A few months ago I came across a comment by another Army supporter describing an Air Force supporter as being in the “Chair Force.” That phrase describes perfectly much of modern war activity. The classic cliché that war is “killing people and breaking things” is still true of course. How that is done is what has changed dramatically. Most killing of people and animals and breaking of things happens at a great distance with the killer and destroyer doing so while sitting in a comfortable chair with virtually no jeopardy to themselves.

The mythology of war has not changed. We are asked to hold the Chair Force warriors in high regard. We are told that they are defending our freedoms by risking their lives. In fact, they carry out acts of war like dispatching cruise missiles from ships far distant from the targets they engage. They remotely operate Drone aircraft that kill people half way around the world. They sit at the controls of nuclear war machinery poised to let loose a holocaust of nuclear destruction. The national security state’s veil of secrecy keeps being extended to cover the acts of war and plans for war. It is true that other nations are playing the high-tech war game. But the U.S. is far in the lead in this new arms race.

How do we challenge this new reality? To begin with we challenge the reasons for going to war. The U.S war machine with its goal of full spectrum dominance is defending a status quo, which keeps the poor right where they are and elevates the rich.

We must challenge the new morality which suggests that war from a distance, using the resources of outer space and cyber space, cannot be measured by traditional ethical, moral or legal standards.

We also need to challenge the modern mythology of war, which says full spectrum dominance is a good thing. We need to oppose the enormous expenditures of the military, industrial, congressional, religious, educational complex. Vital social programs are starved everywhere in the world as countries spend huge amounts on weapons.

Perhaps the most difficult thing to do will be to challenge the notion that warriors of all stripes are true heroes. If the war they are fighting is unjust, they are not heroes. If they never get blood on their hands while they cause death and destruction half way around the world they are not heroes. If they are cogs in a military machine which robs the poor of the world they are not heroes. If they choose to act in secrecy they are not heroes. If they join the military for economic reasons they are not heroes. Many in this group end up being physically or mentally injured by war. Then their stories are exploited by those advancing the cause of militarism. Thus they end up being victimized twice.

Finally we must challenge the leaders of all nations who exploit the idea of military sacrifice to further their own control of power and resources. They must be held accountable for the increase in civilian casualties in the wars which they promote.

Bill Sulzman
Citizens for Peace in Space
Colorado Springs, Colorado
Menwith Hill Protests Continue

This year marks ten years of our weekly protest. A small group of people has protested at the main entrance to the American base at Menwith Hill in North Yorkshire, England. Sometimes there has been one person, at other times a few and occasionally up to twenty - people come and go. The point is that we are there. There have been many arrests and charges over the years. We have overcome many challenges to restore the right to protest. There has been a presence at the base every Tuesday evening (6-8 pm) - throughout the spring, summer, autumn and winter. There was a lot of snow last year and the snow came early this year. It can be very mean up there. But we are still there. Why is it so important to be there and keep a vigil? Menwith Hill is run by the National Security Agency (NSA) and under the umbrella of the US Air Force (as with all the US bases in the UK) and is the largest intelligence gathering and surveillance base outside the US. It is strategically very important - involved with the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan etc. Menwith Hill is also very important because it is crucially connected to the US Missile Defense system. CAAB was the first campaign to find out about this link in 1997.

The protest, every Tuesday evening is to say to the people who come and go on the base that tonight we are here to oppose what you do. What difference does it make? Who knows? But not to be there is to collude and stay silent as to what goes on. We will be there until the US Visiting Forces go back to within their own borders, and the wonderful Yorkshire Dales are restored once again.

Protest is not the only way CAAB works. The weekly protest is one important way however. www.caab.org.uk

Lindis Percy and Laila Packer
Campaign for the Accountability of American Bases – CAAB
Harrogate, England

All Things Become Possible

The global movement for peace and social justice is in for a rough ride in the next few years. Global corporations have largely taken control of our governments and are driving military spending to record heights as they look ahead to the coming conflicts over declining resources. Cooperation, planning, and sharing are not in the lexicon of these neo-feudalists who are slashing social spending to pay for their greedy war binges.

Missile defense (MD), or missile offense as we are now calling it, is the latest twist used by the military industrial complex to sell their deadly weapons to a public weary of war. Rather than make serious attempts to get rid of nuclear weapons, as the United Nations Non-Proliferation Treaty demands, we instead get more spectacular claims that MD interceptors are the new “disarmament” policy. The Pentagon and Obama have successfully dragged NATO, South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan into the ever-expanding MD program that is now being used to encircle Russia and China, thus ensuring the latest round in the expensive and destabilizing arms race.

Russia sits on the world’s largest supply of natural gas, and the oil majors (centered in Washington, New York and London) think they should control this vital resource. China is increasingly dependent on fossil fuels for its huge economic appetite and imports 80 percent of its oil on ships. While the U.S. can’t imagine competing with China’s surging economy, the Pentagon brass have brilliantly determined that if they can control the sea lanes from the oil regions to Bejing, then the U.S. can still potentially hold the keys to the Chinese economic engine. Thus the current U.S. strategy is to expand bases on Guam, Australia, South Korea, Japan, and begin to make amends in Vietnam, in hopes that ports there might once again dock U.S. warships. China, not eager to surrender its sovereignty to the U.S. military, is expanding its Navy to protect its “vital interests” and sea lanes.

Our Global Network affiliates around the world all report the same basic story from their countries: expanding militarism, essentially junior partner relationships with the U.S. Empire, with dramatic cuts in social spending to pay for this military madness. Increasingly, it is beyond obvious that if we hope to halt the plans for missile defense, or Star Wars, then we have to fight for social progress at home as well. The days of affording guns and butter are forever gone. Two trains are heading for a collision. The question for all of us is which do we want to survive – high-tech warfare or social progress?

The global corporate oligarchy is banking on a return to feudalism - the corporate variety. Our strength is in our numbers and our common bond. We must internationalize our resistance to militarism and corporate domination, and one of the key strategic points for our organizing must be our efforts locally to connect the dots between economic crisis and endless war.

The Afghanistan occupation is costing the U.S. taxpayer about $10 billion per month. We’ve got to ask the people to imagine how those $$$ could be used at home. As protests mount across Europe against cutbacks in human needs the opportunity increases that the public will demand cuts instead in military budgets. We must increase our articulation of these deadly connections.

When the people of the world move together in solidarity to speak out against costly war and in favor of the future generations, I believe we become an unstoppable force. We should remember that we are not working alone. When we build a unified peace and justice movement globally all kinds of things become possible.

Bruce K. Gagnon
Bath, Maine
**Strengthen the Global Network**

The National Conference on "Achieving a Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defence Free Asia" was held at Nagpur, India on October 9-10, 2010. The conference attracted more than 200 college students from different parts of India along with a good number of women and academicians. This conference had the benefit of participation of three stalwarts: Jayanta Dhanapala, former Under Secretary of the UN via satellite uplink; Admiral Vishnu Bhagwat, former Naval Chief of India; and Bruce Gagnon, Coordinator of the Global Network. Their participation elevated the level of discussions.

Another event, which involved students from different colleges, is the national level Essay Competition organized by me during the past year, which has been held for the last four years. Students have written essays on subjects like Weaponisation of Space, Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Global Terrorism and Asian Union.

At present both at the international level and at the national level (India) it is only the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space that is working on the issues of weaponisation of space and missile defence. No other organization is paying attention to this theme. In India, the Global Network introduced these issues into the peace movement. Some academicians and students are hearing about them for the first time.

The future of any peace movement requires the involvement of youth to sustain it. With an improved effort youth can be drawn into our organization in a big way. But it is not an easy task. We have to invest resources and time.

Youth are not prepared to stick to a particular subject. They are interested in diverse issues like the environment, global warming, and the UN. In the colleges and institutions they get introduced to many global and national issues, but not the problems of war and peace. Issues of weaponisation of space, missile defence programmes, foreign military bases and the military industrial complex of the US Empire are never part of the curriculum or extracurricular activities. These issues are not on the agenda for the debating and essay competitions by the educational institutions in India.

We have to create more inquisitive-ness on these issues by linking them with other issues. Weaponisation of Space-Space Ecology, Weaponisation of Space-Military Bases, Weaponisation of Space-Economy, Weaponisation of Space-Warfare, etc. We must prepare teaching material on these issues that can be used by us to reach the youth. We have to create a team of resource persons to expand our base. Whether it is Bruce Gagnon, Prof. Karl Grossman, Physics teacher Lynda Williams or Loring Wirbel - they are pioneers on the issue of weaponisation of space. We must be proud of them.

Amongst us there are many who are associated with different issues and movements like Abolitions of Nuclear Weapons, Abolition of Military Bases, Environment, Anti-War, UN, and other developmental issues. For campaigning, different organizations are producing material for education. Global Network also must produce study material on various issues connected with the weaponisation of space and missile defence. We have got scholars amongst us. They must prepare a syllabus and material, which can be used to educate the youth and to create teams of resource persons by conducting workshops, discussions, seminars, etc.

Keeping the future of the movement in view I am planning to organize a National Conference of Youth in October 2011 on the Global Network issues. I welcome support and advice from the Global Network fraternity.

