the only way to provide security, because the mere existence of nuclear power plants makes us all potential nuclear hostages.”

Kamps continues, “Nebraska’s reactors are neither buried nor remote. The Ft. Calhoun plant is a mere 17-mile drive from Omaha, and 36-mile drive from Bellevue, home of Offutt Air Force Base and StratCom (Strategic Command). Cooper Station in Brownville, just east of the town of Auburn, is a 75-mile drive from Omaha, and only 66 miles from StratCom. Of course, as the crow flies (or wind blows), the distances are even shorter. StratCom, being the nerve center of the U.S. invasion of Iraq and other far-flung military activities (U.S. Space Command, nuclear weapons arsenal control center, etc.), is in and of itself a potential target for terrorist attack. StratCom’s proximity to these commercial nuclear reactors, though, makes for a particularly dangerous combination.”

The Threat of a Nuclearized Peace

The reactors and missiles as tools in a war may be no more dangerous than they are in a time of nuclear peace. Their disrespect for “the places where our life is lived and their lack of respect for the materials our life uses” is dangerous to human health now.

First, there is the Hallam plant built in 1962 near Olive Creek Lake and entombed in 1964. It is difficult to know how safe the entombment process will be over the long haul, but Hallam appears not to be a problem now.

Second, the other two Nebraska nuclear plants, the 1973 Cooper Nuclear Plant located at Brownville—perhaps the oldest, most historic place in ‘European’-based Nebraska—and the 1974 Fort Calhoun plant near populous Omaha (also a center of affection for many of us) have not been exempt from accidents. On May 31, 1992, an engineering accident occurred at Fort Calhoun. Two accidents have occurred at Cooper: on Aug. 8, 1990, a steam valve failed and on June, 2001 an electrical fire burned for more than a quarter of an hour, making the plant go on ‘alert.’ A reactor recirculation pump having a potential to affect safety equipment shut down, and backup power to the plant’s emergency response center did not fully kick in. The plant also failed to meet its deadlines to notify local authorities of the problem (Omaha World-Herald, Dec. 19, 2001). The possibility of a Three Mile Island or Chernobyl-like episode exists at either the very antiquated Cooper or Fort Calhoun plants.

The long-term environmental effects of our failure to plan for high-level nuclear waste are devastating. The two working nuclear plants here give Nebraska about 30 percent of its electricity. Yet, we have no idea where we will store their spent fuel. Since 1983, we in Nebraska have committed $276.1 million to the federal Nuclear Waste Fund to finance nuclear waste management. We do not know that the Yucca Flats Nevada site to which we have contributed will ever be used and, for the time being, the approximately 400 tons of used fuel at our reactors temporarily sits in water-filled vaults that could themselves be subject to explosions, spills or other accidents.

Meanwhile, the Nebraska Public Power District plans to

Convert The Military-Industrial Complex


Nebraska’s Congressional delegation recently sent around news releases proudly proclaiming that they helped to bring big money to the state. They said the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved, for fiscal year 2007, $3.4 billion for DDX destroyer ships at Bath Iron Works and an additional $50 million for smaller military contracts sprinkled throughout the state.

This is the industrial policy of America today. Weapons production. It is our #1 industrial export product. And when weapons are your #1 industrial export product, what is your global marketing strategy for that product line? That’s right, endless war.

Our Congress should be fighting to bring funding to our states to build rail systems, solar power and windmills. At a time when we are told that we are having the hottest summer in the recorded history of the U.S., does it not make sense that the taxpayers should be demanding that our tax dollars be used to expand the production of sustainable technologies? What does more military production do to alleviate global warming? How will we be able to get to work when gas hits $4, $5, $6, $7 a gallon if we don’t have public transit?

Think of the jobs created by building the industrial capacity to put a solar system on every house and business in the U.S. Think of the jobs created if we build a world-class rail system connecting every corner of the country.

Why don’t we citizens demand the conversion of the Military-Industrial Complex to peaceful production?

We will never end war as long as making weapons for endless war employs growing numbers of Americans. What are we waiting for? We will never end war as long as making weapons for endless war employs growing numbers of people in the U.S. This is the direction that the corporate militarists are taking our nation as they now determine that “security export” will be our role in the New World Order.

What does it do to the soul of our nation when we have to make weapons of destruction in order to employ people so they can feed their families?

Today the U.S. is feverishly resupplying Israel with new orders to replace the bunker buster and cluster bombs, bullets, tanks shells and other weapons they used to destroy Lebanon. All the while people work overtime at military production sites to keep up with these contracts for more weapons. An endless cycle of death and destruction. I speak with military production workers often and they routinely say they’d rather be building something socially useful.

Congress is complicit in the disinvestment in American peacetime industry. We don’t make hardly anything in this country anymore. Look in any Wal-Mart store and see for yourself. But what we do make is weapons.

We must demand over and over again that we want our tax dollars to be used for peaceful and sustainable production. We can’t end global warming by building weapons so that we can grab the diminishing supplies of the world’s oil and natural gas. We must convert the Military-Industrial Complex.

Trains not tanks. Windmills not Star Wars. Solar power not fighter planes and new generations of naval destroyers. We need life not death for our children and grandchildren. Make this demand public.
The following article by NFP State Coordinator Tim Rinne was originally published in the December 2, 2006 Omaha World-Herald.

For more than half a century, U.S. Strategic Command has symbolized the threat of nuclear holocaust. Having inspired everything from Stanley Kubrick’s “Dr. Strangelove” to Christian fundamentalist visions of “the final battle” of Armageddon, this command center for the nation’s nuclear arsenal has become synonymous with the unthink-able. The Cold War doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) reinforced this doomsday view. America’s nuclear deterrent, it was popularly understood, was strictly defensive in intent, meant to keep the communists at bay with the threat of total annihilation. If nuclear weapons ever were to be used, it would be only as a last resort, in an end-of-the-world scenario where Americans would “rather be dead than red.”

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, however, the utility and value of the then-Strategic Air Command quickly depreciated. It was a warrior without a foe, and talk accordingly arose about whether this Cold War icon should be dismantled outright. One of its former commanders, Gen. George Lee Butler, even briefly became a disarma-ment advocate.

