

1. We are wasting vast sums on the occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan, on nuclear weapons, on foreign military bases, on "missile defense," on weapons systems that do not work or are designed to fight the Soviet Union or the Japanese fleet, while in fact research shows that investment in nonmilitary industries produces more and better paying jobs. House Financial Services Chairman Barney Frank has proposed cutting the war and military budget by 25 percent. Will you meet with him, offer to help, and let us know what we can do to help move resources where we truly need them?

We oppose wars and waste of our money. We support jobs and green energy, which is one of many ways in which jobs could be created with reclaimed military money.

Investing public dollars in military jobs at home in the United States produces fewer and lower-paying jobs for the U.S. economy than does public investment in healthcare, education, mass transit, or home construction. See "The U.S. Employment Effects of Military and Domestic Spending Priorities," by Robert Pollin and Heidi Garrett-Peltier, Political Economy Research Institute, Univ. of Massachusetts - Amherst.

Congressman Frank thinks 10 percent of the war and military budget could be saved by ending the occupation of Iraq, although it would be lost again if war escalated in Afghanistan. Cutting 15 or even 25 percent of the non-war military budget could be done without touching anything that serves a useful purpose, and could include weapons programs the military has wanted cut in the past but Congress hasn't.

Americans from across the political spectrum, on average, say they would cut the non-war military budget by 31 percent even while increasing funding for veterans. They want the money moved to education, job training, employment, medical research, and renewable energy. See: "The Federal Budget: the Public's Priorities," by the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA).

In November 2008, the Defense Business Board, which is part of the U.S. military stated in briefings that major systemic cuts were absolutely necessary.

Military costs in all departments, including veterans care and debt interest amounts to roughly \$1.5 trillion per year. Here are some possible areas for savings:

Potential Savings Per Year:

- \$162 billion Iraq and Afghanistan.
- \$159 billion Future Combat Systems, or a fraction if just scaled back.
- \$130 billion if we close foreign bases, or a fraction if we close some of them.
- \$20 billion if we cut nuclear weapons to 1,000.
- \$10.5 billion "missile defense".
- \$10 billion if we reduce foreign military "aid".
- \$6.7 billion F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.
- \$6.2 billion for each Nimitz-class aircraft carrier.
- \$4.1 billion F-22 Raptor supersonic stealth fighter.
- \$3.6 billion Virginia Class submarine.
- \$3.5 billion V22 Osprey.
- \$3.2 billion DDG 1000 destroyer.
- \$1.5 billion offensive space weapons.
- \$1.4 billion each Navy Littoral Combat Ship.

Congressman Frank wrote this week: "The math is compelling: if we do not make reductions approximating 25 percent of the military budget starting fairly soon, it will be impossible to continue to fund an adequate level of domestic activity even with a repeal of Bush's tax cuts for the very wealthy. I am working with a variety of thoughtful analysts to show how we can make very substantial cuts in the military budget without in any way diminishing the security we need. I do not think it will be hard to make it clear to Americans that their well-being is far more endangered by a proposal for substantial reductions in Medicare, Social Security or other important domestic areas than it would be by canceling weapons systems that have no justification from any threat we are likely to face."

Note that recent stories of a proposed 10 percent cut to the military budget were based on a proposed budget that increased spending by 13 percent, meaning the supposed cut would actually be a small increase.