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Drone Warfare Is Inhuman

This article by NFP State Coordinator Tim Rinne originally appeared in the February 14, 2010, Lincoln Journal Star

Unpiloted Aerial Vehicles (or drones) more and more are becoming the weapon of choice for America’s international War on Terror. The Predator and the Reaper models, in particular, have become so popular that, in its 2011 budget, the Air Force is requesting more drones than piloted combat aircraft.

Capable of staying aloft unobserved for 24 hours at time and conducting surveillance with spy cameras, at a moment’s notice, these hunter/killer drones abruptly can launch their Hellfire guided missiles and smart bombs at suspected terrorists. The missions for these robot warriors now range from standard military operations in Afghanistan, to targeted assassinations of al-Qaida and Taliban leaders in Pakistan coordinated by the CIA and even the notorious private security firm, Blackwater (now called Xe).

And though its name is almost never mentioned, U.S. Strategic Command here in Nebraska is an active accomplice in each and every one of these drone flights.

StratCom, with its Space, Intelligence/Surveillance/Reconnaissance and Global Strike missions, is integrally involved at every stage of these missions—from the intelligence-gathering to the targeting to the actual ‘flying’ of these satellite-controlled aircraft.

Before our very eyes, these airborne robots are changing the art and rules of warfare.

But the butchery that their space-directed missiles and bombs wreak down on the ground is as grisly and hideous ever.

In 2009, the CIA’s almost weekly clandestine drone attacks in Pakistan were credited with killing anywhere from 350 to 550 people—many of them innocent civilians, including children. The non-combatant death toll has fed anti-American sentiment in that country, threatening the stability of the one-year-old elected government and its stockpile of nuclear weapons.

No less problematic is the fact that these deaths of innocent bystanders have served as a recruiting tool for both al-Qaida and the Taliban. As David Kilcullen, a counter-insurgency warfare expert who advised Gen. David Petraeus in Iraq, bluntly puts it, “Every one of these non-combatants represents an alienated family, a new revenge feud, and more recruits for a militant movement that has grown exponentially even as drone strikes have increased.”

War by robot may be reducing U.S. fatalities, which the folks here at home undoubtedly appreciate. The message it is sending to the developing world, though—an imperial power that kills brutally, indiscriminately and impersonally—is arriving with the force of a Hellfire missile. And it’s creating serious political blowback for the Obama Administration.

The ramifications of this drone warfare policy go even deeper, however—right to the core of our democratic system of governance. With the CIA and even mercenary outfits like Blackwater/Xe now regularly assassinating so-called high-value targets on the U.S. government’s behalf, where’s the accountability?

Who exactly is drawing up these hit lists and on whose authority? Covert entities like the CIA whose disregard for legislative oversight is legendary? Soldiers for hire like Blackwater who kill in America’s name? Can our senators and representatives in Washington tell us? Do they even know?

And let’s not forget StratCom. With eight different military missions in its

conclusion on page 8
Nothing ‘FAIR’ about Them...

Anti-Immigration Organization Operating in Nebraska Branded a ‘Hate Group’ by National Civil Rights Watchdog

by Paul A. Olson
Nebraskans for Peace President

At a February legislative hearing on a bill dealing with immigration, State Senator Bill Avery asked a pointed question of Kris Kobach, the lawyer for the legal affiliate of the ‘Federation for American Immigration Reform’ (FAIR). Did Kobach know, Avery inquired, that the ‘Southern Poverty Law Center’ had classified his umbrella group, FAIR, as a hate group?

As most of us in the audience knew, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) is the organization that definitively identifies and litigates against U.S. hate and neo-Nazi groups. Its legal victories over the Klan, for instance, are legendary. Kobach replied that he was indeed aware of SPLC’s classification of FAIR as a hate group—but that it was wrong.

As NFP State Board member Mark Vasina wrote in a letter to the editor to the Fremont Tribune, however, Kobach’s remark “…is certainly not accurate. In 1997, the founder of FAIR and still current board member, John Tanton, compared immigrants to bacteria in a culture plate, growing ‘until it finally fills the whole plate… crashes and dies.’ Dan Stein, FAIR’s current president who regards Tanton as his ‘hero,’ has characterized Hispanics and Asians as involved in ‘competitive breeding.’ Donald Mann, on FAIR’s Board of Advisors, argues we should ‘give incentives to low-income people who agree to sterilization’ and ‘make available free abortion to low-income people on demand.’”

FAIR’s leaders’ fear of rapid reproduction by low-income people and persons of color comes naturally. The group’s origins lie in the eugenics movement that sought to breed superior people and control the reproduction of inferior ones. As a story by Brendan J. Kelley in the December 2, 2009 Anchorage Press notes, “According to a 21-page white paper by the SPLC’s Dr. Heidi Beirich titled ‘The Nativist Lobby’:

‘FAIR has long been marked by anti-Latino and anti-Catholic attitudes. It has mixed this bigotry with a fondness for eugenics, the idea of breeding better humans discredited by its Nazi association.’

Now we have entered a new era. FAIR has become a visible actor in Nebraska at every level—from local communities to institutions of higher education; from local broadcasts of the “Lou Dobbs” show to state legislative and executive branch politics. Samples of FAIR’s handiwork may be found: (1) in Nebraska’s population each year—28,000 total. Over the course of these eight years, FAIR alleges that the foreign born population increased by 38.6 percent as against a 2.1 percent increase in the native-born. The group locates many more non-English speakers in the state now than in 2000, making the burden of non-English speaking students in rural schools so heavy that in many cases students and teachers communicate only with hand signals. Further, the site says (contrary to other Nebraska research) that illegal aliens cost Nebraska a great deal of money for prison, education and medicine. Through charts, the site communicates to us that Nebraska’s foreign-born population increasingly comes from nations of color: Mexico, Vietnam, China and India. The analysis never makes its statement about Nebraska on its website; (2) in the work of its local Nebraska representative, Susan Smith; (3) in the efforts of its national field director, Susan Tully, to influence immigrant legislation before the Nebraska Legislature’s Judicial Committee; and (4) in Kris Kobach’s efforts to repeal Nebraska’s ‘Dream Act’ and to deny—by city ordinance in Fremont, Nebraska—harbor, employment and housing to undocumented immigrants.