But 9/11, as the Bush-Cheney Administration never tires of reminding us, changed everything. It certainly changed StratCom.

Starting in October 2002, Strategic Command began undertaking a major mission overhaul. Without taking away any of StratCom’s nuclear-related responsibilities, the White House started padding the command’s repertory, adding in quick succes-sion the U.S. Space Command, its “C-4ISR” mis-sions (Command, Control, Computers, Communica-tions, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance), integrated missile defense, combating weapons of mass destruction and “Full-Spectrum Global Strike.”

F oregoing any semblance of a defensive role, StratCom today serves as the command center for offensively waging the administration’s interna-tional “War on Terror” with conventional as well as, possibly, nuclear weapons. As the industry sponsor for the recent “Strategic Space and De-fense 2006” conference in Omaha so forthrightly expressed it, “StratCom is a laboratory for the fu-ture of warfare.”

And the next war the White House gets the United States into—be it with rogue states like Iran and North Korea or geopolitical rivals like China—will be launched and coordinated, and in large part planned, from Colorado Springs, Colorado. With its international network of “listening stations,” the Space Command’s satellite surveillance system keeps a close worldwide eye on anything deemed suspicious and shady.

This StratCom-generated information is of course fed right back into StratCom for processing and analysis to determine whether some preemptive military action, to be executed by StratCom, is in turn warranted. It’s a closed circle that leaves precious little room for oversight by democratic institutions, and it’s creepy to the core.

Ordinarily, given StratCom’s historic mission, it’s hard to imagine anything more sinister than be-ing the agent of nuclear holocaust. But impossible as it sounds, the threat StratCom now poses is graver than ever before.

It not only continues to hold the fate of the Earth in its hands but also is positioned to traverse the globe on “search and destroy” missions to protect America’s interests. It can spy into the private lives of anyone on the face of the planet. And it is assiduously pursuing a strategy for the total domi-nation of space because, as anyone attending those Strategic Space and Defense conferences can tell you, whoever controls space controls the Earth.

StratCom’s long-range plans call for securing space exclusively for the United States and its approved allies. This strategic goal of planetary domin-ance is already fixed and will go on regardless of which party controls Congress or whether a Demo-cratic or a Republican occupies the Oval Office.

StratCom is fast becoming a law unto itself. And if unchecked, that spells doom for an open society and our democratic way of life.
NICARAGUA’S ELECTION

by Robert Epp

Two days before the U.S. November election, Nicaraguans went to the polls. While voter surveys had shown that the Sandinista presidential candidate Daniel Ortega might win on the first ballot, this was far from a certainty. It’s difficult to get accurate poll results in a country as impoverished and fearful as Nicaragua, where even if a representative sample of the voters are surveyed, they’re hesitant to voice their preference. As it turned out though, Ortega won the first round in a heavily split field, preventing the need for a runoff election that might have been tighter.

Just what Ortega’s victory means for Nicaraguan—and its all-important relationship with the U.S.—remains to be seen, however. Since he was last president in the 1980s, Ortega seems to have remade himself into a man willing to compromise on almost anything just to get back into power. He has made his peace with the Catholic Church and his former nemesis Bishop Obando Bravo. And while it is generally assumed that cultural exchanges between Cuba and Nicaragua will now resume (including the welcome services of Cuban doctors and medical professionals), the U.S.-mandated neo-liberal economic policies are expected to continue unabated under an Ortega presidency. No matter how much this ‘reformed’ Daniel Ortega caters to Washington, though, U.S.-Nicaragua relations are certain to be tense. Memories of Sandinista leader’s revolutionary past are still fresh in Washington, and the U.S., as always, is going to insist on having its way in the country.

U.S. intervention in Nicaragua is, of course, nothing new. The U.S. has interfered in Nicaraguan affairs for at least 150 years. Most Americans can still remember the controversy surrounding our government’s support of the Contras during the ‘80s. In recent years, though, public interest in Latin America has generally dropped off the radar screen. U.S. policymakers have continued to try to control the destiny of Latin America, but the distraction of the War in Iraq has made it difficult for Washington to maintain its hegemony in the South. Latin America has been gradually slipping away, most notably in Venezuela, Bolivia, Chile and even in the region’s largest nation, Brazil (although the U.S. and Brazil continue to have fairly good relationship). Costa Rica may well be mounting the greatest resistance to the neo-liberal economic agenda, but tends not to garner much attention because it doesn’t have a revolutionary history. Even the Organization of American States (OAS) elected a Secretary General who was not the Bush/Cheney Administration’s choice. Ortega’s election in Nicaragua, accordingly, fulfilled the administration’s worst fears. And the end may not be in sight. There’s a chance that at the next election in El Salvador the voters might veer left.

This past October, I was part of a delegation to monitor the extent to which the U.S. was trying to manipulate the Nicaraguan election. The U.S. ambassador, Paul Trevelli, had made several public pronouncements warning the Nicaraguan public about voting for Ortega. Thirty veiled threats by the ambassador that the U.S. would have to reevaluate its relationship with Nicaragua should Ortega be elected were coupled with praise for the ALN candidate. Such blatant efforts by a foreign official to influence a U.S. election would lead to the person’s immediate expulsion. But not only was Trevelli not rebuked, Rep. Dan Burton, the conservative Republican from Indiana, had been in Nicaragua the month before to meet with the two conservative presidential candidates, ostensibly to encourage them to form an alliance to defeat Ortega. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld had also recently come to Nicaragua to meet with military leaders, though he publicly stated he would make no comments on the political situation, and did not. He was purportedly there to create a unified command of military forces in the Western Hemisphere against terrorism, though the purpose and timing of the visit had a chilling effect. Finally, U.S. funds from subsidiaries of the National Endowment for Democracy were being funneled into Nicaragua in ways clearly meant to influence the outcome.

