What a Summer and Fall!

Our fall 2018 PEP Newsletter expressed concern with many challenges around the world—climate change, the high number of violent conflicts, millions of refugees, a huge authorization for the US military, and new and old weapons. The fall of 2019 isn’t that different but there are plenty of new issues: abandonment by the US of the Kurds, who are now reaching out to Syria and Russia as Turkey, a NATO ally, advances into Syria; an impeachment process; US political involvement in Ukraine; Brexit; a trillion dollar annual budget deficit, and more.

Here are some of the headlines that cause us concern.

a) Cyberwarfare is the Top Threat Facing Us, Homeland Security, Former Secretary Kristjen Neilsen. NYT, March 19, 2019.

b) The Soaring Cost of Trump’s Air Force One. The Air Force said two jets would cost 5.2 billion ($4.7 billion for the jets and $500 million for associated costs). President Trump said he could get it down to $3.9 billion. The latest estimate is $5.3 billion.

c) White House Orders a Freeze on up to $4 Billion that Congress Approved for Global Health, United Nations Peacekeeping and Other Foreign Aid. NYT, August 19, 2019.

d) Could a New Deal with the Taliban, End the 18 Year War in Afghanistan?


f) Fighting Rages in South Yemen as Civil War Branches Out. A new civil war is now inside the larger one in what the United Nations calls the world’s worst humanitarian crisis. NYT, August 10, 2019.

g) Space Force Must Wait, but Trump Authorizes Initial Command Unit. President Trump wants to assert dominance in space, “preventing conflict by preparing for victory,” Friends like Newt Gingrich want to “occupy” the moon before moving onto Mars. Congress must approve the Space Force. NYT, August 30, 2019.

h) Princeton Study: U.S. Russian Nuclear War Would Kill 3 Million People Within Hours. Another 57 million would be injured, and this doesn’t count those left to die latter from radiation. Princeton simulation of nuclear war escalation conducted by the Program on Science and Global Security.

i) Sec Def Esper OKs $3.6 Billion Of DOD For Trump’s Border Wall. Money for the Trump Administration’s border wall is going to come from DOD construction projects overseas, followed by domestic accounts. Many lawmakers are not happy.

j) New Technology. “We are digging to the middle of the earth where we will make weapons out of lava.” Elementary School child with a shovel, at a local playground, as I walked by with my dog.
Executive Director’s Report

By Jason Sibert

My last year as executive director of Peace Economy Project has been a fulfilling one. This job allows me the opportunity to create media advocating arms control, diplomacy and a more peaceful world. I’ve published lots of letters to the editor, works of opinion journalism and standard stories advocating a more peaceful foreign policy. I’ll have to thank those who help me hold the best job in America – PEP’s board and supporters. Without them, I couldn’t do what I do.

I work out of a small office five days a week doing writing and research for our organization. The World Community Center provides our organization with an affordable rent. Part of my job is to edit the stories of our contributors and do basic administrative tasks. College interns Kira Webster and Maggie Hannick write stories that are published on our website. They’ve been real writer/warriors.

In the last year I’ve implemented the PEP Arms Control Fellowship program that teaches college students the importance of arms control, or a world where security is achieved with fewer weapons! Maggie Hannick, also a college intern, Conner Worley and Aneesh Sood were all arms control fellows. Each fellow does a lesson on the subject of arms control each week and each fellow writes stories on various arms control related subject.

When it comes to world political conditions, I wish things were as happy as they were here at PEP. I feel glum every time I watch the news. We see extreme forms of nationalism emerging around the world with President Donald Trump in the United States, Marine LePen in France, Nigel Farage in the United Kingdom, Narendra Modi in India, Recep Erdogan in Turkey, Andrzej Duda in Poland and Viktor Orban in Hungary. All of these leaders combine statist or semi-statist views on economics, a defense of their nation-state against “the other,” and “the other” takes national (minorities, immigrants, and political opponents in their own country) and international forms (international bodies like the United Nations or the European Union).