J. Narayana Rao
Nagpur, India

---

**MD One Key Cost of START**

The Obama administration paid a heavy price to ratify the modest START treaty when the Senate recently voted to enact it into law. The president originally promised the weapons labs $80 billion over ten years for building three new bomb factories in Los Alamos, Oak Ridge and Kansas City to modernize our nuclear arsenals as well as an additional $100 billion for new delivery systems — missiles, bombers and submarines. He then sweetened the pot with an offer of another $4 billion to the nuclear weapons establishment to [try to] buy the support of Senator Kyl. Additionally, he assured the Senate hawks that missile [offense] development in the U.S. will proceed full speed ahead, even though Russia and China have proposed negotiations on a draft treaty they submitted to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to ban space weaponization. At that conference every country except the U.S. voted in favor of preventing an arms race in outer space. The U.S. is still caught in the grip of the military-industrial-academic-congressional complex which President Eisenhower took great pains to warn us against in his farewell address to the nation.

There are 23,000 nuclear weapons on the planet, with 22,000 of them belonging to the U.S. and Russia. The other 1,000 belong to the UK, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea. In order to honor our promise in the Non-Proliferation Treaty to negotiate in good faith for nuclear disarmament in return for a promise by non-nuclear weapons states not to acquire nuclear weapons, it is essential that the U.S. and Russia continue to make large reductions in their arsenals to create the conditions for the other nuclear weapons states to come to the table to negotiate a treaty to ban the bomb, just as we have banned chemical and biological weapons.

At the NPT conference this spring, for the first time, the possibility of negotiating a nuclear weapons convention was adopted by consensus in the final document. Civil society and friendly governments are now exploring opportunities for starting an ‘Ottawa Process’ for a nuclear weapons ban, just as was done for landmines. China, India and Pakistan have already voted on a UN Resolution to open such negotiations. Perhaps Asia will lead the way. But if the U.S. persists in developing its nuclear infrastructure with new bomb factories, while threatening Russia with proliferating “missile defense”, it’s unlikely that this modest New START will help us down the path to peace.

Alice Slater
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
New York, New York
Odds & Ends

Mars Theme Park
A Florida-based company, NewSpace Center LLC, is proposing to build a flashy Mars-themed entertainment park near the Kennedy Space Center. The company has already secured tax breaks from the Titusville city council. Calling the proposed park Interspace, plans call for the “world’s largest simulated Mars surface environment” where visitors would immerse themselves “in the Mars environment for one or more days.” Because the cost of traveling to Mars, as well as “terraforming” and settling on the red planet would be hugely expensive, the theme park would be used to help get the public to support massive investments in “everything Mars”. NASA is also proposing the design and construction of a facility to quarantine potentially hazardous rock and soil samples brought back from Mars missions. A 2018 Mars mission will collect Martian samples for return to Earth at a later date.

Going Up
The price tag on Northrop Grumman Corp’s Global Hawk unmanned drone is going up. The per-aircraft cost has grown by 11% to $100.8 million since the program started in 2000. The Global Hawk is one of several “drones” being used by the Pentagon after Obama ordered the expansion of round-the-clock air patrols to 65 a day by 2013 from about 39 at the present time. The Air Force plans to order 77 of the planes and they will be deployed at U.S. bases in Guam and Italy in addition to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Only Jobs in Town
As the American economy continues downhill the only real jobs the government is helping to create are in the war machine sector. The Boston Globe reported in December 2010, “The defense industry generated $26 billion in economic activity in Massachusetts last year, supporting more than 100,000 jobs and accounting for 85% of all federal contracts awarded in the state.” A report, funded by Raytheon Co., found that military contracts in the state have nearly tripled over the last 10 years. Only four other states (Virginia, California, Texas, and Maryland) received more in Pentagon contracts than Massachusetts did last year.

Another study, done by the University of Mass-Amherst Economics Department found that spending $1 billion on military production creates 8,555 jobs, but if that same amount of money had been invested in building public transit systems 19,795 jobs would result. Which would you rather have from your tax dollars?

Next Bunch Wants More $$$$ Industry publication, Defense News, wrote on November 4, 2010, “Republicans controlling the House next year are expected to place a greater emphasis on missile defense and countering China’s arms buildup while increasing oversight of the Pentagon and resisting calls to cut military spending.” In December, the Democrat-controlled Congress passed a $725 billion authorization for the 2011 Pentagon budget. The cost of the Afghanistan-Pakistan war is now about $10 billion per month. The Obama budget plans to spend more on the Pentagon over eight years than any administration has since World War II.

Equal Opportunity Campaign Funders
In the U.S. 2010 Congressional election cycle major aerospace corporations donated more money to Democrats than they did to Republicans. Boeing Co. gave nearly $2 million (59% to Dems and 41% to Repubs); Lockheed Martin also donated nearly $2 million in campaign contributions (54% to Dems and 46% to Repubs); and United Technologies gave $832,359 (58% to Dems and 42% to Repubs). It is no mystery why both parties continue to carry water for the military industrial complex.

Obama Favors Aegis BMD System
Space News has reported that testing of the Navy’s second-generation Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, due to become operational in 2012, has been completed. Lockheed Martin is set to begin adapting the ship-based Aegis BMD system for use on land as part of Obama’s planned European “missile shield” under a nearly $70 million contract with the Pentagon. The Navy plans to have a total of 38 naval destroyers with the Aegis BMD systems by 2015. Most of these ships are built in Bath, Maine.

Obama Wants Turkey to Host BMD Radar
The latest U.S. plan for a European missile shield features a radar system that would be deployed next year, probably in Turkey, to cue interceptors that initially would be based at sea, with upgraded versions to be deployed on the ground in Romania and, later, in Poland, a State Department cable posted on WikiLeaks disclosed. Obama’s Phased Adaptive Approach to European missile offense would be the centerpiece of the new U.S.-NATO program. This program replaces the earlier “missile defense” plan of Polish and Czech Republic deployments proposed by George W. Bush.

Space Station Euro Partners Timid
Germany has been unable to persuade its European Space Agency (ESA) partners to commit to a 10-year budget to pay for continued use of the International Space Station (ISS) until 2020. Space News reports that Germany, which has long been the ISS’s biggest supporter in Europe, appears ready to guarantee it 38% share of the 10-year station-utilization program. The ISS will cost more than $100 billion to construct once it is completed. Germany is Europe’s second-largest space power after France and just ahead of Italy. The economic crisis now sweeping Europe is likely making many ESA members timid about funding the ISS operations while cutting back on social progress at home.

Military Space Planes Shrouded in Secrecy
After seven months in space, the Air Force’s secret X-37 unmanned space plane returned to Earth in December. The Air Force has kept the mission and cost of the X-37 wrapped in secrecy. Many believe it is being created to function as an unmanned orbital spy platform or weapons delivery system. The X-37 looks similar to the space shuttle and is built by Boeing’s Phantom Works Division in Seal Beach, California. The second test launch of the Falcon Hypersonic Test Vehicle experimental space plane is planned for 2011. The Falcon is designed to skim the top of the atmosphere just below space, and is a key element of the Pentagon’s Conventional Prompt Global Strike capability — a program to build non-nuclear strategic weapons that can strike conventionally anywhere in the world in less than an hour. The $308 million Falcon is a suborbital near-space vehicle launched on a Minotaur rocket, a solid-fuel booster built from a decommissioned ballistic missile.

Report Urges More Action to Protect Space
“The Obama administration has pledged international cooperation in space and has even stated its intention to reinvigorate U.S. leadership in that domain. But so far its actions have been incommensurate with the urgency of space security and [space] sustainability issues.” So reads a November 2010 report called “Securing the Skies” by the Union of Concerned Scientists. The report challenges the Obama administration to pledge not to attack or destroy other nations’ satellites and implement more transparency and data sharing measures with the world.

Raytheon Rakes It In
Raytheon Co., headquartered in Massachusetts, is raking in the space warfare contracts these days. Raytheon Intelligence and Information Systems (Garland, Texas) recently got a $30 million contract extension for providing “information assurance services.” Raytheon Missile Systems (Tucson, Arizona) won a $175 million contract from the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to continue developing the Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptor that will be deployed on Navy Aegis destroyers. The MDA also gave Raytheon Integrated Defense Systems (Tewksbury, Mass) $190 million to build and test a mobile radar system for missile defense. Raytheon, with 2009 sales of $25 billion, is a perfect example of a weapons corporation that spreads its operations throughout the country as a way to ensure maximum Congressional support.
More Galileo Troubles

Space News reported in November that “Europe’s Galileo satellite navigation system, now confronting the financial trouble its backers have known was coming for two years, might need to be labeled ‘too big to fail’ in the manner of the U.S. financial institutions that were saved from ruin by government cash. Many EU parliamentarians want the negotiations on the 2011 European Commission budget to include guarantees for 2012 and 2013 that protect the Galileo project and are willing to stand firm against Europe’s finance ministers, who are already pleading empty pockets when it comes to fresh Galileo aid.” Galileo is a planned constellation of 30 satellites in medium Earth orbit to provide reconnaissance and navigation services, similar to the Pentagon’s GPS system. Currently, only 14 Galileo satellites are under contract and some in Europe have suggested cutting the program to 24 spacecraft due to the economic crisis.