Our delegation was not there to favor any candidate, but to encourage Nicaraguans to make political decisions free from any foreign influence. We had drawn up a letter addressed to Ambassador Trevelli, which was published in the two major Nicaraguan papers, telling him to quit trying to sway the election and that his efforts to do so violated the Vienna Convention. Our letter in turn elicited a published response from the ambassador, in which he stated that the U.S. would work with anyone who was elected in a free and fair election, though he might “tacitly” favor a certain candidate. This of course raised the question as to what exactly was meant by “tacitly” and whether, if Ortega were to win, the U.S. would consider the election free and fair. At that point, we then held a news conference where three members of our delegation read a prepared statement and then responded to questions from the media. In the statement, we disclosed that, despite our efforts, we had not been able to get a personal meeting with the ambassador. The news conference was well covered by the papers, radio and television.

After the work of the delegation was over and the others had left, I stayed on for a few days just to get a feel for the Managua of today. It had been almost 20 years since I’d made my first trip to the country, and I don’t recall seeing a single woman wearing shorts or slacks. Now, hip hugging jeans and bare midriffs were common. There were also many more cars, quick shops and fast food places. I was in a shopping mall that had a movie theater, food court, expensive clothes, jewelry and watches. But most of Managua still looks as though it has not recovered from the earthquake of 1972, and I stayed in a small hotel for five American dollars per night. On the flight home, though, I spoke with some young Americans who had been on a mission trip to Managua. They said they had stayed in a Holiday Inn for $72.00 per person per night. The difference in price between our accommodations seemed to sum up the neo-liberal economic model perfectly. Some people really live well. And others barely live.
by Bruce E. Johansen

Frederick W. Kayser Professor of Communication at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Johansen is the author of the three-volume “Global Warming in the Twenty-First Century” (Praeger, 2006). The following article originally appeared in the August 2006 issue of The Progressive and is reprinted with permission.

James E. Hansen is the Paul Revere of global warming. The director of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Sciences in New York City since 1981, Hansen was in the news last year when the White House saddled him with a 24-year-old media handler, who ordered Hansen to clear all his statements first. Sixty-five at the time, Hansen has been waging weather wars since before his minder was born. Resisting the gag order, Hansen ultimately prevailed.

Six feet tall, with receding, light-brown hair, Hansen favors plaid shirts that would put him at home on an Iowa farm, which is where he was born. Growing up in Denison, Iowa, about 60 miles northeast of Omaha, Hansen was the fifth of seven children (he has four older sisters). Hansen’s father, a tenant farmer, moved to Denison when Jim was four years old, and took up work as a bartender; his mother worked as a waitress.

With a scholarship and money saved from his Omaha World-Herald paper route, Hansen attended the University of Iowa, graduating summa cum laude in 1963, while majoring in mathematics and physics. Hansen then earned a masters degree in astronomy there.

The University of Iowa was an exciting place to study astronomy. The department had its own satellite, and its chairman was James Van Allen, who discovered the Earth-girdling radiation belts that later were named after him. “I was so shy and unconfident that when I had an opportunity to take a course under Professor Van Allen, I avoided it because I didn’t want him to realize how ignorant I was,” Hansen told an audience at his alma mater in 2004.

Hansen decided to specialize in the atmosphere of Venus at a time when scientists were discovering that the planet’s super-hot house atmosphere (with temperatures above 850 F.) was 95 percent carbon dioxide. He earned a doctorate in 1967 with a dissertation on Venus and Washington, D.C., part of a notably hot summer nationwide.

“The greenhouse effect has been detected, and it is changing our climate now,” he testified, anticipating an increased frequency of extreme climactic events.

Critics accused him of crying wolf. But he had a ready response. “When is the proper time to cry wolf?” Hansen asked in John J. Nance’s What Goes Up: the Global Assault on Our Atmosphere. “Must we wait until the prey, in this case the world’s environment, is mangled by the wolf’s grip?”

Now, as he faces off against an administration known for protecting its fossil-fuel interests, Hansen is holding his ground. Hansen has compared the censorship of science under Bush to the distortion of science under Stalin. Even before getting a minder, Hansen was having trouble. By 2004, according to internal Goddard records, the White House was reviewing all climate-related press releases, imposing gridlock that often delayed news a month or more.

A speech he planned to give in Washington, D.C., sponsored by Resources for the Future, was cancelled a week before the 2004 election. Hansen has no direct evidence of White House pressure, although an explanation he received did refer to the election. Hansen surmised (as he explained in an e-mail), that the group had a case of pre-election skittishness. “They realized Bush was probably going to win the election, so why risk retaliation?”

Hansen then called on Van Allen at the University of Iowa, who was then nearly ninety years of age. Colleagues at Iowa told Hansen that Van Allen was happy to welcome him home. The influence of Hansen’s mentor was still strong. As Hansen told the Bergen (New Jersey) Record, Van Allen himself often had differed with government officials, and the senior scientist told him, “I know that my positions have not endeared me to people at NASA headquarters, but I take the position that I’m dealing with honorable men. It’s a good attitude.” Van Allen arranged for Hansen to give a public presentation in Iowa City on October 26, 2004. “This process [of censorship] is in direct opposition to the most fundamental precepts of science,” said Hansen, speaking explicitly as a private citizen. “This, I believe, is a recipe for environmental disaster.”

Every month, Hansen’s lab takes the Earth’s temperature, monitoring 10,000 temperature gauges around the planet. Year by year, the average temperature rises. Last year was the warmest yet—a fact that his superiors, at one point, told him not to release. Hansen’s office released the data anyway.

At the American Geophysical Union annual meeting in San Francisco last December, Hansen addressed a basic question: How much “wiggie room” does the Earth and its inhabitants have before global warming becomes a truly unavoidable disaster?

Further warming of more than 1 degree C. “will make the Earth warmer than it has been in a million years,” Hansen said. If we continue with business as usual, he said, we will see “changes that constitute practically a different planet... The Earth’s climate is nearing, but has not passed, a tipping point, beyond which it will be impossible to avoid climate change with far-ranging undesirable consequences.” What will that “different planet” look like? At the American Geophysical Union meeting, Hansen spelled it out: “Not only loss of the Arctic as we know it, with all that implies for wildlife and indigenous peoples, but losses on a much vaster scale due to worldwide rising seas.”

Many coastal cities—Shanghai, New York City, London, and Calcutta, to name a few—will be in peril. Hansen cannot tell us exactly when the toilets will back up at the White House (about 50 feet above sea level), but if we don’t cut our fossil fuel consumption soon, they will. The question is when.

