



## From the Director

by Will Hopkins

### Syria and forward.

I never would have imagined that we could actually stop a war cold in it's tracks. Maybe in another country, where people feel empowered and feel like they have a role to play or some influence over their government, maybe in another country where the first and only answer to every challenge isn't the use of overwhelming military force and firepower, maybe in another country, where people get the ties between excessive military spending and economic hardship; but not here. In my 33 years on this planet, there has been only one rule to US policy, *come hell or high water, we always go to war when we have the chance.*

When President Obama tried to start his very own middle-east war; between the virulent racists of the right, willing to vote for or against anything to make the president look bad and the faux-populist corporate shills of the democratic party who could not continue to hold their charade of representing the

people in the face of such overwhelming outcry at the prospect of another war- we built a large enough voting block that it became clear that congress would not authorize the war. At that stage, an act of political theater facilitated by Russia's Vladimir Putin was the only way for the war-mongers to save face. But what a moment in the modern history of the United States; to have stopped a war in less than two weeks- if my contribution to that effort was all I do of substance in my lifetime, I will know I did something worthwhile with my life.

As an organization, we should be proud. Kelly Ayotte was a leading proponent of war with Syria, Annie Kuster was leaning toward following the president, but with an overwhelming burst of pressure, we moved them both to firm opposition. We should all be proud, thank you, and may our influence in 2014 be even greater!

<b>Inside this Issue</b>	
1	From the Director
2	The Faces of Children
3	Connecting the Dots Between Banks and Bombs
4	Iran-US Agreement
6	Honduras Election Results
7	Signature Ad
7	Move the Money
8	Events & Announcements



Non-Profit  
US Postage  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 1667  
Concord, NH  
03301

Return service requested

NH Peace Action Education Fund  
4 Park St. Ste. 210  
Concord, NH 03301



## *Palestine Education Network News*

### THE FACES OF CHILDREN

Interfaith Peace Builders is a delegation program that provides an in-depth exploration of the everyday violence of war and occupation. Participants learn from those committed to nonviolent struggle, human rights and peace with justice. IFPB delegations present alternative images and analyses, not covered in the media, which reach deeper to uncover the roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and avenues pointing the way to change and reconciliation. New Hampshire residents Carolyn Cicciu and Will Thomas participated in their third delegation from Oct. 27 to Nov. 8, 2013, with 21 other participants from across the country. Their meetings with NGOs and victims of violence exposed the tragic consequences of Israeli government policies that marginalize the indigenous Palestinians.

Our IFPB delegation visited a suburb of Jerusalem called Silwan. While walking through this community, we were informed that many Palestinian homes had already been destroyed and that another 88 were scheduled for destruction in the next few months. Israel has decreed that these homes must disappear so that the site may be excavated so as to construct a sort of Disney-like theme park called the “City of David.” Multiple diggings in Silwan have revealed no evidence that King David ever had a “city” in Silwan. Some, like Israeli author Miko Peled, claim that this “David” never even existed! Yet, Israel is eradicating hundreds of homes of Palestinians in Silwan. Could this be the excuse to drive out Palestinians and to “Judaize” East Jerusalem which once had been identified as the site of a future capital of an independent Palestinian state?

In Silwan we met a child, a young girl, age five. We saw her home which was one of those already destroyed. Armed Israel soldiers came in the darkness of night with massive bulldozers to demolish this young girl’s house, which had been the sacred dwelling of her parents, her four siblings and her grandmother. The house had been built into the side of a cliff but now the family was reduced to living inside a cave within that cliff.

This same story was played out in the Bedouin village of Al-Araqib. All the residents are Israeli citizens; they have proof of inhabiting the land since 1916, long before Israel ever became a state. Yet, as citizens and taxpayers, they have been deprived of water, electricity, schools, services, and infrastructure. Instead, Israel plans to move these traditional farmers and herders from their land to new “cities,” an experiment that has already proven unsuccessful for previously relocated Bedouins. The Jewish National Fund is busily destroying the indigenous and centuries-old olive trees with eucalyptus and pines. These non-native plants are fast growing and voraciously thirsty, but have the advantage of hiding the remains of villages they replaced and “make the desert bloom,” as the Israeli government likes to boast. This process occurs over and over again in both Israel proper and the Palestinian territories it occupies. One young Bedouin child, who accompanied us as we surveyed the destruction of his village, still had a dream: to become a doctor and return to this village, now situated in the cemetery in tents, where he would operate a clinic. Palestinian children imagine for themselves the same things that all

children imagine—happy, safe homes, free from invasion and destruction. We can help them reach their dreams.

As the U.S. testifies that it stands for equality and human rights everywhere, its citizens would do well to examine their own consciences and reflect on their own humanity as we witness the on-going assault on Palestinian children and families of Occupied Palestine and Israel. The U.S. unrestricted aid to Israel makes us complicit in these crimes against humanity.

*Carolyn Cicciu and Will Thomas are both members of NH Peace Action and the Palestine Education Network. They available to give presentations on other situations they observed during this delegation. They may be reached through contacting [nhyfp@comcast.net](mailto:nhyfp@comcast.net) or by calling (603) 321-8838.*



The Peace in Palestine flag was created by the Palestine Education Network and colored and signed by participants of NH Peace Action's International Day of Peace Art Festival. It was delivered to the West Bank, Palestine during Carolyn & Will's trip.