The problem with right-wing populism when it comes to establishing and keeping the peace is the mentality it takes among individual nation-states to keep the peace. The idea of international law was promoted by Renaissance thinker Hugo Grotius. His ideas were behind the Peace of Westphalia, a period of European peace considered an accomplishment by all those who care about the subject. But peace via international law takes trust, and trust doesn’t exist in a world defined by a form of nationalism that doesn’t allow individual nation-states a way to reach out to each other.

I honestly don’t think the threat of authoritarian democracy is the same as the threat of 1930’s era fascism which took millions of lives on both sides. The real threat is a world growing apart when the technology for killing grows better and better. We must find a way to come together, but this is very hard in a world defined by the form of nationalism we are witnessing. Not only do we still live with nuclear weapons, we’re going to be seeing robotic soldiers and new forms of cyberwar in the future.

In recent weeks, various groups representing a political position called “white nationalism” have filled the streets spewing hatred on the basis of race. Political writer Hannah Arendt said democracy is not safe and that it is a contest of engagement. Unfortunately, our country seems less willing to engage.

If our country and world cannot engage, how do we find a way to a world governed by law and not chaos? That’s a question will have to answer as a people. Interested parties will have to write a narrative. Hopefully, there will be a happy ending to this story.

Healthcare Not Bombs

By Abbe Sudvarg

As the U.S. continues to address the costs of unnecessary federal projects like the projected $25 billion to “build the wall” on the U.S./Mexico border or the $5.2 billion for the two Air Force One jets, the United States still has roughly 27.5 million citizens without health insurance. Like access to education or housing, healthcare is a basic human right that is being denied to many Americans.

Medicaid is a government program that provides medical insurance to low-income people and individuals with disabilities. Under the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid was to be expanded to cover all individuals with incomes up to 138% of the federal poverty level. In 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in NFIB v. Sebelius that the federal government could not withhold funds from states that refused to expand Medicaid. Missouri is one of the 14 states that have not expanded Medicaid.

Currently, the organization of Healthcare for Missouri is leading a ballot initiative to amend the Missouri Constitution. The amendment would require Medicaid Expansion for Missourians 19 to 64 years old with incomes at or below 133% of the federal poverty level. As of 2020, states with expansion of Medicaid will have 90% of costs coming from the Federal Government; 10% will come from the state itself.
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According to the Missouri Foundation for Health, expansion of Medicaid will be budget neutral for the state of Missouri, given the amount of federal dollars that will return to the state. In states like Iowa and Kentucky, the federal Medicaid dollars has meant more jobs in the health care sector and a healthier population.

Many hard-working Missourians cannot afford health insurance. They cannot afford mammograms or colonoscopies. They cannot afford their blood pressure pills or the cost of their doctors’ visits. And when they have heart attacks or strokes or cancers beyond a curable stage, they may then be unable to work, provide for their families, or pay their taxes. Or they may die from a preventable illness. Missouri can do better.

**PEP Arms Control Fellowship**

By Jason Sibert

One of the best things about holding the title of Executive Director of the Peace Economy Project is working with young people and giving them guidance on how to create conditions of peace in our world. I started the Peace Economy Project Arms Control Fellowship Program earlier this year because I felt arms control had to be taught to college students. I’m a member of the Arms Control Association, an organization that fights to make arms control a major portion of our foreign policy. The ACA publishes a wonderful magazine called Arms Control Today.

I designed the Arms Control Fellowship to be an eight-week program. I named three fellows to the arms control fellowship program last summer: Maggie Hannick, Anesh Sood, and Conner Worley. Maggie just started her freshman year of college, Anesh is an international relations student at Washington University and Conner studies international relations at Georgetown University.

At first, I was unsure of my teaching abilities, but they improved as the sessions went on. I could tell the fellows were interested in what the program had to offer. As a PEP arms control fellow, individuals attend a weekly class and also write on various subjects related to arms control, a method of security which strives for security though fewer weapons. The fellows’ stories are published on our website.