It was after this presentation that Hansen was assigned George Deutsch, conclusion on page 10.
The Central City Friends Meeting was honored as a ‘Peacemaker of the Year’ at the Annual Peace Conference October 14, 2006. NFP State Board member Rev. Del Roper delivered the following remarks in presenting the award.

When I learned that the Central City Friends Meeting were to receive the 2006 Peacemaker of the Year Award, my first thought was, “Wonderful! They are certainly well deserving of this award,” followed quickly by the question, “But why have we taken so long to honor them?” Upon further reflection, though, I realized that at least three individual members of the Central City Friends Meeting have received Peacemaker Awards in past years: Don Reeves in 1995, and Weston and June Webb in 2005. So, today, we are moving on to recognize the contribution that the collective body of this Friends Meeting has made to the cause of peace in our state and world.

The Central City Friends’ peacemaking is rooted in the Quaker faith and practice coming out of Great Britain. The following is a portion of the guidelines they follow:

“Our principle is, and our practices have always been, to seek peace, and to follow the righteousness and the knowledge of God, seeking the good and welfare, and doing that which tends to the peace of all. All bloody principles and practices we do utterly deny, with all outward wars, and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatsoever, and this is our testimony to the world. The spirit of Christ by which we are guided… leads us into all Truth [and] will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the rights of this world.”

In living by that principle, this group has been a faithful witness throughout its history. The Central City Friends Meeting came into being prior to World War I and is closely intertwined with the history of Nebraska Central College, a Methodist college, which was located in Central City. When the Methodists decided to sell the college and consolidate their work at Nebraska Wesleyan in Lincoln, the Central City Friends Meeting was organized to purchase the college facility and to serve the college community. Many of its early leaders, both pastoral and lay, were on the college faculty.

When the U.S. entered the war in 1917, six men from Central City Friends Meeting volunteered to go to France with the newly formed American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), in lieu of service in the armed forces or time in prison. During World War II, at least two of their members were classified as 1-A-O, which meant they were available for military service, but as non-combatants. Other members of the Meeting did see military service without conscientious objector status, one of which was killed at Iwo Jima. The Meeting has always made it a point to support the decisions of those who chose to serve in the military, regardless of the capacity.

Although much emphasis has been put upon the young men and their service during times of war, the Meeting’s women have always been equal to the men as influences for peace, whether for their intellectual, moral or spiritual leadership, or just plain hard work. For instance, during the Vietnam War, teenager Marilyn Mesner chose to wear a black armband to school. She was pressured to remove it or be expelled, but the Friends Meeting rallied to her defense, citing a Supreme Court decision based on another Quaker family’s experience in Iowa.

Several Central City Friends families were part of the original Rural Nebraskans for Peace during the Vietnam conflict, and played a critical role in the creation of Nebraska for Peace (NFP). Several Central City Friends families were part of the original Rural Nebraskans for Peace during the Vietnam conflict, and played a critical role in the creation of NFP.

“Christian Peacemaker Team Founder Seeks Recruits

“There is a way for everyone to be actively involved in peacemaking.” That was the message of Gene Stoltzfus, founding director of Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT) as he spoke in Lincoln and Omaha November 5-7.

Stoltzfus pointed out that, in the past, nonviolent movements have often rested upon a single charismatic leader like Mahatma Gandhi or Martin Luther King, Jr. But CPT has developed a way of organizing ordinary people in the face of violence. It enables them to “get in the way” of violence and allows them to talk back to violence.

Although Christian Peacemaker Teams first received widespread notice in November 2005 when four of its workers were abducted in Baghdad, it has been at work for nearly 20 years. The organization developed from a call, in 1984, for Christians to devote the same discipline and self-sacrifice to nonviolent peacemaking that armies devote to war.

Since then CPT has pioneered a team approach to violence reduction, placing trained international teams to work in support of local peacemaking efforts in conflict situations from Palestine to Colombia to the US-Mexico border. Those interested in serving participate in a five- to 14-day initial delegation in an area of conflict. They then complete an intensive 30-day period of basic training before joining CPT for a three-year term of full-time service. There are presently 36 full-time members of the Peacemaker Corps and 152 reservists who serve periods of two to twelve weeks each year.

At each of Stoltzfus’ Nebraska appearances, audience members were eager to hear of CPT’s work in Iraq. Stoltzfus described the openness of the Iraqi people immediately following the occupation and pointed to night-time raids by U.S. forces as the cause for much of the opposition they have subsequently faced. He explained that, when brothers and fathers are taken away, their families are upset and angry. When they cannot find out where they are, or even if they are alive or dead, the sons and brothers left behind are moved to violent resistance. After the occupation began, CPT focused its Iraq work on locating detainees and advocating for their release. In the process, they assembled a report documenting many of the abuses that eventually made headlines in the Abu Ghraib Prison scandal.

Stoltzfus, who retired from CPT two years ago, made a total of seven presentations in less than 48 hours (including two sponsored by the UNL and UNO chapters of Nebraskans for Peace). During his various engagements, he described CPT’s effort to reopen Hebron University by taking sledgehammers to the cement blocks that closed the main gate; he engaged classes and campus gatherings in lively dialogue on the topic of Peacemaking in the Age of Terror; he challenged an ecumenical group of pastors to organize a locally based CPT team; and he lamented not having 20 teams in Baghdad instead of one when the invasion occurred. “I really think we could have made a difference,” he declared.

Everywhere Stoltzfus went he was recruiting. He made it plain that more peacemakers are needed. “I could paper the walls of my office with requests for teams. The approach that CPT has developed since 1988 has been proven to work. Now we need individuals of all ages and backgrounds with a commitment to peacemaking.” Complete information about CPT may be found at www.cpt.org.

—Rev. David Orr
How a 'letter to the editor' from a political activist from rural South Korea comes to be printed in the Nebraska Report is a tale in its own right.