Global Day of Action on Military Spending

Peace groups around the world (including the Global Network) are signing up to hold local actions on April 12, 2011 for a Global Day of Action on Military Spending. In 2009 alone, global military spending rose to an all-time high amount of $1.53 Trillion! On April 12, 2011, we will organize global events to coincide with the release of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute’s annual report, which will take into account the new figures on military expenditures. On this day, people all over the world will join together in joint actions to focus public, political, and media attention on the costs of military spending and the need for new priorities. See http://demilitarize.org/ for more information.

China Launching More Rockets

The news website Wired reported in December that China’s most recent launch of a rocket, carrying a Chinese GPS-style navigation satellite, set a record for successful Chinese launches in one year at 15. For the first time since the Cold War, another country has matched the U.S. in total number of rocket launches. But even with China matching U.S. launch rates, they might never be able to catch up considering the social demands Beijing faces. China’s 15 launches in 2010 put their space constellation at around 67 satellites, both military and civilian. Russia still has 99, but with its unreliable rockets and difficult finances is struggling to maintain that level. The U.S currently has 441 satellites that are publicly acknowledged.

China Calls Japan Irresponsible for MD Plans

Japan unveiled plans in December to deploy additional Patriot (PAC-3) missile defense interceptors and to expedite production of Aegis missile defense warships. Although Tokyo said the deployments were aimed at countering potential North Korean missile strikes, Beijing warned the plan would undermine Chinese defenses. “Japan’s new military investments are going to transform the military balance in the region,” a Chinese diplomat said. “China will have no choice but to respond by enhancing its own capabilities.” Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Jiang Yu characterized Japan’s missile defense plans as “irresponsible.”

Drone Testing in Alaska

A team led by the University of Alaska, Fairbanks (UAF) has landed a Pentagon contract worth as much as $47 million to test and evaluate drones. UAF was one of three winners of the contract, which was awarded through the Naval Surface Warfare Center. The Unmanned Aircraft Program at the Geophysical Institute’s Poker Flat Research Range, a scientific rocket-launch facility 30 miles north of Fairbanks, will lead the work. Greg Walker, the manager at Poker Flat Research Range, described the contract as a “hunting license” for applicable Navy projects. The University of New Mexico and Applied Research Associates, an Albuquerque, N.M., company, also were named as contract winners. The contract states that 40 percent of the work will be performed in Alaska, with the remaining work split between Wyoming and New Mexico. The program will test unmanned aircraft and how they perform in harsh conditions, as well as evaluating the data-collection instruments carried aboard the aircraft.
Resistance to Navy Base on Jeju Island

According to a Jeju Island, South Korea lawyer it is not an exaggeration to say that the Jeju local court decision against the villagers’ lawsuit for the effective stop and cancellation on the annulment of the absolute preservation area in the Gangjeong village, on December 15th, 2010, was probably the most important court decision in the history of the island. It was a watershed for the fate of Jeju Island — whether it would remain as the Island of Peace since it was so designated in 2006, or be transformed into a war base against China. The Navy pushes for deployment of U.S. Aegis destroyers, outfitted with missile defense systems, to be installed near the naval base. And we, as Jeju Island people living in the current era, have accepted the task of leaving to our next generations an island without military bases, the Island of Peace, the Island of Life, as our fateful task.

On December 17th, the Pan-Island Committee for the Prevention of a Military Base and for the Realization of an Island of Peace, the Catholic Jeju District, and Christians for Peace made a statement when it started its tent vigil near the Gangjeong stream. Here are excerpts:

Jeju Island has faced the challenge of a military base every 15 years since Japanese imperialism’s installation of the military airfield for war use there in 1937. It is a historic lesson that Jeju is a key strategic location that military power cannot but covet.

Using the lessons we have gained from our history, we have been willing to save the future of Jeju Island with our opposition struggle against a military base in the Songak Mountain in 1988 to our current struggle to prevent the naval base. And we, as Jeju Island people living in the current era, have accepted the task of leaving to our next generations an island without military bases, the Island of Peace, the Island of Life, as our fateful task.

On December 25th, Bishop Kang Woo-Il, Chairman of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of Korea and the Bishop of the Catholic Jeju district, led the Christmas mass for life and peace on the Gangjeong coastline while about 400-500 people gathered. On December 27th, when the 65 trucks came, 34 people were arrested. It was an illegal and violent arrest because the activists were engaged in a peaceful press interview opposing the construction. The solidarity statement from Japan greatly encouraged people. Police arrested three people when they stood in front of a cement-mixer to block the construction. A movie critic named Yang Yoon-Mo has been imprisoned since then. He is currently held in the Jeju prison on previous charges by the Navy pertaining to the struggle against the naval base several months ago.

On December 28th, when the activists of the Pan-Island committee attempted to install a vigil tent in front of the Island Council building, the Jeju City mayor mobilized the city officers and forcibly prevented them from setting up the protest. The activists claimed that they were defending the basic rights of freedom of expression stipulated in the Constitution. During the struggle between the activists and the municipal officers, which lasted until the next morning, a man was arrested and a woman was pushed back by a city officer and had three teeth knocked out and her cheek punctured. The incident brought strong criticism from many quarters, even from the Democratic Party, the main minority and conservative party to which the Jeju mayor himself belongs.

On December 30th, Gangjeong village...
Barack Obama and Mahatma Gandhi

During his address to the Indian Parliament on September 11, 2010 Barack Obama invoked the name of Mahatma Gandhi and said, “I have always found inspiration in the life of Gandhi and in his simple and profound lesson to be the change we seek in the world. And just as he summoned Indians to seek their destiny, he influenced champions of equality in my own country, including a young Martin Luther King. After making his pilgrimage to India a half century ago, Dr. King called Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violent resistance ‘the only logical and moral approach’ in the struggle for justice and progress.”

Having said this Obama then fired one more bullet into the coffin of Gandhi by making a deal to sell $15 billion of modern killer weapons to India. While executing this deal Obama didn’t remember Gandhi’s non-violence.

The unresolved issue of Kashmir, which has become a bone of contention between India and Pakistan, has helped the US to arm Pakistan to its teeth resulting in an arms race between India and Pakistan. This mad race ultimately converted both the countries into nuclear nations. While Pakistan is acquiring arms from the US and China, India is acquiring arms from many countries, including Israel. The latest arms deal between India and the US will further boost the attempts of Pakistan to match India. The madness of both these countries is depriving the vast majority of people of a decent living.

If Obama really found any inspiration in the life of Gandhi, he should follow the Gandhian ideology of peace and non-violence. Gandhi lived this belief in every aspect of public life. Experimenting with non-violence, he mobilized millions of Indian people for the freedom struggle and used Satyagraha to end British rule in India. He never felt the need of arms.

US foreign policy is being influenced by the Hitlerism of aggression, wars, violence and killings, not by Gandhian philosophy. Obama is continuing what his predecessors have done and no change is visible in his presidency. If he really finds any virtues in the life of Gandhi, he should first apologize to the people of Vietnam, Japan, Iraq and many other countries, who were subjected to mass annihilation by successive US governments.

How long will the US government, either ruled by Democrats or Republicans and controlled by the military industrial complex, indulge in wars and killings, liquidating the presidents and prime ministers who refuse to toe the US foreign policy line? How long will the US rely on the production and sale of weapons for sustaining its economy? Is it not a fact that to find markets for the sale of arms the US is creating war zones at a global level perpetually?

While praising Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence Obama proudly announced that his visit to India would create 50,000 jobs in the US. But these jobs are in the production of weapons, which will be used for killing people and not to propagate peace. Obama got the Nobel Peace Prize very early in his presidency without doing anything to establish peace. He has not contributed an iota of action to reduce the international tensions engineered by the US government. He has not projected himself as a peacemaker. Having said that he will work for complete nuclear disarmament, he has increased the nuclear weapons budget and approved nuclear sub-critical tests. He is also not interested in abandoning the US weaponization of space program.

If Obama has got any trust in Gandhian philosophy, he should give a new direction to US foreign policy and get the US out of the present morass in which it is engulfed. He should try to erase the stigma of “empire.” Martin Luther King was revered and remembered by the people of the world more than any US president. Obama should stand on the side of leaders like Martin Luther King, Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar and Mahatma Gandhi and should not feel proud of lining up behind people like Bush Sr & Jr, Reagan, and Nixon. It is a great opportunity for him to make a place in history. People of the US are getting fed up with the warmongering of their country. They want to live in peace. He should stand by the millions of peace-loving people of the world.

Obama should also remember the great people of India like Buddha and Emperors Ashoka. Buddha, who hailed from a princely family, eschewed the royal dynasty in pursuit of peace and non-violence. Emperor Ashoka realized the futility of wars and took refuge in the philosophy of Buddha. Obama would be revered as a savior of humankind if he made the US abandon nuclear weapons and ensure space for peace and repose trust in the UN “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.”