I used a number of materials in my arms control fellow program. Former New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s book “On the Law of Nations” was very influential. Senator Moynihan’s book, published in 1990, discusses the tendency for the United States to engage in behavior that violates international law. I also extensively used Hedley Bull’s book “The Anarchical Society: A Study of World Order in Politics.” This book seeks to create a school of foreign policy where order and law comes to the world through identifying the self-interests of individual states. The fellows also read stories featured in “Arms Control Today” for exposure to contemporary issues in arms control.

I also introduced the fellows to various schools of international relations. I used online stories to lecture on various schools of foreign policy: liberalism, realism, feminism, constructivism, Marxism, democratic peace theory and world systems theory. I personally loved seeing how each fellow increased their knowledge of how our world works through learning about the different schools.

PEP continued the arms control fellowship program after one eight-week session into a second eight-week session. Conner Worley is currently the lone fellow in the program. He will be writing stories for our website. The PEP Arms Control Fellow Program has been a success so far. I’ll look forward to continuing it in the future.

**The Military-Industrial Smell Test**

By Charles Kindleberger

Huntington Ingalls was charged with failing to apply a “special hull treatment” to Virginia-class attack submarines on September 26th. The complaint is that this failure would allow the submarines to be at risk of discovery by enemy sonar. A Mr. Ari Lawrence, an engineer at Huntington Ingalls, is reportedly suing under the False Claims Act because the company, a spinoff of Northrup Grumman, “falsified testing and certifications on multi-billion dollar submarine contracts” separately.

Separately, there were plenty of protests when a DOD budget request was for six fewer F-35 Joint Strike Fighters than previously planned. Apparently, some 128 retired senior military officers complained, not particularly surprising because the F-35 program provides jobs in some 45 states.

What was upsetting was that fifty of those who signed the letter failed to disclose that they had “actual or potential personal or financial ties to the program.”

By Charles Kindleberger

This year is different. Recall that last year the House-Senate Conference Committee agreed to the NDAA by the end of July. Then the two-step process (first the authorization, then the appropriations) ended with a September “mini-appropriation package” which was passed by the House and Senate and sent to the President. It contained the Defense Department budget.

Last year’s NDAA was named after Senator John McCain, a former head of the Armed Services Committee. This reflected the bi-partisan respect for the Senator. However, the real reason for the slow down this summer and fall has to do with the 41 new democratic congressmen that took over the House of Representatives in November 2018.

Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019. At the beginning of August, President Trump signed H.R. 3877 into law. Negotiated between House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Secretary of the Treasury this law put in place new budget caps for Defense and Non-Defense discretionary monies for FY 2020 and FY 2021. It also suspended the debt ceiling and extended cuts for certain programs in 2027 to 2029.

This legislation was similar to previous laws that removed the Budget Control caps set in place in 2012. Rather than a ceiling, those limitations proved to be a floor that has been dramatically exceeded over the subsequent years. There was never a sequester, and now the Budget Act of 2019 adjusts the original caps for the last time. The old law no longer applies after FY 2021. Overall, the latest compromise represents an increase in defense caps of about $172 billion for the 2-year period FY2020-2021, not that much different than the $165 billion increase for the 2 year period FY 2018-2019. But compare that with the increase in BBA 2013 ($32 billion) and BBA 2015 ($40 billion) for their respective two-year periods.

House and Senate Differences. The House of Representatives approved their version of the NDAA on July 12, 2019, establishing a limit of $733 billion dollars; the Senate passed their version earlier on June 27th with a limit of $750 billion, the amount that President Trump agreed to after initially requesting $50 billion less. The Conference Committee has begun to negotiate starting with almost no time before the end of the 2019 Fiscal Year. However, the $18 billion dollars between the two groups would seem to be hardly the largest stumbling block. Consider some of the others:

Overseas Contingency Operations. The Senate amount is $75.9 billion; the House amount is $69 billion. The Administration originally asked for a much higher number for this fund which is not subject to budget caps and which is viewed by many as a slush fund given our reduced current expenditures in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Wall. The President wants to build 500 miles of wall by the end of 2020. Two and one half billion dollars has already been obligated by the Pentagon. It is said that the remaining $3.6 billion should be obligated in the near future, an amount necessary to build 175 miles of wall. This money will come from 127 “deferred” construction projects. The first $1.8 billion will be at the expense of overseas proposed projects; e.g. $400 million in Japan; $130 million in Poland, etc. More will come from many proposals in the U.S. such as the addition of two missile interceptors at Fort Greely, Alaska ($8 million), a ship maintenance facility in Portsmouth, VA ($26 million) and a pier and maintenance facility at Kitsap, Washington ($89 million). The House has no interest in using these projects to fund the wall. The Senate version would replace the construction money in the new authorization, but not approve subsequent wall funding.