For the most part these efforts do not come out, on their face, as racist statements. They appear as innocent efforts to enforce the law: “What part of illegal don’t you understand?” FAIR never uses the overt terminology of prejudice, but rather words and situations that make the person troubled by the presence of people of color feel denied or threatened.

When Kobach ran for Congress in a largely Republican Kansas district in 2004, “One reason he lost, according to The Road to Congress 2004 ‘was because... he was accused of taking money from a white supremacist organization, and the charge stuck.’”
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overly racist comments. Yet, anyone who reads it—without supplementary data from other sources—will feel that white folks are being increasingly overwhelmed by people of color who will not speak English and do not pay for themselves. In fact, according to the Southern Poverty Law Center’s report, its founder, John Tanton, once said that to preserve American culture, “a European-American majority” is requisite.

(2) FAIR’s local representative, Susan Smith

According to the national FAIR site, Smith heads two local organizations. The ‘Nebraskans Advisory Group’ is comprised of Nebraskans concerned about illegal immigration from Mexico (NAG says 93 percent of “illegals” are from Mexico). Among the “reputable [web] sites” that the advisory group recommends are the ‘Aliac site’ that tells us that Mexican-American drug gangs growing marijuana are taking over U.S. public lands; the ‘NumbersUSA site’ that opposes almost all illegal and legal immigration; and Susan Smith’s ‘Nebraska Taxpayers For Freedom (NTF) site,’ sponsored by a Nebraska anti-tax group that has affiliations with the “tea party movement.” The Nebraska Advisory Group’s website contains almost nothing but notices that would make one fear or hate undocumented immigrants who are persons of color and seemingly makes an effort to conflate terrorists and illegal aliens with legal aliens (as terrorists and illegal aliens are sometimes conflated and often the data offered concerns legal and illegal aliens as a collective group).

(3) The Susan Tully testimony

The general philosophical thrust found in Susan Smith’s organizations—demonizing persons of color, conflating illegal aliens and terrorists and promoting fear—formed part of the testimony of Susan Tully, the national field director for FAIR, when she appeared before the Legislature’s Judiciary Committee study group on December 12, 2008. Tully predictably encouraged the Legislature to adopt the ‘E-Verify’ program, saying that it is 99.4 percent accurate. (She later contradicted herself in the same hearing by saying that E-Verify is not accurate in that “illegals” can use identity theft to get through it easily. UNL Economics Professor and NFP State Board member Hank van den Berg gave testimony of a very different picture on the inaccuracy of E-Verify and the reasons for it). Tully also encouraged all local communities to give law enforcement officials ‘287G’ training. ‘287G’ is a program that Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano has ordered reviewed and the GAO has condemned because it allows local officials use minor immigrant offenses to deport undocumented individuals, which tends to victimize women in particular and lead to local racial profiling. At the same time, 287G (with its emphasis on the petty offender, appears often to be impotent in training officials to find big criminal fish in the immigrant community (Washington Post Wednesday, March 4, 2009).

Smith moved from 287G to the heart of her spiel, saying of undocumented that, though there are “millions of people who are here simply to have jobs,” there are also “hundreds of thousands of terrorists in this country illegally who want to hurt us.” Further she asserted that the country will probably face a “biological ticking up cells all over this country. How legal residents are supposed to be able to tell brown-faced workers from the brown-faced terrorists (who apparently are everywhere) is never explained.

Tully’s testimony was characteristic. In 2006, when a Tennessee talk show host suggested that all undocumented people trying to get across the border be shot, Ms. Tully chuckled (Building Democracy Initiative, April 28, 2006). In 2004, she said, “[Muslims] are not coming here to become Americans…[They are] promoting colonization of their own religion, of their own culture in towns and taking them over.” In 2004 as well, she said, “I have a secret plan to destroy America…We must first make America a bilingual-bicultural country… I would then invent ‘multiculturalism’ and encourage immigrants to maintain their own culture…Having made America a bilingual-bicultural country, having established multiculturalism, having the large foundations fund the doctrine of ‘victimology,' I would next make it impossible to enforce our immigration laws.”

(4) Kris Kobach’s work

FAIR’s two two legal initiatives in Nebraska—repeal of the Dream Act and the draconian city ordinance proposed for Fremont—are so closely connected to the career of Kris Kobach as to require a little background of his general work. Kobach claims to be an immigration law expert at the University of Missouri at Kansas City and a distinguished counsel to John Ashcroft as attorney general of the United States—a picture of Kobach to which Nebraska newspapers have largely subscribed. However, when Kobach ran for Congress in a largely Republican Kansas district in 2004, “One reason he lost, according to The Road to Congress 2004 was because, ‘in general, Kobach was accused of taking money from a white supremacist organization, and the charge stuck.’” (Phoenix New Times, 2/10/2010). In 2009, at a Leavenworth County, Kansas Republican event, Kobach “asked what Obama and God had in common” and answered that, “Neither had a birth certificate.” He later said that this was a joke and that he is no ‘birther.’ The ‘Anti-Defamation League of B’nai Brith’ has condemned Kobach’s employment by an Arizona sheriff to train persons working on illegal immigration issues, calling it “outrageous” that a man “who works on behalf of an anti-immigrant group” should “conduct training on immigration law and ethnic profiling” and describing his hiring “an affront to the federal government, the community at large and certainly the Hispanic community.”

Just as he and FAIR have done in many other states, Kobach pushed the Nebraska Legislature (in Sen. Charlie Janssen’s LB 1001 effort) to repeal the Dream Act granting in-state tuition rates to undocumented students who have been living in Nebraska and graduated from Nebraska high schools. Only a handful of such students exist, and at least some of
by Hank van den Berg
UNL Economics Professor

Our civil society is being transformed into a cruel plutocracy right before our eyes, and no one is paying attention.