J. Narayana Rao
All India Peace & Solidarity Organisation
Nagpur, India
A View from Europe

On the night that Barack Obama was elected in 2008, most of Europe believed we had entered a new era. There was a strong feeling that things were going to change. The contrast between our images and impressions of Bush and Obama couldn’t have been much greater. We were impressed with Obama’s eloquence, his obvious intelligence and how he seemed to be able to relate to a wide range of American citizens. We had become tired of the arrogant strut of Bush, and were relieved and even inspired by Obama’s confident and upright demeanor. He was obviously well educated, clever and somewhat sophisticated, but at the same time he appeared to have a common touch that helped him build the broad base of support that got him elected. A man who talked of nuclear disarmament and of no weapons in space, who spoke out against missile defence, becoming president! This must be the start of something big. Even so, many were still suspicious that even if he meant everything he said, and really wanted to do all those things, the task would be too great.

We all knew of course that it wouldn’t be plain sailing – that he would have to deal with a military industrial complex that had become well entrenched and was now so much part of American society and culture. We realised that many Americans could not imagine any type of security other than to be armed to the teeth, any way of achieving peace other than by eliminating all opponents and anyone who might be a threat in the future. However, here at last was a US President who might actually be able to change all that. At that time the London Times political cartoonist Gerald Scarfe depicted Obama as some kind of new Superman. However, by the middle of the following year, these images had changed.

Although we all knew it wouldn’t be an easy ride, I think we were still taken aback by the problems that the new President had with his ideas for health care. He has recognised and made some good speeches about the dangers of climate change. He may even be making some headway there, but in terms of nuclear disarmament and keeping the heavens free from weapons, his image has faded and the cartoon Superman version has become more and more bedraggled.

A significant turning point occurred in late 2009 when he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Two camps formed – those who thought it was a good idea and would encourage him to fulfill the promise that was reflected by the award; and those who thought that perhaps the prize should be given for actions and not just fine words. Things have deteriorated since then. Obama’s request for a 2011 military budget of $708 billion is 33% higher than at the peak of the Vietnam War and 64% higher than the Cold War average. Guantanamo Bay has not been closed. The President chose not to hold Bush and his neocons accountable for war crimes. He didn’t even support an investigation into how the nation had been conned into invading Iraq. Despite a supposed withdrawal of US troops from Iraq, there are still over 50,000 US military there. There is no end to the war in Afghanistan; in fact he has escalated it. US drone attacks continue to kill hundreds, perhaps thousands, of civilians and they are spreading more often and more deeply into Pakistan and Yemen. The US is still extraordinarily reluctant to support sanctions over the illegal Israeli settlements in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. Despite calls from Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway and Luxembourgh to remove the remaining US nuclear weapons on European soil, they remain.

Obama is expanding the US military presence in Europe through bases and installations to be part of his new proposed missile defence system. This is despite having said as a presidential candidate that he would only support missile defence when the technology has proved to be workable. Perhaps I missed that proof? Or perhaps the President missed the second test failure of the year in the Pacific in recent weeks? On December 18th, President Obama wrote a letter to the leadership of the US Senate in which he gave missile defence the strongest ever statement of support, saying that as long as he is President, the United States will continue to develop and deploy missile defences and he will take “every action available” to support the deployment of all four phases of his so-called “European Phased Adaptive Approach”. Obama also made campaign promises about government transparency, but instead he is cracking down on whistleblowers that revealed government wrongdoing and he is getting the Justice Department to find ways to prosecute WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange.

No wonder then that those initial feelings of hope and inspiration are wearing a bit thin now. Not that we aren’t used to this kind of thing happening. To be an activist in the peace movement means that you are always looking for those positive chinks of light that offer some way forward. We are used to being frustrated by slow progress and know that one step forward is often followed by several steps back. It can be very wearing and even draining. Many of us feel like the headmaster played by John Cleese in the film “Clockwise.” It’s not the despair, we can take the despair. It’s those occasional little glimmers of hope we sometimes find impossible to bear.

We know from experience, though, that things take time and creating meaningful change requires a lot of hard work and perseverance. We know that sometimes you have to make compromises to move forward a little bit at a time. There have been some steps forward. It is good that the US Senate has ratified the New START agreement with Russia! There may well be thousands of nuclear weapons still poised ready to strike at a moment’s notice, but it is a little bit of progress for something that seemed to have all but been ruled out at one time. We are also aware, though, of how easy it can be to lose your way through all that and forget what your original principles and objectives were. You can take too much time arguing the case for the compromise, forgetting that it is not what we set out to achieve. It is our role as a peace movement to make sure that those ideals are not forgotten. Although we can welcome the small steps of progress that might be made here and there, we must also continually remind everyone of what there is still to do. That is our role, but at the same time we don’t want to help the right wing with their continuing barrage of criticism of Obama. We know that things could be far worse.

From the UK we see many parallels between the US and UK politics. We have both gone through extended periods of pretty right-wing administrations. We had Thatcher (for a very long time - we don’t have a maximum period for our prime ministers), you had Reagan and Bush. We followed Thatcher with Blair and then Brown – you followed Bush with Obama. We thought that Blair would

Continued on next page
Next GN Space Confab June 17-19 in Massachusetts

Each year the Global Network holds an international space organizing conference in a different part of the world. Each time we try to go to a community or country that plays a key role in the expanding program of space militarization.

In 2011 it has been decided that our 19th annual conference will be held in North Andover, Massachusetts. This community hosts a major Raytheon Co. production facility, and the national headquarters for the aerospace corporation in Massachusetts as well. Raytheon plays a central role in building and testing “missile defense” systems for the Pentagon. Local peace groups have maintained a vigil outside the gates of Raytheon in North Andover for years and are excited about hosting the GN conference.

The event will be held from June 17-19 and will be called “Raytheon, Missile Offense, and Endless War.” A registration brochure will be prepared soon and distributed to our membership. Home hospitality will be arranged in the North Andover area for out-of-town conference participants. Andover is only about 25 miles from Boston and a commuter train connects those two communities.

A special effort will be made to bring young activists from around the world to this event, so we urge all those coming to bring a student to the conference. A workshop called “Students Speak Out: Space Weapons Technology Impacts on Social Progress” will be led by these young activists. Other discussions at the conference will include “Raytheon and the Military Industrial Complex: Missile Defense Deployments in Europe and Asia” and key peace activists will report from around the world.

A View from Europe
Continued from previous page

Bring the radical change we needed to see. After all, he promised to! But it didn’t come. There were some improvements and it was certainly better than Thatcher, but he also gave us the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which eventually became his downfall. Then came another glimmer of hope – Blair was replaced by Brown, but he turned out to be only very slightly better. So the public rejected him too, and now we have got the right wing back in power. At the last election the Conservative right took note of how Obama conducted his campaign. They weren’t convincing enough to win outright, but they have formed a coalition government with the now hugely discredited Liberal-Democrat Party and have set about making dramatic cuts to education, health and social care programs – while at the same time trying to persuade everyone that we need to renew the Trident nuclear weapons system.

We are going through some tough financial times. Here in Europe people are starting to react to the viciousness of government cuts. In Greece, France, Germany, Portugal and the UK, people (especially young people) are becoming aware of how politics affects their lives. There have been demonstrations and protests in most European cities in the last few months. People are asking questions about spending priorities, questioning the established ideas and demanding that people take priority over profits. Our arguments to cut military spending and cancel destructive weapons programs are being heard. Our calls for converting the manufacture of arms into something more life enhancing are being recognised.

Perhaps we do not need to look any further than ourselves for the leadership and inspiration we need? During his nomination campaign Obama quoted the Hopi elders saying “we are the ones we have been waiting for” – let’s take him up on that.

Dave Webb
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
Leeds, England

Book Review

The Future of War

Wired For War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in The 21st Century
by P.W. Singer
Penguin Press, 2009

Fundamental changes in warfare, occurring at the ever-increasing speed of computers, bring us to the era of war with robots. These will be the tools of attempted world domination.

There are thousands of unmanned vehicles presently operating on land, at sea, in the air and in space. Seemingly unlimited billions are being spent on research and development of robotic tanks, insect-sized surveillance aircraft, and swarm technology for unmanned attack aircraft.

The speed and complexity of the technology brings problems of command and control in the military, as 19 and 20 year old “cubicle warriors” make life and death decisions about targets half a world away, based on what they see on a video screen in Nevada.

In Wired for War P.W. Singer makes a chilling case that, due the rapid advance of artificial intelligence, technology becomes obsolete almost as soon as it is applied to warfare. The weapons we worry about today will quickly be replaced by ever more capable killing machines.

Legal questions abound in the area of robotics, but there are no national or international laws pertaining to accountability or liability when robots are used. This issue grows even murkier when private contractors are the ones flying drones.

With disparity in the education levels of competitors like China (54% science and engineering graduates) and the United States (13%), instability increases as competing sides consider a first strike in order to take advantage of perceived temporary leads in technology. Also contributing to instability is the danger that citizens may easily accept “war without risks,” without any debate, and stop caring whether or not their country is at war.

Singer’s broad coverage of robotics, their use in war and effects on all aspects of society is informative and quite disturbing. With the biggest changes in future wars coming in the form of microscopic nano chips, how will we know when the technology has gone past our ability to control it?

Mark Roman
Waterville Area
Bridges for Peace
& Justice
Solon, Maine
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Peace and social justice activists in Maine continue to return to the state capital in Augusta to call upon local and state elected officials to connect the dots between endless war spending and fiscal crisis at home. As more responsibility for social funding is dumped by the federal government onto states, who have no resources to deal with social needs, our state capitals will increasingly be key strategic organizing centers to make the call to Bring Our War $$ Home.