In April 2006, while out in Colorado Springs to network with the Citizens for Peace in Space group about StratCom, I got introduced to the first Korean I think I've ever met. Choi Sung-Hee, an artist and Korean national living in New York City (who, it turns out, had privately made a very remarkable art film about StratCom and nuclear war), came to Colorado Springs specifically for the protest at the U.S. Space Command's annual symposium. Three months later, we literally ran into each other again on the streets of Vancouver, British Columbia while attending the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space annual meeting at the World Peace Forum. The Korean delegation at the Peace Forum had organized a number of workshops on the political situation in Korea, including one on "U.S. Military Bases in the Asia-Pacific." Sung-Hee, who had attended most of these sessions and became very well briefed about the struggle between the local farmers and the U.S. military over the base expansion at Pyeongtaek, beseeched me to publish an article about the situation in the Nebraska Report. With one thing and another, it took me several months to get around to it, but the Nov/Dec. 2006 issue included an article entitled "South Korean Military Base Threatens International Security," which linked the Korean base's purpose to StratCom's Missile Defense mission in the Asia-Pacific.

Unbeknownst to me, Sung-Hee immediately translated the story into Korean and submitted the article to the political group "Solidarity for Peace And Reunification of Korea" (SPARK). The editor at SPARK in turn posted it on the organization's website. (The Korean version of the article, plus more photos, can be accessed at: www.spark946.org/bugsboard/index.php?BBS=s_news&action=viewForm&uid=1351&page=4)

Thanks in part to the efforts of the SPARK editor, the Korean translation of the article subsequently found its way to Pyeongtaek, where it publicly read aloud at one of the candle light vigils the community daily holds. According to on-the-ground reports, the farmers and activists welcomed this show of support from a sister peace group, particularly as it came from a rural region like Nebraska, which also hosts a major military base namely StratCom. Jang Do-Jung, Secretary of the Paengsung Residents' Resistance Committee and a SPARK member, said of the Nebraska Report story, "Thanks very much for your concern. One thing I want to know is what Nebraskans think [of the protests at Pyeongtaek] after reading the article. I am eager to let you know the recent news here and welcome any communication for peace and solidarity." Jang's 'letter to NFP' was written in his native Korean language, and then translated by Sung-Hee into English for our Nebraska readers. As the text indicates, however, Pyeongtaek is but one of the areas in South Korea where the U.S. military has adopted a more aggressive policy on the Korean peninsula and elsewhere in the world.

As for situation at Pyeongtaek, the little village of Daechuri has become the last front in the struggle. On November 8, 2006, before Jang wrote his article, the final rice field near Daechuri was fenced off with razor wire by the South Korean military. Nine South Korean activists were arrested that day for putting up resistance. Since the struggle began three years ago, 828 people have been arrested, five people jailed, and more than 1,000 people injured. The cumulative fines levied by the police nearly total 4 billion dollars.

In its desire for military dominance in North East Asia, the U.S. government is pursuing plans for an expansion of the U.S.'s military bases in Korea and a massive relocation of its forces stationed the country. And it is people from of the small farming village of Daechuri who are paying the price.

Daechuri has become a national symbol of the Korean people's suffering from imperialist military designs, because this is not the first time the people of this village have been uprooted.

In the century just past, the Daechuri people were expelled from their homes by the Japanese imperialists so they could construct a military base. The United States, who replaced the Japanese, expelled the villagers yet again, on a winter night, to expand the boundaries of the base. Many of the people who were robbed of their home and land died from cold and starvation. The rest built up the new village just outside the U.S. base's wire fence, reclaimed the land from the sea with their hands and established the current rice field. For the farmers of Daechuri, this land is their life and the legacy for their children.

The expansion plans for Camp Humphrey at Pyeongtaek call for increasing the base to twice its current size, by about 1,000 hectares. Of the land seized from the village to expand the base, about ten percent is being allocated for a large golf course and luxurious spa facility. (*If the areas for ammunition storage and training grounds, and the Osan U.S. Air Force Base near Camp Humphrey are also factored in, the total expanded area of Camp Humphrey will be about 2,670 hectares.)

The people of Daechuri have struggled desperately the past three years, praying "we can not give up the land that is our life for the sake of a U.S. military war base." Their prayers though stem not only from their desire to keep their land and homes. They know full well of the war crimes committed by the U.S. government in Iraq. The people of Daechuri believe that they have a responsibility, in the name of peace, to prevent the base expansion.

At the command of the U.S. military, the South Korean government has evacuated part of the village’s houses, sentenced the village leader, Kim Ji-Tae, to two years in prison, destroyed rice fields, set up checkpoints, begun monitoring the residents, and finally, erected additional wire fencing around the last rice field, choking off the farmers. Even so, the residents are determined to keep their home.

Because the U.S. government is actively expanding its military power throughout the world, people who want peace need to seek solidarity beyond national borders. Here, in Daechuri, this global solidarity has begun. The Daechuri people have become friends with the farmers in Larzac, France and the people in Henoko, Okinawa. Many peace activists from the U.S., Canada, France, Japan, Thailand and Germany have visited Daechuri.

February 17, 2007 will be the 900th day of the residents' daily candlelight vigil and May 28, 2007 will be the date of the 1,000th. On the 1,000th date, it is my hope that every peace-loving person in the world will have a candle in their hand for the people of Daechuri.

Jang Do-Jung
Secretary, Paengsung Residents’ Resistance Committee

The ongoing seizure of farm land around the military base meant the rice harvest this past October was the leanest the local farmers had experienced in three years. But the people are committed to keep fighting so that this harvest won't be their last.