Under the guise of fiscal responsibility, federal, state, and local governments are avidly dismantling the ‘social safety net’—public education, Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, Aid to Dependent Children—that nearly all Americans rely on to protect them against unforeseen disasters and unfortunate economic outcomes.

The Role of the Budget Deficit

To grasp why the social safety net is threatened, consider the following:

1. In his 2010 ‘State of the Union’ message to Congress, President Obama announced a three-year spending freeze on “non-security discretionary spending” such as education, infrastructure, technology, scientific and medical research.

2. According to the Congressional Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 56 percent of total budgeted U.S. government expenditures in 2009 were for mandatory programs such as Medicaid, Medicare, unemployment insurance and veterans programs.

3. 23 percent of all budgeted 2009 expenditures (and well over half of all discretionary expenditures) were for national defense, and a few percent more that fall in the listed category of “other discretionary expenditures” are for Homeland Security, Star Wars research, international surveillance and covert meddling overseas.

4. At least 4 percent of total government expenditures in 2009 went for financial bailouts to firms like General Motors, AIG and other recipients not expected to ever repay.

5. Five percent of payments listed in the total 2009 budget—discretionary and non-discretionary—were for interest on the federal debt (a percentage expected to rise to 7 percent in 2011).

6. According to the OMB, this leaves little more than 10 percent of the total budget as “non-security discretionary.”

7. With the shortfall in tax revenues, the overall deficit for the proposed 2011 budget is on the order of $1.5 trillion—over 30 percent of the total budget and more than 10 percent of the U.S.’s total gross domestic product (GDP).

By itself, the “non-security discretionary” portion of the federal budget—even if we cut all of it—is way too small to erase the entire budget deficit. Financially, however, the U.S. government simply cannot continue accumulating debt at the rate of 10 percent of GDP every year (which is what 2009’s deficit added), as lenders will soon refuse to let us borrow any more money for fear we’ll be unable to pay it back. Consequently, our elected officials are faced with having to cut either “security” expenditures or non-discretionary expenditures.

Faced with what is apparently a very difficult choice, President Obama did what other presidents have done: appoint a ‘bipartisan commission’ to come up with suggestions for cutting the budget deficit.

The President’s new “Bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform” will have to deal with some ominous trends:

1. The U.S. private saving rate declined drastically over the past 30 years.

2. While federal government expenditures rose, assorted tax cuts on the wealthy have kept revenues from rising with the growth in expenditures.

3. The U.S. rate of unemployment of near 10 percent and the combined estimate of unemployment, underemployment, and withdrawal from the labor market stands at nearly 18 percent of the potential U.S. workforce.

4. Real incomes have stagnated for 90 percent of all Americans; only the top 5 percent of U.S households have experienced real income growth over the past 30 years.

5. The United States is at the bottom of all high-income countries in terms of social mobility—defined as the likelihood that a person born into a low-income family will move to a higher-income bracket later in life.

6. Global warming and species depletion continues unabated, with carbon about to reach 400 parts per million within the next five years (150 p.p.m. more than the level under which humanity evolved).

In short, cost-cutting measures to reduce the budget deficit run the risk of extending the ‘Great Recession,’ the dismantling of social programs threatens to reduce social mobility even further, and we are making no progress in reducing the dangers associated with global warming.

On the other hand, turning around the economy with costly programs to boost employment and stimulate economic growth on promise to produce more budget deficits.

It’s All Greek to Us

The United States faces a future not much different from the situation currently
Has Our Nasty Winter Ended Global Warming? We Should be So Lucky

Nasty winter, eh?

Enough to make some of us question the association between sanity and a Nebraska address. La Vida Buena, anyone?

I could use a transfer to the University of Nebraska at Key West.

I’ve had more than one person greet my little lecture about the difference between ‘weather’ and ‘climate’ with gentle suggestions that I could drown myself in a pothole. I’ve read triumphal letters to the editor in the Omaha World-Herald suggesting that we all burn up more oil in low-mileage SUVs to warm the place up and prevent a new ice age. The lower the mileage, the better, they argue. Forget carbon footprints. Burn fossil fuels, be happy!

We should be so lucky.

Our local cold and snow has been shaped by atmospheric collusion of El Niño in the Pacific Ocean (usually a warming influence), and the Arctic Oscillation, a high-pressure system over Greenland that opens the gates of the Arctic in middle and eastern North America. While El Niño gooses the storms by providing more warmth and moisture, the Arctic Oscillation provides cold air here. The result: what we got this winter—back-to-back blizzards and near-record cold. While we were shivering, Greenland’s temperatures were above average.

CO₂ and Temperatures Still Rising

The fact is that as long as the proportion of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere keeps rising, climate change is right on track. Weather, which is still very changeable, is fooling some gullible contrarians.

Meanwhile, at the Winter Olympics near Vancouver, B.C., snow was imported to skiing venues with helicopters and trucks. It’s too warm for natural snow. Is anyone ready to ski in the rain?

And the weather’s been just as extreme ‘down under.’ In Australia this past January (during their summer), the temperature reached 106 °F in Sydney and 108 in Melbourne. The hot wind was blowing record highs out of the interior of an increasingly dry, fire-ravaged continent.

NASA reported in November, 2009 that the July through October period of that year, worldwide, was the warmest on the instrumental record. During the decade 2000-2009 in the continental United States, record high temperatures for individual dates occurred twice as often as record lows. From January 1, 2000 to September 30, 2009, 291,237 daily record highs and 142,420 record lows were recorded, according to a National Center for Atmospheric Research study led by senior scientist Gerald Meeh, in Geophysical Research Letters.