Space Force. The President has initiated a Space Command, but an actual new branch of military service will require Congress to authorize and appropriate monies for the Space Force. The House version places space assets into a Space Corps within the U.S Air Force. The Senate follows the President’s wish and creates the U.S. Space Force. The Space Command was originally established in 1982, with responsibilities for satellite communications, missile warnings and more. Currently 26,000 professionals are employed.

Low Yield Nuclear Warhead. The Administration and Senate argue that a low yield ballistic missile on submarines is necessary to provide the United States with more flexible options. The House believes this would be destabilizing. Non-classified estimates are that a new W76-2 warhead would yield around 6.5 kilotons versus a W76 with a roughly a 100 kiloton yield. The 1945 Hiroshima bomb had approximately 15 kilotons of force. Despite strong pressure from DOD secretary James Mattis, the House of Representatives prohibits such funding.
IRN Research. The House does not want the US to conduct further research on intermediate range missiles previously outlawed by the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces treaty. It wants the Pentagon to stop its $96 million dollar R & D program on such missiles. No surprise, the Senate argues that the Russians broke the treaty sometime back, and that the US needs to catch up.

Plutonium Pits. Resembling a pit inside a fruit, these small devices trigger nuclear fission when they are squeezed by explosives. The Pentagon wants the National Nuclear Security Administration (Energy Department) to manufacture 30 a year by 2026 and 80 by 2030. Current pits were mostly developed between 1978 and 1989. Two studies in 2006 suggested that most have a minimum life span of 85 years. The House says that 30 pits a year is enough, and would reduce the funding allocation by $241 million accordingly. The Senate wants 80 a year during the 2027-2030 time period.

Army Priorities. For the last year or two, the Army has been going through an exercise to identify its most important priorities and to compare them against current programs. One of the existing efforts recommended for cutbacks is the CH-F47 helicopter, an initiative that has been expecting advance procurement funding. Will Congress go along with the change?

Air Force Priorities. Another debate has to do with the Air Force’s interest in purchasing upgraded F-15 planes, as originally introduced in 1977, but modernized when other countries have continued to buy them. There are fierce arguments regarding the F-15X’s likely cost and capabilities. Meanwhile, the Air Force claims that it needs to acquire 72 fighters a year in order to replace those that are “aging out.” The still controversial F-35 is said to be scheduled to deliver 60 planes a year in 2026. The House position is to acquire two prototype F-15X, followed by a rigorous cost-benefit analysis before further purchases. The Senate authorizes acquisition of 8 of the new planes.

Navy Priorities. As with the other service branches, the Navy wants to focus on unmanned vehicles, hypersonic weapons, and artificial intelligence. That translates into pressure to reduce its more traditional wish list. Its $206 billion budget would result in 314 ships by 2024, 12 ships fewer than last year’s plan that aimed for 2023. The twelve ships it wants to build include: three more Virginia-class attack submarines; 3 Arleigh Burke-class guided missile destroyers; a new Ford-class aircraft carrier; 2 John Lewis-class oilers; 2 T-ATS towing, rescue and savage ships, and a new guided-missile frigate (FFG(X) program said to cost $1.3 billion. A major cost saving decision is to not refuel the USS Harry S. Truman, a decision that will mean its retirement during the 2020s, but is estimated to save $3.4 billion in procurement costs, and $1 billion in maintenance and operation costs for every year that the Navy does not operate a carrier and its airwing. The Navy envisions spending about $19 billion on 148 aircraft – 4 more F-35Cs and 10 fewer F-35Bs, 24 F/A-18E-F Super Hornets, and a whole lot of additional planes that are not fighters.