Peace activists and village guardians protesting this past October on land wanted by the government. The signs read “No U.S. military base! Let’s keep the field!”
**Politician Contacts**

**The White House**  
Washington, DC 20500  
Comment Line: 202-456-1111  
202-456-4114  
202-456-2933 (FAX)  
president@whitehouse.gov

**Sen. Chuck Hagel**  
246 Russell Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, DC 20510  
202-224-4224  
202-224-3213 (FAX)  
402-225-4600 (Lincoln)  
402-758-8981 (Omaha)  
308-632-6032 (Scottsbluff)  
hagel.senate.gov

**Sen. Ben Nelson**  
720 Hart Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20510  
202-224-6551  
202-224-0012 (FAX)  
402-391-3411 (Omaha)  
402-441-4600 (Lincoln)  
bennelson.senate.gov

**Rep. Jeff Fortenberry, District 1**  
1517 Longworth House Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20515  
202-225-4806  
402-438-1598 (Lincoln)  
202-225-4806  
720 Hart Senate Office Bldg.  
Sen. Ben Nelson

**Rep. Lee Terry, District 2**  
1524 Longworth HOB  
Washington, DC 20515  
202-225-4155  
202-226-5492 (FAX)  
402-397-9944 (Omaha)  
leeterry.house.gov/contact.asp

**Rep. Adrian Smith, District 3**  
3321 Avenue I, Suite 6  
Scottsbluff, NE 69361  
888-ADRIAN7 (Toll Free)  
308-220-3211 x133  
308-635-7412 (FAX)  
http://www.house.gov/fortenberry

**Capitol Hill Switchboard**  
202-224-3121

**State Capitol Switchboard**  
402-471-2311

**State Senator, District #**  
State Capitol  
PO Box 94604  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4604

**Governor Dave Heineman**  
PO Box 94948  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4848  
402-471-2244  
402-471-6031 (FAX)  
http://gov.nebraska.gov/egov/govmail.html
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**WINTER LECTURE SERIES:**

**Climate Change, Causes & Responses**

The 2007 Winter Lecture Series at the Unitarian Church, 6300 A Street, Lincoln, Nebraska will begin Sunday, January 21, 2007 at 7:00 pm with the first two-hour lecture session, and will run seven almost consecutive Sundays (except for the Super Bowl).

1/21: “The climate detective: Unraveling the evidence for global warming.” Professor Kenneth F. Dewey is a Regional Climatologist in the School of Natural Resources, High Plains Regional Climate Center, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UN-L). He specializes in storms and weather features of the plains states, especially tornadoes, and teaches courses in climatology and meteorology at the graduate and undergraduate level.

1/28: “Basic warming science and an introduction to the Brokaw film on climate change.” The discussant, Professor Clinton M. Rowe is Associate Professor of Geosciences at UN-L. His research interests range from climate modeling and climate cycles and water distribution in the sand hills (and elsewhere) to climatic change evidence derived from ice core drilling in Greenland.

2/4: Super Bowl. No Lecture.

2/11: “The ANDRILL project: Determining 20 million years of climate conditions.” Assistant Research Professor Richard H. Levy is a faculty member in the Geosciences Department at UN-L, and he is a staff scientist on the ANDRILL project. The ANDRILL project is supported by a $13 million National Science Foundation grant that features the drilling of rock (not ice) cores from below Antarctic ice shelves and sea-ice to determine climatic conditions for periods of time during the past 20 million years.

2/18: “Public policy and the impediments to concern and action.” Charles Harper is a Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Creighton University. His interests, expertise, and several books range from food security to how human perspectives affect social and governmental responses to environmental concerns. His teaching spans courses from Religion and American Society to Environmental Sociology.

2/25: “Christian environmental worldviews and the implications for climate change policy.” Professor Janel M. Curry is Dean of Research and Scholarship, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Her scholarship and a recent book have focused upon how faith and faith communities impact views of nature, the cosmos, and the environment.

3/4/07: “Tackling climate change: The U.S. potential for renewable energy and energy efficiency to 2030.” Dr. Charles F. Kutscher is an NREL (National Renewable Energy Lab) scientist in Golden, Colorado. He has been developing technology (e.g., solar collectors) relevant to renewable energy for decades. In recent addresses and in his WLS lecture he will focus on how policy changes could lead to world and national energy efficiency in the future. Chuck’s presentation will be co-sponsored by the Sierra Club and the Sorensen Lecture Foundation of the Unitarian Church.

3/11: Dinner is planned to include a panel with a Nebraska focus on climate change.

---

**The Paul Revere of Global Warming**

the young political operative, to manage his media relations. Deutsch’s purported journalism degree from Texas A & M quickly was exposed as a fraud, and he was forced to resign, meanwhile pouting that he had been a victim of a Democrat ambush. Deutsch’s sole qualification for the job was his service on the Bush-Cheney reelection campaign. Hansen himself is a political independent who readily acknowledges that he voted for John Kerry in 2004. After the Deutsch scandal, NASA issued new rules protecting the rights of scientists to communicate their work to the public.

Hansen still hopes that time remains to avoid climatic calamity (he gives us a decade, maybe two to reach the “tipping point”). “Strong policy leadership and international cooperation” will be necessary, he told the geophysicists, but that has not been forthcoming from the Bush White House. Hansen emphasized that special interests are “a roadblock wielding undue influence over policymakers.” These special interests, he says, “seek to maintain short-term profits with little regard to either the long-term impact on the planet that will be inherited by our children and grandchildren or the long-term economic well-being of our country.”

As Hansen was evading his mind at the NASA, he was receiving reports in the journal Science that the melting of the Greenland ice cap has been accelerating markedly, suggesting that existing estimates of future sea-level rise are too low.

“How long have we got?” Hansen asked in a piece published on the front page of the London Independent on February 26, 2006. “We have to stabilize emissions of carbon dioxide within a decade. We cannot wait for new technologies like capturing emissions from burning coal. We have to act with what we have. This decade, that means focusing on energy efficiency and renewable sources of energy that do not burn carbon. We don’t have much time left.”

According to a Mark Bowen in Thin Ice (2005), Hansen enjoys reading fiction with heroes who flout convention and are persecuted for sticking to their principles. Asked for specifics in an e-mail, Hansen said he had in mind Elizabeth of Pride and Prejudice and Tom Joad from Grapes of Wrath.

Hansen maintains an extensive e-mail list of people to whom he sends early drafts of his papers, asking for criticism. (I’m honored to be on that list.) On March 13, Hansen sent a letter to his correspondents observing that the ideological weather improved at NASA after he went public. At the EPA, however, “where double-speak (‘sound science,’ ‘clear skies,’) has achieved a level that would make George Orwell envious, [the situation] is much bleaker, based on the impression that I receive from limited discussion with colleagues there,” Hansen wrote. But Hansen averred that, “unless some new event demands it,” he would like to avoid whistle-blowing activities in favor of full-time science so he could get back to his task of “quantifying options for dealing with global warming.” With that, Hansen returned to the lab—until the next time.
Speaking Our Peace, conclusion

same thing. No cabinet people and almost no Congress members have sent children to this war. A few have signed up recently, especially the children of presidential candidates. Very few of the rich put their Isaacs on the Iraq altar.