Our local chill here in the Midwest was abnormal in a worldwide context. The 2000-2009 decade also was the warmest on the instrumental record worldwide—a third of a degree warmer than the 1990s. That’s a large amount in decadal recordkeeping, “providing fresh evidence that the planet may be warming at a potentially disastrous rate,” according to the National Climatic Data Center. The year 2005 was the warmest on record, at 1.11 degrees above average.

2000-2009 Record Warmest

The past decade, in fact had the two warmest years on record, according to NASA. 2009 was the second warmest on the instrumental record (since 1880), after 2005. James E. Hansen, director of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies, said that global temperatures varied because of changes in ocean heating and cooling cycles. “When we average temperature over 5 or 10 years to minimize that variability,” said Dr. Hansen, one of the world’s leading climatologists, “we find global warming is continuing unabated.” The NASA data indicated a temperature rise of about 0.36 degrees Fahrenheit (0.2 degrees Celsius) per decade during 30 years.

Because of melting polar ice, the Kodiak-Kenai Cable Co. is planning this year to lay a $1.2 billion fiber-optic cable across the Arctic between London and Tokyo. The new route, called ‘ArcticLink,’ is half the distance of other cable lines and will cut the transmission time almost in half, from 140 to 88 milliseconds.

Mass loss from glaciers along the coasts of Greenland and Antarctica are accelerating faster than expected and contributing to sea-level rise, according to a late 2009 report in Nature by Hamish D. Pritchard and colleagues. Accelerated ice flow or what’s called ‘dynamic thinning’ (measured by high-resolution laser altimetry that maps changes) reaches all latitudes in Greenland, has intensified on key Antarctic grounding lines, has endured for decades after ice-shelf collapse, penetrates far into the interior of each ice sheet, and is spreading as ice shelves thin by ocean-driven melt.

The National Climatic Data Center said in September, 2009 that sea-surface temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere for the summer of 2009 worldwide were the highest on the instrumental record, since about 1880. Cyclical El Niño conditions in the Pacific Ocean contributed to temperature rise, but the temperatures were above previous El Niño peaks. The summer 2009 average was 62.5 degrees, 1 degree above the 20th Century average.

Thus, while the contrarians react to transitory weather events and scoff at ‘climate change,’ nature is telling a different story.

Bruce E. Johansen is a professor of Communication at the University of Nebraska-Omaha and author, in 2009, of Hot Air and Hard Science: Dissecting the Global Warming Debate and the two-volume Encyclopedia of Global Warming Science and Technology.
2 Books for Beleaguered Activists
Proving That 1 Person Can Make a Difference

Reviewed by John Krejci

*Three Cups of Tea: One Man’s Mission to Promote Peace, One School at a Time* by Greg Mortenson (2006)

By spending the time to drink “three cups of tea” with the people he met: the first cup, in Mideast hospitality, offered to a stranger, the second to a friend, and the third to one who is considered a part of the family. Over tea, relationships are forged, trust is gained, promises are made, and customs learned and respected. Greg listened to the people, their wants, needs and hopes—particularly for their children.

He learned that nothing trumps relationships. To access a village or a region, one has to have a personal relationship: friendship with a village leader, a mullah (religious leader), or a warlord of the area. Absent that, have a relationship with someone who is recognized and accepted by the leaders. Relationships are key, be they family, clan, tribe or friendship.

As Americans we mistakenly think about Afghanistan and Pakistan as unified countries with three tidy layers of government: national, regional, local. But this Western concept is inaccurate. Afghanistan (and Pakistan, to some degree) is organized into amorphous regions controlled by warlords: some ex-mujahadeen, others Taliban, still others Northern Alliance, mullahs, or one of the multi-ethnic local leaders. Hence the term for the U.S.’s man in Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, as ‘the mayor of Kabul.’ His power is located mostly in the capital city, and not much further. In addition, each village has a leader, perhaps a mullah, or group of leaders. And the many regions have diverse languages, e.g., Dari, Pashto, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Nuristani—to name a few.

The bottom line is that, unless you have a ‘three cups of tea’ relationship, you will not be successful. ‘Dr. Greg,’ as he was often called, learned that the local people knew what they needed. He just bungled into the school-building business, he admits, after learning that this is what people in remote areas told him they wanted. Partly in gratitude to the village leaders of Korphi who had saved his life during his descent from his failed attempt to climb K2, he promised to build a school for their children (something that the governments, as corrupt and nearly bankrupt as they are, were either unwilling or unable to provide the necessary resources for).

These books could be classed as ‘road’ books. They chronicle his adventures, traveling to the “end of the road” to build schools (mostly for women) in Pakistan and later in Afghanistan. I was both impressed and humbled by the hardships, danger and deprivation that Mortenson and his Afghan friends endured as they braved horrible roads, landslides, foul weather, the dangers of the Taliban and drug trade, and even his


How many of us, in our quieter moments, have asked ourselves, ‘Am I wasting my life struggling to bring peace to such a violent world?’ Read Greg Mortenson’s autobiographical works to be encouraged, enlightened and edified. I certainly was.

Greg Mortenson, a disorganized, “punctuality handicapped,” failed mountain climber, parlayed his unsuccessful attempt to climb K2, the world’s second-tallest mountain, into the building of 167 schools—mostly for girls—in the remote areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan. And all this amidst two wars and an earthquake!

The keys to his success are relationships, his commitment to keeping his word, his rugged doggedness in enduring physical hardships, a naïve idealism and goodness, an understanding and appreciation for local people, and a good bit of luck. He learned patience by spending the time to drink “three cups of tea” with the people he met: the first cup, in Mideast hospitality, offered to a stranger, the second to a friend, and the third to one who is considered a part of the family. Over tea, relationships are forged, trust is gained, promises are made, and customs learned and respected. Greg listened to the people, their wants, needs and hopes—particularly for their children.

He learned that nothing trumps relationships. To access a village or a region, one has to have a personal relationship: friendship with a village leader, a mullah (religious leader), or a warlord of the area. Absent that, have a relationship with someone who is recognized and accepted by the leaders. Relationships are key, be they family, clan, tribe or friendship.