Bruce Gagnon (carrying the sign) organized a peace walk for Maine Veterans for Peace that brought the cost of war issue through 40 Maine communities. The walk began in Farmington on November 2 (election night) and ended nine days later in Portland. Walking more than 125 miles, and led by Buddhist monks and nuns, the walk was seen by tens of thousands of people who heard the peaceful message from veterans.

Catholic nuns joined hundreds of villagers on Jeju Island, South Korea on Christmas day at a peace mass along their sacred coastline in opposition to the construction of Navy base where U.S. Aegis destroyers, outfitted with “missile defense” systems, will be ported.
CodePink activists in northern California regularly hold vigils at Beale AFB and at this recent event one of the GI's from the base joined the protest. Beale AFB hosts U-2 and Global Hawk reconnaissance aircraft and also a PAVE PAWS radar facility that has been upgraded for participation in the missile offense program.

Global Network supporters took to the streets in New York City during Keep Space for Peace Week to hold signs and pass out literature to the public.

In early October each year the Global Network holds local actions around the world during Keep Space for Peace Week. These activists walked all the way around the Menwith Hill U.S. intelligence gathering and surveillance base in North Yorkshire, England that plays a key role in the growing space militarization program.
START Treaty and Real Disarmament

For months now, public discussion in the U.S. about arms control and disarmament has been dominated by treaty negotiations between the Obama administration and a formidable adversary. The treaty in question is the new U.S.-Russia strategic arms reduction treaty (START). The adversary is not Russia (those negotiations concluded last spring); it is the U.S. military-industrial complex and its representatives in the U.S. Senate. The U.S. Constitution requires Senate consent for treaty ratification, and those who advocate unfettered U.S. military power long have seen the ratification process as an opportunity to extract both policy and spending commitments in return.

The START treaty will have little effect on the material institutions of the arms race. It will have only minimal effects on current nuclear weapons deployments, and places no meaningful limit on the modernization of nuclear arsenals or the development of strategically significant weapons systems such as missile defenses and conventional “prompt global strike” weapons with global reach. The principal purported benefits of new START, given that it requires only marginal arms reductions over seven years, mainly fall into two areas: resumption of on-the-ground verification measures, and re-establishment of a negotiating framework for future arms reductions. The concessions extracted by the weapons establishment in anticipation of ratification, in contrast, will have immediate and tangible effects; beginning with increases in weapons budgets and accelerated construction of new nuclear weapons facilities. These increased commitments of resources are intended to sustain a nuclear arsenal of civilization-destroying size for decades to come. They will further entrench interests that constitute long-term structural impediments to disarmament.

One would think that the START deal, with a treaty requiring only small arms reductions coming at the cost of material and policy measures that are explicitly designed to push any irreversible commitment to disarmament far into the future, would spark considerable discussion within the U.S. “arms control and disarmament community.” With the struggle over treaty ratification [now over after being passed in the Senate by a vote of 71-26], however, most U.S. arms control and disarmament organizations have obediently lined up behind the Obama administration, parroting its talking points and saying little that criticizes the budget increases and policy promises provided to the nuclear weapons establishment.

From the disarmament perspective, do the vast concrete negatives of the START deal outweigh its considerably more intangible positives? The “arms control and disarmament community” has concluded that the answer is yes, but has done so with little visible debate.

The making of the START deal

The new START treaty was designed to change nuclear weapons deployments little, and to limit the development and deployment of other strategically relevant weapons systems even less. Mainstream arms control groups admit that the new START limits mainly just changed the counting rules, allowing both the U.S. and Russia to continue to deploy about the same number of nuclear warheads as had been permissible under the Bush-era SORT treaty. As Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists pointed out, “while the treaty reduces the legal limit for deployed strategic warheads, it doesn’t actually reduce the number of warheads. Indeed, the treaty does not require destruction of a single nuclear warhead and actually permits the United States and Russia to deploy almost the same number of strategic warheads that were permitted by the 2002 Moscow Treaty.” Regarding missile defense, as the Arms Control Association noted in a recent issue brief supporting START, “New START is a missile defense-friendly treaty. It does not constrain U.S. missile defense plans in any way.” New START also leaves U.S. “global strike” programs for delivery of conventional weapons with global range untouched.

The Treaty places no limitation on modernization of nuclear arms, providing explicitly that “modernization and replacement of strategic offensive arms may be carried out.” The Obama Administration, eager to attain something it can portray as a foreign policy “win” and to regain the ideological “high ground” for its counterproliferation/nonproliferation efforts, attempted to preempt the inevitable demands for increased funding commitments from the party of war and weapons (which extends well beyond the ranks of the formal Republican opposition). The Administration’s February 2010 budget request for the 2011 fiscal year proposed an increase of almost 10% for Department of Energy nuclear weapons programs, and continuing increases over five years. By May, the administration had committed to budgeting a total of $180 billion over the next ten years for nuclear warheads and delivery systems; an amount that would assure significant increases over previously projected spending. The increases were of sufficient size that Linton Brooks, head of the U.S. Department of Energy under President Bush, observed that “I’d have killed for that budget.”

Having failed to obtain Senate approval for ratification during the brief window available for substantive decision making between U.S. elections, the START battle could only be fully joined again after the early November balloting. Facing significant Republican gains in the Senate, the Obama administration [became] visibly desperate to obtain consent to START before the seating of an even more hostile Senate in 2011. In November, the administration promised billions of dollars in additional increases for the weapons complex, while reiterating its “extraordinary commitment to ensure the modernization of our nuclear infrastructure.” Aware of gloomier fiscal times ahead, the Senate negotiators on behalf of the weapons complex are seeking to accelerate spending on major projects like the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee and the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement facility (CMRR) in Los Alamos, New Mexico. To the extent that they are successful these efforts also will reduce the chance for a future change in direction on nuclear complex modernization.

Given its weak limits on weapons development and deployment, START has been promoted by its advocates for its verification provisions and as a first step towards further rounds of reductions. The verification provisions such as on-site inspections, while not without value, are considerably less important than they were during the Cold War, with neither Russia nor the United States currently engaged in large scale nuclear weapons production and frequent rollouts of new delivery systems. With satellite surveillance and other intelligence gathering means there is little reason to believe that any verification crisis or “yawning gap in the collection of strategic information” exists.

Perhaps the strongest argument for new START is that it provides a first step and a framework for going forward with further U.S.-Russia bilateral reductions. If one goes beyond taking the disarmament rhetoric of the Obama administration at face value, however, prospects for significant U.S. reductions below proposed new START levels (which really means below current deployments) are debatable at best. Although U.S. officials use the language of “deterrence” in public arms control contexts, the actual policy of the U.S. government is to pursue escalation dominance at all levels of warfare, with the world’s most powerful conventional forces operating world-wide under the “umbrella” of nuclear forces of sufficient size and flexibility to threaten everything from credible use of small numbers of nuclear weapons up to societal annihilation. Until this policy changes, “reductions” in the U.S. arsenal are likely to be of the new START variety - largely cosmetic, and leaving unaltered the fundamental danger that a nuclear arsenal of civilization-destroying size represents. Nor are other nuclear-armed states, which see themselves as potential adversaries of the U.S., likely to give up their nuclear arsenals so long as the U.S., with by far the most powerful conventional forces, continues to pursue global military dominance.

For disarmament advocates, the arguments for new START may have some merit, but certainly are not so decisive as to foreclose debate. There are a number of questions that might have been considered. Is there any threshold of budget and policy commitments to the military-industrial complex that would, in the
view of NGO disarmament professionals, outweigh the value of the treaty? If one believes the treaty is more good than bad, is the best political strategy for disarmament groups to endorse it while remaining largely silent about the anti-disarmament character of the ever-expanding START “deal”? Even if one concludes that START is an incremental step forward, is it sufficiently valuable to warrant the expenditure of time and resources for a disarmament movement whose social base has largely disappeared, and that might better spend its time developing a less militarian approach to new START and the useful-ness of campaigning for them should be debated and judged.

I am not arguing for halting action until we can develop the perfect analysis of global political economy and social change. I am arguing for turning disarmament work right side up. The criteria for choosing and judging actions cannot be what is possible in the short term in the halls of government or what the ideological and material concessions to the military-industrial complex fail to garner Senate support for ratification, the damage has been done. This was the result in the late 1990’s when the mainstream arms control and disarmament groups acceded to a similar package of “safeguards” for the U.S. nuclear arsenal offered by the Clinton administration in a vain attempt to garner support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Today, the U.S. still has not ratified the CTBT, but billions of dollars of new nuclear weapons research facilities have been built with the money extracted by the nuclear weapons establishment in the bargaining over that failed “deal.”