Now we know one reason why politically we have had a national policy creating rural poverty. We need it to give us cannon fodder. The story is not new. The Johnny of “Johnny I hardly knew ye” is a rural Johnny from Athy in County Kildare:

Ye haven’t an arm, ye haven’t a leg, hurroo, hurroo
Ye haven’t an arm, ye haven’t a leg, hurroo, hurroo
Ye haven’t an arm, ye haven’t a leg, Ye’re an armless, boneless, chickenless egg
Ye’ll have to put with a bowl out to beg
Oh Johnny I hardly knew ye.

Chorus:

With your guns and drums and drums and guns, hurroo, hurroo
With your guns and drums and drums and guns, hurroo, hurroo
With your guns and drums and drums and guns,
The enemy nearly slew ye
Oh my darling dear, Ye look so queer
Johnny I hardly knew ye.

Fouling Our Nest, conclusion

ified 75 perchlorate releases in 22 states, including Arizona, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, New York, Maryland and Massachusetts, as well as California. Defense-industry dumping is suspected in nearly all these cases, though perchlorate has also been linked to fireworks and other explosives, automobile airbags and Chilean fertilizers. The EPA says it will take hundreds of years and cost several billion dollars to clean up the known plumes.” (Cf. http://www.organicconsumers.org/Toxic/wj-perchlorate.cfm)

Some Recommendations

For the time being, these recommendations seem to me to be in order for NFP and our environmental organizations to support:

- That Nebraska and Nebraska Public Power Districts refuse all new nuclear plants so long as we have no secure high-level permanent waste storage for the by-products of the electrical generation process.
- That all present waste in Nebraska be removed to temporary water-filled storage vats away from metropolitan areas and

away from StratCom into secure desert areas in the West. The Nebraska Legislature should petition the federal government in regard to this problem.

- That Nebraska immediately invest as much in wind power as it has cost to find temporary storage for spent nuclear fuels—that is, about $330 million.
- That sufficient state lottery funds concerned with environmental quality be used to develop an independent assessment by environmental scientists of the presence of TCEs, perchlorates and radioactive or other dangerous materials in the soils and water proximate to Nebraska’s nuclear power and nuclear weapons sites.

Nebraska sits on the largest underground aquifer in the world and it has some of the best soil in the world. Folly has told us to foul each of these to “defend” ourselves on the grounds that we are far away from the coasts and our military sites will be safe. Hardly anything could be less safe. We have already lost much of our life in trying to protect it militarily.
Your Foundation Speaks

by Loyal Park, President, Nebraska Peace Foundation

CONTRIBUTIONS BENEFIT FROM NEW TAX LAWS

The Nebraska Legislature has passed legislation that sets up a Nebraska Charitable Tax Credit for Nebraskans donating to a Nebraska-based Foundation’s endowment fund. Our Foundation’s endowment fund qualifies for this special tax treatment which gives the donor a credit towards their Nebraska income tax. This is a substantial tax benefit for those able to take advantage of this special provision. Please consult your accountant or tax advisor if you wish more information on how this can benefit you.

Also for 2006 and 2007 the Pension Protection Act of 2006 allows contributions direct to charities from your IRA for donors age 70½ or older thus avoiding tax on the distribution. Again, consult with your accountant or tax advisor on how this can benefit you.

Contributions benefit from new tax laws.

Saying “No universal draft” for peacenik reason and nationally. All change begins with kind, broke the consensus in Nebraska Qaida. We were almost alone. We, and our escorted by Interpol policing against Al-Qaeda. We favored international law accompanied by “New Deal” for the Middle East, and the national law, international alliances, a "Rummy" and the rest. We favored international law, international alliances, a “New Deal” for the Middle East, and the maximum use of international law accompanied by Interpol policing against Al-Qaida. We were almost alone. We, and our kind, broke the consensus in Nebraska and nationally. All change begins with consensus breaking.

Why did it take so long? I used to say, “No universal draft” for peacenik reasons like Charlie Rangel’s. Now I go, almost every Monday, to my old duffers’ group. In another time, we would have sat around the pot-bellied stove in our bib overalls in the Podunk General Store, chewed, spit Copenhagen, and pontificated about the weather, the crops and the need for Free Silver. Now we meet at Perkins and eat eggbeaters and low-fat muffins. One of our duffers, just before the election, asked what would ever get the American people to oppose the war with authority. You know, people in the streets at nightfall, candles in hand, singing “How many roads?” marching on the Federal Building. (We still need that, you know, even after Nov. 7.) Another duffer opined, “Bring back the draft! This thing in Iraq wouldn’t last a month if we had a draft that fell on every mother’s son.” He may have been right. We need to think about the draft and justice for every mother’s son. Now the dying goes to rural people: white, African-American, Hispanic, Indian.

I too have supported a new universal draft on the basis of something like my duffer friend’s argument. Because of this, Roy Schoen, Vietnam vet and head of the Veterans Center in Lincoln, and I decided to debate the issue at the Annual Peace Conference. Roy argued for what Clinton had earlier proposed: a two-year national service including military training for persons wishing for such training and Peace Corps or Americorps-style work for peacebuilders. I, in contrast, argued for a full-fledged draft that would mobilize the American people... put the burden of war on those whose economic interests it serves. Ultimately, the group debate pretty largely came down on the side of Roy’s national service idea. The prevailing idea was that a draft could dangerously feed the Iraq War machine, while the decline in volunteerism when the military is short-handed would force us out. National service won the day, national service of a specific kind.

Though I was defeated in the debate, I raised good issues, the same ones that Rep. Rangel has raised. The children of the rural and poor are fighting the war. Forty-four percent of our recruits are rural, while only 21 percent of America’s population are. Youths that live in the most economically depressed parts of the country are more likely to join the army than city kids. Major cities—the big ones—furnished 14 percent of our population, but only eight percent of our recruits. The high-tech urban areas of the country furnish the lowest percent of all. Almost no children of the rich have gone to this war. Death rates in Iraq, in counties of over 1,000,000, are less than one half what they are in counties under 25,000.