As Americans we mistakenly think about Afghanistan and Pakistan as unified countries with three tidy layers of government: national, regional, local. But this Western concept is inaccurate. Afghanistan (and Pakistan, to some degree) is organized into amorphous regions controlled by warlords: some ex-mujahadeen, others Taliban, still others Northern Alliance, mullahs, or one of the multi-ethnic local leaders. Hence the term for the U.S.’s man in Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, as ‘the mayor of Kabul.’ His power is located mostly in the capital city, and not much further. In addition, each village has a leader, perhaps a mullah, or group of leaders. And the many regions have diverse languages, e.g., Dari, Pashto, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Nuristani—to name a few.

The bottom line is that, unless you have a ‘three cups of tea’ relationship, you will not be successful. ‘Dr. Greg,’ as he was often called, learned that the local people knew what they needed. He just bungled into the school-building business, he admits, after learning that this is what people in remote areas told him they wanted. Partly in gratitude to the village leaders of Korphi who had saved his life during his descent from his failed attempt to climb K2, he promised to build a school for their children (something that the governments, as corrupt and nearly bankrupt as they are, were either unwilling or unable to provide the necessary resources for).

These books could be classed as ‘road’ books. They chronicle his adventures, traveling to the “end of the road” to build schools (mostly for women) in Pakistan and later in Afghanistan. I was both impressed and humbled by the hardships, danger and deprivation that Mortenson and his Afghan friends endured as they braved horrible roads, landslides, foul weather, the dangers of the Taliban and drug trade, and even his

---

**Investing in Girls’ Education Yields High Returns**

**Income Growth**
- Increased education leads to income growth for girls themselves and for nations as a whole.
- Educating girls also boosts farm productivity.
- Educated farmers are more efficient and their farms more productive, which leads to increased crop yields and declines in malnutrition.

**Maternal and Child Health**
- Educated women have smaller, healthier and better-educated families.
- The better educated the women in a society, the lower the fertility rate.
- The better educated the women, the lower the infant mortality rate.
- Educated women are more likely to insist on education for their own children, especially their daughters.

**Women’s Empowerment**
- Educated girls and women are more likely to stand up for themselves and resist violence.
- Educated women channel more of their resources to the health and education of their children than men do.
- As women are educated and approach parity with men, research shows that governments and other institutions function better and with less corruption.
- When vegetables or meat wrapped in newspapers are brought home from the market, women often ask their literate daughters to read the news to them and can understand more about the dynamic world around them.

*(Adapted from Stones into Schools)*

-MARCH / APRIL 2010 NEBRASKA REPORT, P. 7-
Wazir kidnappers—not to mention an earthquake and two wars (India/Pakistan, U.S.-Afghanistan).

Mortenson briefly tells of his courtship and marriage to an equally dedicated and long-suffering spouse, Tara Bishop. She lives with their children, Khyber and Amira, in Bozeman, Montana, where Greg’s nonprofit organization, the “Central Asian Institute” (CAI), is housed. Besides his perilous travels throughout the Mideast, he is now in demand to speak across the United States to teach people about his work and raise money to build and maintain the schools. Each school requires the donation of land from the village, the village labor to build the school, and a commitment to support the schools. The cost of the initial schools was $20,000—about one fourth the cost of similar government or NGO schools. Local decision-making and local control are keys to success.

In addition to relationships with local villagers and Muslim leaders, Mortenson’s prestige and charm has allowed him to work with the Taliban, ex-mujahadeen, and even the U.S. military. Chapter 20 of Three Cups of Tea is titled “Tea with the Taliban.” Chapter 21 is “Rumsfeld’s shoes” (Greg never did have tea with Rumsfeld).

Since Mortenson served in the military (as a medic from 1975-77), he has “respect and admiration” for the armed forces, although he abhors the violence of war. Chapter 12, “An email from an American colonel,” tells of a fascinating military relationship. Colonel Chris Kolenda grew up in Omaha and wrote the following to Greg’s Central Asia Institute:

“I am the Commander of Task Force Saber… Our primary goal… is to provide hope for the good people of Afghanistan, particularly the children. Building schools is one of my top development priorities… I am convinced that the long-term solution to terrorism in general and Afghanistan particularly will not be won with bombs but with books… The thirst for education here is palpable. People are tired of war after 30 years and want a better future… Reading Three Cups of Tea has inspired me even further to pursue the development of Afghan schools and education…” (Stones into Schools, p. 258)

Kolenda understood relationships, worked with the village leaders and even organized a jirga (a village meeting) to discuss building a school. Three Cups of Tea is now required reading for all Special Forces personnel. Mortenson’s ability to work across borders and barriers is demonstrated by the picture of Admiral Mike Mullen (Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) in Chapter 15, “A meeting of Two Warriors,” handing out books to CAI students. Mullen is later quoted: “The Muslim community is a subtle world we do not fully—and don’t always attempt to understand. Only through the appreciation of the people’s culture, needs, and hopes for the future can we hope ourselves to supplant the extremist narrative.” (p. 313).

On one occasion Admiral Mullen, amidst the bad news in Afghanistan, asked Greg for some good news. Greg responded, “…at the height of the Taliban’s power, in 2000, less than 800,000 children were enrolled in school in Afghanistan—all of them boys. Today, however, student enrollment across the country (is) approaching 8 million children, 2.4 million of whom are girls.” (p. 318).

Needless to say, Mortenson kept his distance from the military and even other NGOs connected with the West, so that he could carry on his work without suspicion of being a tool of Western influence and imperialism. Part of the success of his schools was again their independence and their close ties to the local people.