This approach, in which both the less militarian elements in the U.S. Congress and most disarmament NGO’s fail to oppose massive expenditures for modernization of nuclear weapons research and production facilities also makes it more difficult to create effective opposition to the nuclear weapons establishment “on the ground,” in the regions where these immense and politically powerful institutions exist. When local opposition has played an effective role in stopping nuclear weapons facilities or deployments it typically has done so by creating multi-issue coalitions that also gained the support of some local elected federal officials. Episodes like the failed CTBT deal and the new START bargain capture legislators in commitments to the weapons complex, including funding for facilities being fought locally. Furthermore, the public is presented with a contradictory picture, with local disarmament groups attempting to block new or modernized weapons facilities, pro-treaty politicians and the mass media portraying nuclear weapons “modernization” as essential to obtaining Senate consent to ratification, and most national disarmament NGO’s telling local activists that the treaty is an urgent priority.

Building the movements we need requires far more than convincing a few NGO’s who work on other issues to do e-mail blasts to their lists supporting one or another disarmament initiative hatched inside the Beltway. It will require a redirection of our resources away from centers of corporate, political, and military power down to where the rest of us live, starting over again in the long hard task of building movements that can give us power and voice. And it requires a vision of a better future conjoined with an understanding of how cause and effect works in society today that demonstrates why the disparate problems and injustices people are working to eliminate have common causes.

Andrew Lichterman is a lawyer and peace activist living in Pleasant Hill, California. He is a board member of the Western States Legal Foundation. This article was originally written for the January 2011 German edition of Wissenschafter und Frieden.
Pentagon’s Growing Appetite for Hyperadjacent Space

Space isn’t what it used to be. Until the early 20th century the old legal dictum had gone unquestioned: “whoever owns the soil, it is theirs up to Heaven and down to Hell.” Then in 1926 Congress passed the Air Commerce Act, and the skies above 500 feet were declared to be “navigable airspace” under federal government control. Space hasn’t been the same since.

For the next three decades the outer limit of this “airspace” kept being extended until 1957, when the Russians sent Sputnik beyond the earth’s atmosphere; the “space race” had begun. Then, ten years later the Outer Space Treaty took effect, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space and declaring it the “common heritage of mankind”. In spite of that noble pronouncement we have been fighting an ongoing battle against the militarization of space ever since.

But there is another kind of space, and another battle over its militarization. It’s not the outer reaches of space, but those strata of space closest to earth, below 500 feet. A 1946 Supreme Court Decision determined that this air space belongs to the surface owner. In that decision Justice William Douglas said, “The superadjacent airspace at this low altitude is so close to the land that continuous invasions of it affect the use of the surface of the land itself. We think that the landowner, as an incident to his ownership, has a claim to it, and that invasions of it are in the same category as invasions of the surface.”

In Southeastern Colorado both the Army and Air Force are threatening to invade the superadjacent airspace, the wide-open spaces where ranchers in region live out their lives. The Army wants to add a Combat Aviation Brigade at Fort Carson, in Colorado Springs, adding to the training burden at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site. And the Air Force has proposed a 95,000 square-mile Low Altitude Tactical Training Area (LATN) which would allow their Special Forces units to operate as low as 200 feet.

Southeastern Colorado is a land of dramatic red-rock canyons and prairies. Twisted cedars and jagged rock outcropping accent the wide, open space of the plains. Pronghorn [antelope] race across the horizon and red-tailed hawks ride high upon thermal layers, shrieking their piercing cries. And while the land is open and spacious, there is much evidence of the humans who’ve lived and died there; cryptic prehistoric symbols are etched into the canyon walls, the adobe ruins of Hispanic Placitas, the hand carved gravestones of Charles Goodnight’s young cowboys who died driving herds up from Texas. These are simple but poignant statements whispered into the silence of the hyperadjacent space.

The history of Southeastern Colorado boils down to the ownership of the land, and by implication the space above it. The souls who’ve lived along El Rio de las Animas Perdidas en Purgatorio, (the Pur-gator-y River; Spanish for “The River of Lost Souls in Purgatory”) have watched it happen over and over again. In the 19th century it was the Cheyenne and Arapaho people, who believed that the earth belonged to the Great Spirit alone; an inexhaustible expanse extending to the far horizons and beyond. In the early 20th century Hispanic settlers assumed that the waters flowing down from Sangre de Cristo Mountains to irrigate their modest crops were a gift from God, freely given and gratefully received. More recently surface owners have been surprised to learn that they don’t own the resources beneath their little five-acre plots and that corporations can move in with their heavy equipment to construct roads and wells and pumping stations to extract the gas.

Back in 1982 ranchers who ran cattle on the prairies and in the canyons of the Purgatory River Valley discovered that the Department of Defense had the power to take them from land that had been passed down to them from their great great grandfathers in order to create the 235,000-acre Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site. That acquisition became the largest exercise of eminent domain in U.S. history.

Over time the inhabitants of the wide-open spaces adapted to the reality of “the black hole” in their midst. The presence of the Army became a fact of life. The removal of people from their homes and lands became a sad, but accepted chapter of local history. That is, until 2005 when leaked Army documents revealed a plan that had been taking shape deep in the bowels of the Pentagon to expand the maneuver site to dimensions which would engulf the entire southeastern corner of Colorado, all the way to the Kansas and Oklahoma borders, wiping out everything and everyone in the region.

As classified documents began to surface the master plan came into focus. The official papers that came to light revealed a 17-year, phased acquisition-plan, which would ultimately engulf all of Southeastern Colorado, including the Comanche National Grasslands, wipe out the agricultural economy of the region, and create 17,000 refugees. The documents described a 6.9 million acre, live-fire range designed to serve as a “Joint and Combined Department of Defense training facility for all U.S. forces and allied forces.”

While the Army’s public claim was that the proposed expansion was to serve the tank-training needs at Fort Carson, located a couple of hours north at Colorado Springs, both the documents and those who were politicking for the expansion suggested that there were other reasons. It was obvious why Congressman John Salazar, who represented Southeastern Colorado, or why Representative Doug Lamborn who represented the district where Fort Carson is located, were engaged with the issue. But it was less clear why Congressman Mike Coffman from Aurora, Colorado, a suburb of Denver became intensely interested, even to the point of claiming that Colorado Governor Bill Ritter’s support for the ranchers amounted to supporting terrorists. Coffman’s long-distance interest in the issue seemed strange until it was noticed that his home district included corporations like Lockheed-Martin, Raytheon, and Boeing. It became clear that the Pentagon didn’t want Southeastern Colorado for tank maneuvers; they had other things in mind.

One of the reasons mentioned over and over again in the leaked documents is the availability of the electro-magnetic spectrum in the region; radio frequencies. It’s true that you can drive for a hundred miles across the region and try in vain to find a good clear station. And it’s easy to understand why the military would want nice, clear channels to practice “Net-centric Warfare.” But there may be more sinister reasons why the military may want to gain control of the hyperadjacent air space of Southeastern Colorado.

In military jargon the control of everything from outer space, down to the surface of the earth is called “full-spectrum dominance” a concept whereby a joint military structure achieves control over all elements of the battlespace. Full spectrum dominance includes the physical battlespace; air, surface and sub-surface as well as the electromagnetic spectrum and information space. Hyperadjacent space is the missing link in the Pentagon’s quest for total control.

The Pentagon is developing whole new classes of weapons that are designed to operate, not in outer space, but much closer to earth, using radio frequencies of the electro-magnetic spectrum. They are developing a category of weapons called high-energy radio frequency weapons (HERF), which at various frequencies are able to simply immobilize or to fry the enemy to a crisp. Project Pandora uses low-frequency microwave radiation to closely mimic and interact with human brain waves having similar low frequencies, inducing auditory input which creates the effect of hearing voices that are not a part of the recipient’s own thought processes.
It is also likely that future uses of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site include the testing and training with a wide range of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, (UAVs) operating within hyper-adjacent space. They include drones like the Predators and Reapers currently in use, but also new classes of robotic weapons; small ones of weapons-development in hyper-adjacent space is an initiative by Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), to develop Hybrid Insect Micro-Electro-Mechanical Systems (HI-MEMS), moths and beetles with embedded electronic chips. Pentagon-funded researchers at Harvard and Cornell have operating below 500 feet, and since they’re getting away with it, it must be legal. One possible reason why the military is pressing the issue in Southeastern Colorado at this time is that if they are unable to assert their right-of-way now, they may lose the opportunity. The region has been identified as a promising area for the development of wind energy and the military has a problem with that.

Another concept being developed as part of the Army’s Future Combat Systems program is Micro Air Vehicles, (MAVs), tiny, insect-sized drones which are able to operate in hyper-adjacent space, even infiltrating the interior spaces of buildings. Perhaps the most disturbing new area like the Wasp and the Gnat.

Numerous courts have ruled in conformity with the 1946 Supreme Court decision that the hyperadjacent airspace belongs to the land and to the landowner. But the Air Force counters that they’re already successfully inserted electronic surveillance devices into the pupa of insects which can then be remotely controlled once their metamorphosis is complete.

The military has objected to, and halted alternative energy development projects, especially wind farms. It’s easy to see how military training flights at 200 feet might be in conflict with high-power electrical transmission lines and wind generators rising to 495 feet.

It is ironic that the very thing that would move the United States in the direction of energy independence, and away from wars to secure and defend oil fields in foreign lands is being opposed by the military.

So while the fight to preserve outer space for peaceful purposes goes on, the fight to preserve hyperadjacent space continues as well. Citizens have organized across Southern Colorado and Northern New Mexico and organizations have fought successfully in the courts and at the state and federal levels to enact legislation to protect their land and their hyperadjacent airspace. But the military continues its quest for full spectrum dominance.