A new report from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) argues that the Navy’s 30 year plan (March 2019) to expand its number of ships (fleet of 555 battle force ships from last fall’s 290) is wrong. CBO believes the Navy Plan would cost $28.8 billion per year. The Navy assumption is $22 billion per year. The differences are mostly accounted for by variations in methodology – inflation, labor, material costs. And CBO notes that $2 billion in other costs, like nuclear refueling, have not been considered by the Navy.

There are many additional differences between the House and the Senate. In some cases, one has a clear position while the other simply doesn’t speak to the subject. In other instances, there is obvious difference in policy. Those interested in a comprehensive list should visit The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation web site. It will be fascinating to see the extent to which the Conference Committee can make progress.

Beyond the NDAA is the challenge of appropriations. This process is already underway; however, many of the same issues are likely to persist. The Peace Economy Project will report on appropriations progress in the coming weeks.
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By Jason Sibert

The Peace Economy Project has spent 2019 producing media that is consistent with the mission we’ve pursued for years. We put energy into a call for the transfer of funds from the military to health care, community policing and nation building. Executive Director Jason Sibert regularly argues for less military spending, a more diplomatic approach for foreign policy, the establishment of international law and more spending for human needs in letters to the editor for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Belleville News Democrat. He also writes op-eds for Today’s Advantage and stories for the Progressive Populist and Op-Ed News.com, national media outlets. When not publishing in outside publications, Sibert also writes stories for PEP’s website.

PEP’s Mission

The Peace Economy Project researches military spending, educates about the hazards of an unchecked military-industrial complex and advocates for conversion from a military to a more stable, peace-based economy. We focus our attention on local weapons manufacturing, arms proliferation and worldwide militarization. We collaborate with other organizations to raise consciousness about where our tax dollars are invested and to encourage others to reinvest in their communities.

PEP’s Accomplishments

PEP collaborates with Veterans for Peace, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, Empower Missouri, the Table, Drone-Free St. Louis, the United Nations Association, Interfaith Center on Latin America, Show Me $15, Jobs with Justice, Hiroshima and Nagasaki Commemoration, Netroots Nation, Amnesty International, Civitas Model UN, and Forward Through Ferguson.

PEP publishes a monthly eZine, maintains our website, and publishes an annual newsletter.

The organization publishes a call to Congress to cut military spending, collected signatures, and delivered the signatures to Members of Congress.

PEP worked with two college interns in the last year – Kira Webster and Maggie Hannick. They both produce stories for our website where they tackle such subjects as police militarization, nuclear arms control, international law, and obscene military spending. Between the interns and the executive directors, readers of our website are treated to a new story each week. PEP has created a credible news site for those who are interested in the topics we report on.

In past year, we’ve honored our supporters with a brunch in Clayton and a wine and cheese celebration at board member Mary Ann McGivern’s house. The two events gave the executive director and PEP board members the opportunity to interact with supporters and supporters had the opportunity to engage in discussion with board members and the executive director. In the summer, we hosted former State Department Arms Control official Tom Countryman for a discussion on the wrongs of our current foreign policy and the importance of nuclear arms control.

The executive director also designed and implemented an arms control fellowship program. Hannick, Annesh Sood and Conner Woorley were chosen as fellows. They studied arms control through weekly sessions taught by the executive director. The fellows also produced stories for the website.
To our readers: If you are not currently a member but like what you have read here, please consider joining PEP. Your membership supports PEP’s research and work to build a peace-based economy. Clip and mail the form below, or donate on-line at peaceeconomyproject.org. With your PayPal account, you can give a recurring monthly donation.

Yes, I want to join PEP.
Contributions are tax-deductible.

___ $50 Sustaining Member
___ $30 Member
___ $100 Major Donor
___ $10 Member on limited income

Name ___________________________________________________________
Street ___________________________________________________________
City ____________ State ____ Zip ____________
Phone ____________________________
Email ____________________________

Return to: Peace Economy Project
438 N. Skinker Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63130