One of the key developments and an incredible source of funding for the Central Asia Institute was a cover story in 34 million circulation of Parade Magazine in April, 2003. Mortenson’s picture appeared on the cover with the headline, “He Fights Terror with Books.” Greg is quoted saying, “If we try to resolve terrorism with military might and nothing else, then we will be no safer than we were before 9/11. If we truly want a legacy of peace for our children, we need to understand that this is a war that will be won with books, not with bombs” (Three Cups of Tea, p. 301). The deluge of mail and phone calls that followed this article was so great that a phone bank had to be set up in Omaha, Nebraska!

So what have I learned from Mortenson’s two books?
• One person can make a difference.
• Relationships are the key to success in the Middle East—and everywhere else too.
• Schools will bring peace before bombs ever will.
• We must strive to understand the complex web of cultures, customs and values of people.
• The Muslim religion, Islam, is a reality for over a billion people. We do well to understand and respect it.
• The geography, history and political divisions of Afghanistan are complex and we are very ignorant of even the basics of that part of the world.
• There is a high price associated with ‘making a difference’ in terms of personal suffering, family sacrifices and danger.

I enthusiastically recommend reading these two books. You can check them out at www.threecupsoftea.com or www.stonesintoschools.com. The Central Asia Institute can be found at www.ikat.org. As-Salaam Alaaikum. Peace be with you.
Watch Out! conclusion

faced by Greece, where retired workers, students and public employees are rioting against proposed cuts in the government expenditures that they rely on for their existence. The Greek government is cutting spending on education, healthcare, retirement and other social programs because economic analysts warn that financial markets will not provide further loans to cover these budget deficits—not unless, that is, public spending is cut by at least 4 percent in each of the next three years to eliminate the country’s 12 percent budget deficit. If no new lending is forthcoming, Greece faces immediate cuts in government spending of over 12 percent of its GDP—and, most likely, instant economic depression.

Here in the U.S., the government has not yet proposed draconian measures such as Greece’s budget cuts equal to 10 percent of their total budget and 4 percent of their GDP. But such numbers are not entirely out of the question for us in the future. With the total U.S. deficit (now at an unfathomable $12.4 trillion) expected to grow another 20 and 30 percent through 2016, a few cuts in discretionary spending will not help.) Even a large 10 percent cut in “non-security discretionary spending” such as education, health, infrastructure or the environment reduces the overall budget deficit by only 1 percent—all else being equal. Therefore, the President’s commission will probably propose cuts in non-discretionary spending programs like Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, retirement expenditures and student loans.

The reason I expect this recommendation is because President Obama’s choice for the chair of this commission is the long-time Democratic operative Erskine Bowles, who currently serves on several corporate boards, including General Motors and Morgan Stanley. Despite also serving as president of the University of North Carolina, Bowles received over half a million dollars in compensation for serving on the Morgan Stanley board. And did I mention that nearly half of the Commission’s members are Republicans?

Cuts in the social safety net are now common events at state and local levels in California, New York, Nevada and even in Nebraska. Worse cuts have been avoided only through federal stimulus funding—although even with the stimulus spending and assistance to state and local governments, California nevertheless just announced pink slips for 23,000 teachers. That will not help social mobility. So what can we do to avoid further cuts in the social safety net?

We Could Easily Raise Some Taxes

One obvious alternative to cutting government expenditures is to raise some taxes. Interestingly, while Social Security has received much attention, a relatively small increase in Social Security taxes (say by raising the income level at which taxes are cut off—currently about $106,000—to about $200,000) will permit the system to cover the currently promised benefits for the next 75 years. Of course, the financial industry wants to privatize the Social Security system, so such a straightforward solution will never even be put on the table.

The budget deficit can also be cut by restoring the marginal tax rate for high-income earners to 40 percent—the level where it was under President Reagan. Such a rise will not have any adverse effect on economic growth (after all, the historic highs for U.S. productivity growth occurred during the 1950s and 1960s, when the top marginal tax rate was 90 percent!) When a government has the income to expand education, invest in science and technology, and improve infrastructure, the economy grows, income distribution improves, and everyone benefits. There is the real ‘bubble-up’ effect—in contrast to the ‘trickle-down’ mythology that was used to justify recent tax cuts.

Or, We Could Cut Defense Expenditures

The most obvious solution to the budget deficit—while avoiding further damage to the economy, the environment or the social safety net—is to cut defense expenditures. President Obama’s defense budget for 2011 is at an all-time record high, despite the fact that we have no real enemies with a significant military capability. As Paul Olson reminds us in his ‘Speaking Our Peace’ column in this Nebraska Report, well over half of the discretionary portion of the U.S. government budget goes to past, current and future wars and national security. Including all “security” expenditures brings expenditures to about 30 percent of the total national budget (7 percent of GDP). Taking even just half of that would be enough to maintain expenditures on education, anti-poverty programs, unemployment insurance, Medicaid, food stamps, and some serious environmental programs such as public transportation and real alternative energy research.

We Must Stop the Destruction of the Social Safety Net

The destruction of the social safety net mostly affects those in greatest need in our society: the poor, the very young and very old, ethnic minorities, immigrants, and the sick and disabled. Some contend that the dismantling and privatization of the government’s social safety net is inevitable because (1) the people not currently in need are not directly affected by the cuts, (2) there is a huge propaganda machine touting the efficiency of privatization over the ‘waste’ of government, and (3) we are led to believe that expenditures on entitlements are out of control and unaffordable in the long run. All three of these points are inaccurate.

All Americans rely on and participate in the public social safety net. Virtually everyone working today will be eligible for Social Security and Medicare. The persistent job losses over the past three years have made millions of Americans eligible for unemployment benefits. Federally subsidized student loans are the norm for middle class families with college-age children. Most Americans benefit from tax exemptions for employer contributions to health insurance and various types of retirement plans. Then there are subsidies and crop insurance for farmers, tax credits for home improvements, tax exemptions for medical expenses, charitable giving, and interest on home loans. We are all part of the social safety net; this is not just for some ‘other’ group of people. And most people know this first hand.