The counties on which the deaths fall are disproportionately poor. The top 20 counties in percentages of population that go to Iraq are all lower-than-median-income counties. In April of this year, Nebraska had experienced about 13 military deaths per million of its population, the fifth-highest state proportion of soldiers killed after four rural states with high poverty levels: Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota and Vermont. Nebraska regularly has 1-6 of the poorest counties in America in the lists—all of them rural.

While urban minorities are not suffering disproportionately in this war, African-American, Indian and Hispanic rural minorities are. For Hispanic illegal immigrants, service and the risk of death has become a quick route to the frontline and, for those who survive, citizenship (http://innercitystruggle.org/story.php?story=96). Legal immigrants, given space in the military, ride quickly to death or citizenship—falsified green card holders the conclusion on page 11.

Killing the Huddled Masses Yearning to Be Free

by Paul Olson, UNL Professor Emeritus

"There is no question in my mind that this president and this administration would never have invaded Iraq, especially on the flimsy evidence that was presented to the Congress, if indeed we had a draft and members of Congress and the administration thought that their kids... would be placed in harm's way."

—Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY)

The election is over. Where the Democrats won the House handily and the Senate by two votes, Iraq was the issue—our preemptive going to war, its conduct, the deaths, the torture. Peace activists throughout the nation should be proud of Nov. 7, 2006. From the beginning, we said ‘No’ to the Afghan War, ‘No’ to the Iraq War, ‘No’ to American torture, and ‘No’ to neo-con bullying by Cheney, “Rummy” and the rest. We favored international law, international alliances, a “New Deal” for the Middle East, and the maximum use of international law accompanied by Interpol policing against Al-Qaida. We were almost alone. We, and our kind, broke the consensus in Nebraska and nationally. All change begins with consensus breaking.

Why did it take so long? I used to say, “No universal draft” for peacenik reasons like Charlie Rangel’s. Now I go, almost every Monday, to my old duffers’ group. In another time, we would have sat around the pot-bellied stove in our bib overalls in the Podunk General Store, chewed, spit Copenhagen, and pontificated about the weather, the crops and the need for Free Silver. Now we meet at Perkins and eat eggbeaters and low-fat muffins. One of our duffers, just before the election, asked what would ever get the American people to oppose the war with authority. You know, people in the streets at nightfall, candles in hand, singing “How many roads?” marching on the Federal Building. (We still need that, you know, even after Nov. 7.) Another duffer opined, “Bring back the draft! This thing in Iraq wouldn’t last a month if we had a draft that fell on every mother’s son.” He may have been right. We need to think about the draft and justice for every mother’s son. Now the dying goes to rural people: white, African-American, Hispanic, Indian.

I too have supported a new universal draft on the basis of something like my duffer friend’s argument. Because of this, Roy Schoen, Vietnam vet and head of the Veterans Center in Lincoln, and I decided to debate the issue at the Annual Peace Conference. Roy argued for what Clinton had earlier proposed: a two-year national service including military training for persons wishing for such training and Peace Corps or Americorps-style work for peacebuilders. I, in contrast, argued for a full-fledged draft that would mobilize the American people... put the burden of war on those whose economic interests it serves. Ultimately, the group debate pretty largely came down on the side of Roy’s national service idea. The prevailing idea was that a draft could dangerously feed the Iraq War machine, while the decline in volunteerism when the military is short-handed would force us out. National service won the day, national service of a specific kind.

Though I was defeated in the debate, I raised good issues, the same ones that Rep. Rangel has raised. The children of the rural and poor are fighting the war. Forty-four percent of our recruits are rural while only 21 percent of America’s population are. Youths that live in the most economically depressed parts of the country are more likely to join the army than city kids. Major cities—the big ones—furnished 14 percent of our population, but only eight percent of our recruits. The high-tech urban areas of the country furnish the lowest percent of all. Almost no children of the rich have gone to this war. Death rates in Iraq, in counties of over 1,000,000, are less than one half what they are in counties under 25,000.

The counties on which the deaths fall are disproportionately poor. The top 20 counties in percentages of population that go to Iraq are all lower-than-median-income counties. In April of this year, Nebraska had experienced about 13 military deaths per million of its population, the fifth-highest state proportion of soldiers killed after four rural states with high poverty levels: Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota and Vermont. Nebraska regularly has 1-6 of the poorest counties in America in the lists—all of them rural. While urban minorities are not suffering disproportionately in this war, African-American, Indian and Hispanic rural minorities are. For Hispanic illegal immigrants, service and the risk of death has become a quick route to the frontline and, for those who survive, citizenship (http://innercitystruggle.org/story.php?story=96). Legal immigrants, given space in the military, ride quickly to death or citizenship—falsified green card holders the conclusion on page 11.

NFP BULLETIN BOARD

NFP State Office Hours in Lincoln, 941 ‘O’ Street, Suite 1026, are 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. weekdays.

Wednesdays Anti-war vigils, Lincoln Federal Building, 15th & ‘O’ Streets, 5:00-6:00 p.m. Call 402-499-6672 for more information.

Dec. 26-28 28th Annual Feast of the Holy Innocents Retreat, Witness & Line Crossing at StratCom Headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base. The Retreat begins at 7:00 p.m. Tuesday, Dec. 26 with a Christmas Party and Social. On Wednesday morning Dec. 27, there will be a brief prayer service and reading of St. Mathews, Infant Narrative at Offutt AFB. Nonviolence training, community building, bible study and prayer will follow on Saturday. The Retreat will end with a Vigil and Line Crossing at Offutt AFB Thursday.

Jan. 1 New Year’s Day
Jan. 3 Nebraska Legislature Convenes
Jan. 15 Martin Luther King Jr’s Birthday (observed)

Check Out the NFP website at www.nebraskansforpeace.org

To list an event, submit in writing by the tenth of the month preceding the event to: NFP, 941 ‘O’ Street, #1026, Lincoln, NE 68508, or email: NeReport@nebr.rr.com.

Contributions benefit from new tax laws.