Doug Holdread
Trinidad, Colorado
Aljazeera reported in December that, "Technological failures and massive financial costs aside, if Barack Obama, the U.S. president, is serious about reducing the possibility of nuclear war, then it seems developing new missile systems isn’t the best way to inspire international trust."

"The U.S. will always say that missile defense is a defensive system," said Tom Sauer, a professor of international relations at the University of Antwerp in Belgium. "The problem is that the Russians or Chinese may perceive it as threatening or offensive. When it comes to missile defense, perspective is everything."

Vladimir Putin, Russia’s prime minister who is well versed in Cold War history, called U.S. plans for a missile shield in Eastern Europe "very similar" to the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, when the world teetered on the brink of nuclear war.

"The Bush administration planned to have a radar station in the Czech Republic and interceptors in Poland," Dr. Sauer said. Obama has not ended the missile programme in Eastern Europe; he has just amended it slightly.

In a letter to Senate leaders aimed at allaying concerns voiced by START treaty opponents that the new arms treaty would constrain missile defenses, Obama said, "as long as I am president and as long as the Congress provides the necessary funding, the U.S. will continue to develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect the U.S., our deployed forces, and our allies and partners."

Significantly, Obama stated in the letter that the Pentagon is committed to all four phases of its European missile defenses. The Pentagon will begin deploying the first phase of Aegis sea-based missile defenses in the Baltic Sea next year, he stated, and will then start fielding advanced, ground-based SM-3 missile defense interceptors in Romania and Poland.

On September 17, 2009 Obama and Defense Secretary Robert Gates announced plans to abandon the George W. Bush administration project to base ten ground-based midcourse interceptor missiles of the sort based in Alaska and California in silos in Poland in favor of a “smarter, stronger and swifter” deployment of a graduated, layered interceptor missile system in Eastern Europe from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea.

The Pentagon already deployed Patriot (PAC-3) anti-ballistic missiles and 100 troops to Morag, Poland - half an hour's drive from the Russian border - in May of 2010. Obama has also announced that the Pentagon will forge ahead with basing Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptors in Poland, part of what the administration refers to as the Aegis Ashore program to adapt ship-based SM-3s for use on land. However, Washington will almost certainly add SM-3-equipped Aegis class warships to the mix with a continuous rotation in the Baltic Sea.

SM-3 and Patriot (PAC-3) anti-ballistic missiles are what the Pentagon and its Missile Defense Agency refer to as kinetic – “hit-to-kill” – weapons that officially are not equipped with an explosive warhead and destroy incoming missiles on contact. The USS Lake Erie guided missile cruiser launched an SM-3 into the exoatmosphere over the Pacific Ocean on February 21, 2008 to destroy an American satellite with a kinetic warhead. This proved that the system could also be used as an anti-satellite weapon.

Russia has threatened to quit the START treaty if Obama goes through with U.S. missile defense deployments near its borders, under a clause that stipulates that either side may do so if their national security is threatened.

Moscow fears that the U.S. and NATO will also deploy “missile defense” systems in other former Warsaw Pact nations that border Russia as the ever-expanding NATO military juggernaut continues to head eastward in violation of post-Cold War promises by the U.S. that the alliance would not move “one centimeter” toward Russia.

European and U.S. leaders agreed, at the November NATO summit in Lisbon, to spend around £170 million on the system. But that sum, a NATO background document says, will only meet the cost of command-and-control networks, which will link future national interceptor missile and radar sites to a separate Europe-based U.S. system designed to protect its troops. The Pentagon’s April, 2010 acquisitions report placed the cost of a similar U.S. system at $58.01 billion (£36 billion).

Compiled by Bruce Gagnon from Military Buildup in Poland, by Rick Rozell and from Al Jazeera.
Waging Space Lawfare, Not Warfare

Near the top of the Global Network web page, in the right hand side bar, there is an image of a constellation. Look at it closely and you will see the form of a fully armed U.S. soldier walking in a starry sky. Beneath it are the large letters PAROS.

PAROS is the acronym for Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, a proposed, but not yet negotiated, UN treaty that is supported by 174 UN member nations and championed by Russia and China. The USA, however, has opposed it adamantly since the “capture” of the U.S. Congress led by Helms and Gingrich in 1993.

Global Network and its affiliates support PAROS in principle as well as negotiation of other laws that would strengthen the 1967 Outer Space treaty. That treaty sought to ensure the peaceful uses of space for all humankind but lacks mechanisms for prevention of wars in, from and through space.

Those of us in Global Network seek a ban on space weaponization, a ban on nuclear power in space, which would increase the risks of deadly plutonium contamination on earth, and the end of missile defense research and development. We see the latter as an attempt to develop a shield to go with the sword. Missile defense is not purely defensive, but in the U.S. is designed to protect that country (and supposedly its allies) from counterattack when initiating military action against another country.

Click on “More Details” on the GN home page just below the intimidating soldier and you will be transported immediately to Reaching Critical Will, a project of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). The page you have reached belongs to the PAROS Working Group of Global Network and WILPF.

WILPF, which has been an affiliate of the Global Network since its inception, maintains Reaching Critical Will (RCW) teams at the United Nations in New York and Geneva. Their primary focus is on abolition of nuclear weapons, but since the U.S. space program and nuclear weapons programs are closely interwoven there is considerable work on PAROS as well. Staff observes and reports failed attempts to negotiate new space laws in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. In New York, WILPF/RCW staff reports on actions regarding space issues in the General Assembly and the Security Council. The team facilitates civil society dialogue and input with national delegations and United Nations staff.

Take time to investigate the WILPF/RCW PAROS Working Group page and you will learn a great deal more about the efforts to negotiate additional space law. Any affiliates of Global Network concerned about the development of effective space law is welcome to join the international group. Queries can go to carol.disarm@gmail.com.

One of the items you will find on the PAROS pages is a link to the new U.S. space policy put forward by President Obama in July 2010. The new policy celebrates the many positive benefits space exploration has already provided humankind of every nation, and urges cooperation to maintain and expand those benefits. It affirms the right of every nation to explore and/or enjoy the benefits of space. It also affirms existing space law that would preserve space as a commons and prevent claims of ownership by any nation. However, it does make room for the use of nuclear power in space despite the grave risks posed by plutonium—especially on rocket launch. It alludes briefly to uses of space for what is defines as “legitimate self defense,” but avoids any discussion of the dangers of space militarization for aggressive purposes as in pre-emptive wars for Middle Eastern oil and water. It also ignores the threats to the environment and life on earth if wars in, from and through space are ever waged by powerful rival nations.

Despite the negative aspects, the real differences between this document and the 2006 Bush space policies gave some members of the PAROS Working Group hope that the U.S. might change its longstanding opposition and join the 174-nation majority in the General Assembly that has voted their support for PAROS during recent years. This was not to be. At least this time the U.S. did not cast the sole NO vote as in the last years of the Bush regime, but the U.S. and Israel remained the only two nations to abstain. Perhaps that means the new policy, despite its more positive tone, is still the same old one in a fancy new dress. A more hopeful interpretation is that the positive changes since the Bush 2006 space policy document are meant to be real, but still opposition from the Pentagon and arms contractors still makes implementation difficult or impossible. Perhaps the President needs a more visible international and national constituency to move toward sanity in the space program.

WILPF, at least, believes our best hope lies in developing and educating that global constituency in all nations. Otherwise there is increasing danger that China and Russia will feel they have no alternative but to enter the space arms race they have been trying to prevent. That scenario, though some in the military-industrial complex seem to desire it, is too great a threat to life on earth to contemplate or allow.

Carol Reilley Urner
Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom
Whittier, California
East Asian Arms Race and the Crackdown in Korea

Jeju is a volcanic island in the East China Sea where the origins of Korean culture are uniquely preserved. For many, Shamanic rituals celebrating ancient spirits are part of everyday life. Though equidistant from Seoul, Shanghai and Japan, Jeju’s winds carry little evidence of her neighbors’ industrial prowess. Her waters sparkle. Her skies are scraped by black lava tubes that stream down from her peaks. It is a UNESCO World Natural Heritage site. But like Japan’s Okinawa, it’s out of sight of most of the country’s population. For the weapons industry, that makes it the perfect place for a new Navy base.

A similar dichotomy of interests characterizes the atmosphere on the Korean mainland, where a defense spending boom has run head-on into a mature civil society. The country boasts major universities and health care facilities, both pro-labor and pro-capital daily newspapers, and in recent years, a level of public participation in government unmatched by any in the region. But after the Korean government framed a likely marine accident as cause for war preparation, a crackdown against dissent has stymied political opposition and raised concerns of a return to its past authoritarian tendencies.

The schism between sustainable economic development and military spending is also being played out on another Pacific bastion of blue seas and lumbering battleships, Japan, where campaign promises to address the burdensome financial and social costs of maintaining US military bases near Japan’s major cities, to establish a relationship with China independent of the US, and to work toward an Asian economic union, swept the Democratic Party of Japan into power in 2009. Though DPJ failed to keep its pledge to dislodge a particularly intrusive US Air Force base from a highly populated part of Okinawa, political pressure in Japan makes Korea increasingly attractive to Washington’s arms merchants.