We of course have to get past the myth that the government is less efficient at protecting us from danger, misfortune and disaster. To the contrary, in the case of healthcare, other developed countries all provide all of their citizens with better healthcare at, on average, about 60 percent of the average U.S. cost by accepting universal, single-payer systems and much higher levels of regulation and mandates. Recent OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) data for the world’s rich countries also makes it stunningly clear that the U.S. education is also falling further behind other countries that rely much more on public education than we do.

Finally, we can afford to maintain—and even expand—the social safety as well as seriously reduce the future budget deficits that are now on course to bankrupt our government. All we need to do is reinstate some modest tax increases on the wealthy elite that captured all of the past 25 years’ income gains, and we must stop our senseless militaristic extravagance.

Nebraskans for peace, take note: What’s good for peace is good for the economy!

Your Foundation Speaks

by Loyal Park, Nebraska Peace Foundation President

2009 is over, except for filing your income taxes. It’s too late to do anything about what you owe for last year, but a tax-deductible contribution to the Nebraska Peace Foundation in 2010 can help with what you may have to pay in the year to come.

Check with your tax advisor today to see how you can benefit by making a gift to the Foundation.
Nothing ‘FAIR’ about Them, conclusion

them are on the way to documented status—as the testimony of one student who had gone to college as undocumented and has now achieved legal status illustrated.

Kobach and his entourage argued that denying the Dream Act (and the 'American dream' to undocumented residents) is a matter of saving state taxes and enforcing law and order. They said the Dream Act should be repealed and the Mexican-American undocumented students should be sent home to Mexico

citizens from harboring, hiring or employing undocumented immigrants. This ordinance, written by Kobach, has been attempted in substantially the same form in Hazleton, Pennsylvania; Farmer’s Branch, Texas; Valley Park, Missouri; Riverside, New Jersey; and Escondido, California. Litigation costs associated with the ordinance in other cities have cost them millions of dollars. The ordinances were generally found illegal on appeal by the superior courts.

The final visible effort of FAIR and Kobach in Nebraska is the Fremont ordinance that would prevent Fremont citizens from harboring, hiring or employing undocumented immigrants.

The Fremont version was presented to the City Council by Councilmember Bob Warner in July 2008. It was defeated by a 4-4 vote with the mayor of Fremont vetoing the measure. In March, 2009, a ‘citizen’s petition’ with 1900 signatures asking that the issue be put on the ballot, was filed successfully. In response, the City of Fremont filed in the District Court asking that the proposal not be placed on the ballot because it deemed the proposal “unconstitutional” and violative of the “single subject” rule. The District Court upheld the voter’s right to vote on the issue because it ruled that a substantive challenge could not be made until the petition’s ordinance had become law. The City of Fremont appealed this ruling to the Nebraska Supreme Court which heard the argument in January, 2010. We are still awaiting its ruling on FAIR’s and Kobach’s brain child. Meanwhile, people of color in Fremont feel that they are experiencing considerable suspicion and anger, whether they are legal or undocumented, and those whites who wish to better race relations in the community are finding themselves marginalized.

Since the Fremont-style ordinances have been found illegal on appeal in a variety of venues, FAIR’s legal strategy is probably seeking to do two things:

(1) stir up suspicion of all Mexican-American persons in Fremont and Nebraska since—according to most statistics—40-80 percent of Mexican-American families are made up of a mixture of documented and undocumented folks;

(2) create litigation histories for this sort of ordinance until it is upheld somewhere in the country and ultimately becomes the law of the land. The cost of this litigation is born by the municipalities.

John Tanton, FAIR’s founder and still active member of the board, has also founded four other nativist groups, including ‘U.S.English’—an organization committed to making English the required language of public discourse in this country. In a memo for that organization, he asked,

“Will Latin American migrants bring with them the tradition of the mor dida (bride), the lack of involvement in public affairs, etc.?”, “What are the differences in educability between Hispanics (with their 50% dropout rate) and Asians (with their excellent school records and long tradition of scholarship)?”

“The demographic point: perhaps this is the first instance in which those with their pants down are going to get caught by those with their pants up!”

When the memo was published, Walter Cronkite and conservative commentator, Linda Chavez, resigned from the board of ‘U.S.English.’ Their actions provide a principled example that Nebraskans should emulate—particularly now when we are facing outside manipulation of sentiment against our neighbors and fellow human beings.

Nebraska does have real immigration problems. The destruction of rural Mexico by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has created a large body of needy people—many of whom are fleeing to the U.S. The route to citizenship for undocumented, though, is a ‘Catch 22.’ Border enforcement is selective, depending on the political strength of workers and unions in the United States and corporate demand for laborers to fill agricultural and unpleasant industrial jobs. All of these problems, however, demand federal solutions—not punitive state-based ones.

And if we in Nebraska are serious about tackling the immigration issue, we will seek them. We have had enough outside stirring of the fires of hatred and it’s high time we speak up.
Studies—which former Nebraska Senator Jim Exon consistently supported in his campaign for a U.S. Peace Academy—is a well-recognized academic study.

In the globalized economy of the 21st century, war-mongering is almost guaranteed to be the least viable path to security. Resentment fostered by our imperialist and colonialist foreign policy—our shameful heritage of support for slavery, racism, corporate exploitation of the resources, and the installation of brutal dictators like Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and the Shah of Iran (men who served our narrowest interests in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and some parts of Africa)—has only increased our insecurity. Despite our noble intonations of ‘democracy,’ our foreign policy has not respected traditional cultures, national self-determination or human dignity. And daily, we are paying the price for this destructive history, both through our burgeoning military expenditures (and ballooning national debt) and the hatred our belligerent foreign policy is engendering.

If our government was concerned about security in any real sense, we would immediately start reducing our nuclear stockpile down to zero, as nuclear weapons and delivery systems do not deter men willing to blow themselves up to stop us. Real security comes from striving to collectively meet the needs of the whole world—not from forcefully trying to bend the rest of world to our will.