The 2008 inauguration of President Lee Myung Bak signaled full steam ahead for US prospects in Korea, and heralded a jarring change of character from the policies of his two left-leaning predecessors. Shortly after taking power, Lee ended bilateral engagement with North Korea — President Kim Dae Jung’s popular “Sunshine Policy” — and countered crucial media reforms of his immediate predecessor, Roh Moo-hyun.

Weeks into his presidency, Lee met George W. Bush at Camp David, where the groundwork was laid for Lee’s lifting of a ban on imports of US beef, and a new emphasis on Korea’s role in the region began to take shape. Hyundai would launch its prototype of a new Aegis warship, fitted with an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) and radar system made by Lockheed-Martin. Regular diplomatic provocations of China have characterized the public face of Lee’s integration into the US block, while Korean ships paint a particularly aggressive picture of Washington’s reaction to Chinese control of the Western Pacific.

Before the first ship was launched, the Korean Navy’s mission was limited to coastal defense against North Korea. But will become a second focal point for the US Pacific Fleet’s dealings with Beijing. The new Korean fleet is scheduled for deployment alongside US-flagged vessels on Jeju Island in 2014.

People’s Liberation Army Air Force Lt. Colonel Dai Xu, has often criticized US allies’ ABM deployments, which he calls “a crescent shaped encirclement” of China by Japan and Korea. Hyundai and Lockheed announced last year that they would build additional ABM destroyers to sell to India upon completing their orders for the Korean Navy.

The use of Jeju Island for a naval base has already been rejected by two Jeju communities targeted for its placement. But those rejections came in 2002 and 2005, when Koreans enjoyed the civility of Kim and Roh’s more restrained style of law enforcement. Upon Lee’s inauguration, construction at the last acceptable site for the base, the tiny Jeju fishing village of Gangjeong, became subject to Seoul’s new resolve. Although Gangjeong’s mayor said that 94 percent of his constituents voted to oppose the base, Lee’s Ministry of National Defense bulldozed the construction site in early 2010, tore out trees and cordoned off the area. The message was clear, but a question remained: was it foreign policy or corporate proflit that the new administration would not subject to the will of local residents?

Gangjeong villagers filed suit against the base on the grounds that it would inhibit the island’s economic viability for agriculture, fisheries and tourism. They argue that a large US naval base would bring the same results they have brought to Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines and Japan — damage to sea life and tourism, problems with military personnel and permanent hazardous waste sites; in effect turning Jeju into a Korean version of Okinawa.

At first, Jeju islanders were confident of their lawsuit’s success. But after the warship Cheonan sank near North Korean waters, things changed for the worse.

Immediately after the incident, Lee’s defense minister and intelligence chief said there was no sign of North Korean involvement. Upon reconsideration, however, Korean and foreign investigators claimed Pyongyang had indeed sunk the ship.

Lee charged Pyongyang with terror-
ism, threatened retaliation, and was echoed by US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Clinton labeled the revised findings “overwhelming proof” of Pyongyang’s culpability. A few days later, the Pentagon said it would send an aircraft carrier group to Korea for anti-submarine exercises.

This barrage of force and rhetoric came just a week before regional elections in Korea. But Koreans quietly repudiated it by voting Lee’s party out of control of the Seoul regional legislature.

Rather than backing down, Lee’s police and intelligence forces raided Korea’s most important civic organizations and indicted and intelligence forces raided Korea’s most important civic organizations and indicted individuals who questioned government dubious findings about the Cheonan.

Though it is widely acknowledged that ABMs cannot yet be relied upon to detonate incoming nuclear weapons in a defensive capacity, Beijing’s relatively small nuclear deterrent force grows increasingly vulnerable to the threat of a preemptive strike. But China’s new fleet of submarines fitted with missiles that carry nuclear warheads effectively replaces China’s old deterrent. In other words, the resulting weapons build-up on both sides of the East and South China Seas, does little more than integrate Korean and Japanese high tech industry with the Pentagon through missile defense; portend lasting rightward trends in Korean and Japanese politics; and inhibit Korea and Japan from achieving a desperately needed economic union with China.

Lockheed Martin has a history of corrupt practices tied to foreign aircraft and weapons sales to Japan and Korea. The government of Japanese Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka fell following revelations of his administration’s agreeing to take bribes from the company for a large aircraft purchase in 1974, and lobbyist Linda Kim was indicted for offering bribes and sexual favors to Korea’s defense minister in exchange for buying a radar system manufactured by a Lockheed subsidiary in 1996.

Hillary Clinton, for example, whose bellicose statements following the Cheonan reversal heralded Seoul’s crackdown, was referred to as “the Senator from Lockheed,” by New York Magazine for her ties to the company. She was the leading recipient of funds from missile defense contractors among Republican and Democratic candidates for president in 2008.

Yet while China builds its navy and Washington arms its neighbors and holds military exercises just off the Korean Peninsula, the hesitancy of ordinary Koreans to show their displeasure with these and other reminders of past authoritarian conditions, throughout 2010, slowly eroded the likelihood of Jeju Islanders prevailing.

Lee used limited force to disperse candle-light vigils against himself and his beef deal in 2008. He cordoned off Korea’s traditional demonstration grounds in front of Seoul City Hall and later gutted the building. Opening a banner there has now become grounds for arrest.

Following president Obama’s awarding Lee with November’s G20 Summit earlier this year, UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, Mr. Frank LaRue, investigated democratic conditions in Seoul and speculated as to whether such an honor was warranted. He reported in May that the right to free expression and free assembly started deteriorating a few months after Lee’s election.

The first signs of the Lee Administration’s new style of governance came after television news magazine ‘PD (producer’s) Notes’ broadcast its investigation of Lee’s lifting of the ban on US beef, and the program’s producers were seized from their homes in the middle of the night, arrested and prosecuted. Though the prosecution failed to win the two- and three-year sentences it sought, the case cast a notable chill over independent media. Said Ho Cheol Shin of weekly news magazine Sisain, “I’m afraid they’re going to arrest me in the middle of the night.”

Hillary Clinton, for example, whose bellicose statements following the Cheonan reversal heralded Seoul’s crackdown, was referred to as “the Senator from Lockheed,” by New York Magazine for her ties to the company. She was the leading recipient of funds from missile defense contractors among Republican and Democratic candidates for president in 2008.

During the course of the two-year prosecution, Lee fired directors of Korea’s public television networks and the chair of Korea’s national communications commission, and replaced them with campaign aides. The new commission chairman lifted restrictions against media consolidation by permitting right wing dailies to apply for cable television licenses.

Throughout this period, independent media have been reluctant to criticize Lee, and the huge candle-light vigils against Lee and his beef deal that followed the PD Notes broadcast in Spring 2008, have not been repeated in the wake of the prosecution of its producers, nor in response to the crackdown that followed the Cheonan incident.

The Jeju islanders, though, have continued to stand their ground. On June 3, a predawn attempt by the defense ministry to position construction cranes on the grounds of the proposed base was turned back through civil disobedience. Emboldened, the islanders vowed to “fight to the death” to protect their way of life. But in the new atmosphere of national security alert, evidence of such boldness is in short supply. Yet, they could not continue to hold off the base without the overt support of National Assembly members, significant press coverage and public support from Seoul.

Live-fire exercises carried out by Washington’s subordinate South Korean forces in disputed waters around South Korea’s Yeonpyong Island, brought retaliation by the North Korean People’s Army and renewed the state of emergency conditions that the Cheonan brought on at the end of last winter. Hence, the combination of government pressure bending the will of Seoul’s one-aggressive television and print outlets, the intimidation of civil groups with raids and arrests, and martial law scares emanating from successive military skirmishes with Pyongyang, have laid the groundwork for construction of Washington’s newest foreign military base.

In the early hours of December 27, 2010, 66 cement trucks pulled into Gangjeong, accompanied by countless police vehicles and unidentified government officials. Demonstrators stood their ground — 34 were arrested — but were grossly outweighed by the authorities, and concrete was poured a short distance from the waves. Two days later, protests moved to the entrance of Jeju Island’s regional assembly building, where two people were hospitalized, including one woman who had three teeth knocked out, and her cheek punctured. One of the protesters remains in custody as of latest notice. Lee’s resurrection of Korea’s pre-democracy-style governance illustrates well the lessons of 1930s Europe, where the interests of the labor and middle classes fell silent as defense expenditures rose steadily toward war and authoritarianism.

Asked about the balance between personal prosperity and maintaining political freedom, one student at Yeonsei University, whose parents’ generation drove riot police off the country’s campuses in the late eighties, summed up her generation’s most common sentiment: “I’m one of the people who is at fault. I only study and think about getting a job. I don’t follow politics at all.”

Matthew Reiss
New York, New York
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On December 16 an anti-war protest was held at the White House during a snow storm in Washington DC by Veterans for Peace and 131 people, mostly veterans, were arrested. GN Coordinator Bruce Gagnon, a Vietnam-era veteran, was among those arrested. On January 4 the government dropped the charges on those who were planning to take their arrest to court. More actions like this by Veterans for Peace are being planned for the near future.