But as a nation, we are naked when it comes to the real security. Naked economically, militarily and politically. We have so much sovereign debt that we soon will not be able to pay our bills. We cannot meet the needs of an economy in recession. Our Republican and some of our Democratic leaders tell us that Medicare, Medicaid, TARP, Social Security, healthcare and jobs programs all cost too much. We are so poor nowadays—our political leaders who are poised to approve the biggest military budget in the history of the earth—that we can’t even afford to stop global warming (as the failure to produce an outcome at Copenhagen so amply demonstrated).

And according to our own military, our failure to deal with global warming is itself a security threat. In the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review mandated by the Congress, Pentagon officials conclude that climate change will act as an ‘accelerant of instability and conflict,’ ultimately placing a burden on civilian institutions and militaries around the world. The Defense Department also acknowledges in the QDR Review that climate change will affect the military’s operating environment, roles and missions. Climate-related changes include heavy downpours; rising temperature and sea level; rapidly retreating glaciers; thawing permafrost; and lengthening ice-free seasons in oceans, lakes or rivers. Assessments conducted by the intelligence community indicate that climate change will have significant geopolitical impacts around the world, contributing to poverty, environmental degradation and weakening of fragile governments…” (Homeland Security Defense Library)

Shortly after the Soviet Union fell, I lectured in Moldova—one of the first parts of that former union to declare its independence and the poorest country in Europe. People told me that Reagan had not defeated the Soviet Union. It had defeated itself, in that everything went to the military—all the money, all the intellectual resources and the best infrastructure.

Today, reconfigure the U.S. as the Soviet Union. A behemoth on its last legs.

During the Vietnam War, a commander was heard to say, “We had to destroy the village to save it.” Today military spending speaks. It says, “We have to destroy the global village to save it.” We have to have universal poverty and global warming to pay for our security.

This is pure bunk, and no one—not one candidate for Congress—should be elected who does not pledge to bring the U.S. back to, at least, 1977 priorities. And no one should be reelected who does not produce on this agenda.

WHERE YOUR INCOME TAX MONEY REALLY GOES

Carlton B. Paine, Ph.D. • Clinical Psychologist

5625 ’O’ Street, Suite 7 • Lincoln, NE 68510
Phone: 402-489-8484
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NFP Scholarships for High School Seniors

Nebraskans for Peace is offering scholarships to graduating high school seniors. Three $500 scholarships and six $100 scholarships will be awarded to seniors who wish to pursue a college education. The awards, based upon written essays, will be evenly divided among the three congressional districts. The recipients will be students who wish to further their education in an area consistent with the mission of NFP: peace with justice through community building, education and political action.

Applications should go within the body of an email (not as an attachment) to NFPscholarships@gmail.com on or before April 15, 2010. For details on how to apply, visit our website: www.nebraskansforpeace.org.

Goin’ Broke Paying for War
More than a Catchy Slogan

by Paul Olson, NFP President

The ‘Goin’ Broke Paying for War’ message that NFP has been pushing the past two years (first with bumper stickers—and now with yard signs) is more than just catchy language. Both economically and culturally, it’s patent truth.

In our obsession with security (the U.S. is now spending more than $2 billion a day on the Pentagon—as much as the rest of the world combined), we’ve driven ourselves to the brink of bankruptcy. And, ironically, wound up making ourselves even more ‘insecure.’

Throughout the ’60s, ’70s and ’80s, we were told by almost everyone (save former General and President Dwight Eisenhower) that we needed a massive military machine to stop the Soviets. Today, we know that the Pentagon and the CIA deliberately overestimated the strength and sophistication of Soviet militaries to up military spending on armaments. Were we more secure?

We were told that we would have a ‘peace dividend’ once the Soviets fell. But though military budgets fell briefly in the Clinton years (from a Reagan/Bush the Elder average of about $500 billion per year to a Clinton average of about $400 billion), under George W. Bush, they nearly doubled to $700 billion. Obama, who ran on a peace platform of getting out of Iraq and reducing nuclear weapons, seems captive to this compulsive behavior as he too keeps upping military spending. As the chart below shows, the budgeted average from 1988 to 2009 moves steadily upward, to almost double—despite the end of the Cold War.

At the same time, spending on what we need to stay alive as a country and to keep our citizens fed, clothed and strong (medicine, education, infrastructure, agriculture, energy and transportation) stayed even at about $400 million. Reagan’s plan to starve the social service sector reduced the civilian budget to a low of $250 billion, from which it only gradually crept upward until it spiked a bit under Bush Jr. to pay for the damage from Hurricane Katrina.

In 2008 and 2009, domestic spending had leveled out to where we’d been in 30 years before, in 1977. During the three decades from 1977 to 2009, non-military spending on ‘butter’ items (as opposed to ‘guns’) remained virtually constant.

The War Resister’s League annually produces a telling pie chart (see page 11). What this chart shows is that 54 percent of the 2009 discretionary budget went to present and past military costs. (The federal government’s pie chart conceals this reality by including trust funds such as Social Security in the budget—and not including the leftover costs of past military ventures.)

We live in a democracy moving toward a military state, as Pierre Tristan argued in the February 6, 2007 Florida News Journal. This means that the first priority of our government is military spending... that apparent ‘peaceniks’ who campaign for federal office soon become hawks after their elections because of military pressure... and that every member of Congress has military industry propping up their district’s local economy.

Most of this spending, as we know, is downright frivolous. From the $600 toilet seats that Ronald Reagan made an issue of to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld’s admission that the Pentagon “cannot trace $2.3 trillion in transactions,” we know the Pentagon is the premier practitioner of ‘waste, fraud and abuse.’ As much as 25 percent of what the military spends cannot be accounted for, according to the Pentagon’s own auditors. Special ‘no-bid’ contracts with Halliburton. Shadowy agreements with private mercenaries like Blackwater/Xe. And then the seemingly endless parade of deals with arms contractors for weapons we don’t need and ultimately end up

Conclusion on page 11