#### **New Hampshire Peace Action Staff**

Will Hopkins, Director  
Doreen Desmarais, Administrator  
Emily Spencer, Membership Advocate

*“Peace is not only better than war, but infinitely more arduous.” - George Bernard Shaw*

***The Board and Staff of NH Peace Action Education Fund would like to thank the***

***Anne Slade Frey  
Charitable Trust***

***for ongoing support of this newsletter  
and our other educational programs***

Connecting the Dots Between Banks & Bombs

by Susan Bruce

A new report called Don't Bank on the Bomb, from ICAN, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear weapons and IVK Pax Christi has recently been released. The report looks at how heavily the global private sector (banking, pension funds, investment companies) is invested in nuclear weapons. The private sector investments are in addition to the substantial (involuntary) investments we all make as taxpayers.

Some 298 financial institutions from around the world have provided some form of financing to the nuclear weapons industry – to the current tune of \$314 billion. The Don't Bank on the Bomb report has a Hall of Fame that lists banks and companies that have no nuclear investments. None of them are located in the US. The Hall of Shame, however, lists 166 US financial institutions, substantially more than any other country. In second place is the UK with 27. Some of the biggest players in the United States are: State Street, Capital Group, Blackrock, Morgan Stanley, Northern Trust, Goldman Sachs, and JP Morgan Chase.

Let's take a quick look at a few of the companies examined in the report; companies with very familiar names. Morgan Stanley's statement of their priorities: "Morgan Stanley is dedicated to making a positive contribution to society through our focus on the environment, our communities, responsible business practices, strengthening the next generation of citizens, and our people." In their quest to make a positive contribution they've loaned money (since 2010) to a number of nuclear weapons manufacturers, including BAE Systems, Boeing, Gencorp, Honeywell International, Lockheed Martin, and Northrop Grumman. Morgan Stanley owns or controls at least 0.05% of the stock in these companies: Babcock and Wilcox, Alliant Techsystems, Gencorp, General Dynamics, Honeywell International, and Huntington Ingalls. Investing in nuclear weapons manufacturers seems contrary to Morgan Stanley's stated goals.

Goldman Sachs also proudly touts their brand of social responsible investing: "At GSAM, (Goldman Sachs Asset Management) we believe responsible and sustainable investing extends beyond the evaluation of quantitative factors and traditional fundamental analysis. Where material, it should include the analysis of an entity's impact on its stakeholders, the environment and society." One can wonder if the impact of nuclear weapons on the environment and society was ever truly a consideration. Goldman Sachs has made loans (since 2010) to BAE Systems, Bechtel, Boeing, EADS, Honeywell International, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, and Rolls Royce. (Rolls Royce is part of a joint venture to develop the next generation of nuclear submarines.) Goldman Sachs also owns or manages at least 0.05% of the company shares of Boeing, General Dynamics, Honeywell International, Jacob Engineering, and Lockheed Martin. One must move the goalposts very far indeed, to be able to term these investments as "socially responsible."

TIAA-CREF handles retirement investments for those in the academic, medical, research, cultural, and governmental fields. From their website: "TIAA-CREF has a long-standing commitment to socially responsible investing that is consistent with our nonprofit heritage and unwavering mission to serve those who serve the greater good." TIAA-CREF owns or manages at least 0.05% of the stock in Aecom, Alliant Techsystems,

Boeing, Fluor, Gencorp, General Dynamics, Honeywell International, Huntington Ingalls, Jacobs Engineering, Northrop Grumman, and Rockwell Collins. TIAA-CREF also owns or manages at least 0.05% of the bonds at Alliant Technologies, BAE Systems, Boeing, Fluor, General Dynamics, Honeywell International, Huntington Ingalls, Lockheed Martin, Jacobs Engineering, Northrop Grumman, and Rockwell Collins. Can this type of investment really be considered socially responsible?

It isn't easy to ferret out this kind of information, which is why this report is so important. Peace activists who have retirement accounts through TIAA-CREF should certainly be asking them questions and exerting pressure on the company. Morgan Stanley should be publicly shamed at every opportunity for their hypocrisy. It's hard to pressure big banks, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't try. The first step (as always) is educating those around us.

The whole report can be found at this link:

http://www.ikvpaxchristi.nl/media/files/dbotbexecutivesummary10321007.pdf .

The entire report is a must read. Save it. And pass it on. Most retired teachers don't know that TIAA-CREF is invested in nuclear weapons, and it seems likely that many of them would be horrified to learn that this is the case. If enough retirees get mad and make their feelings known, TIAA-CREF will have to divest themselves of their nuclear holdings.

Susan Bruce is a write and member of NH Peace Action. Visit her blog at: susanthebruce.blogspot.com/

\*\*\*\*\*
★ NH Peace Action Education Fund ★
★ Board of Directors ★
★ Lynn Chong, Chair ★
★ Susan Bruce, Vice Chair ★
★ Chris Hobby, Secretary ★
★ Jessica Wixson Shaw, Treasurer ★
★ Alex Fried ★
★ Michelle Cunha ★
★ Chris Hansen ★
★ Frank Irvine ★
★ Jonie LaBombard ★
★ John Lamperti ★
★ Griffin Sinclair-Wingate ★
★ Curt Smith ★
★ Sandra Yarne ★
\*\*\*\*\*

## **A new chapter or another page from an old book?**

On November 23, 2013, Iran and the United Nations Security Council reached an historical and unprecedented agreement on the long disputed Iranian nuclear issue. The deal calls for a pause in Iran's nuclear activities and stopping uranium enrichment at the 5% level. All previously enriched uranium to the 20% level will be turned into fuel. Of the centrifuges in Natanz, 50% will be nullified, as will 75% of those in Fordo. Production of additional centrifuges will be limited only to replacement of the used ones. Activities at the heavy water reactor in Arak will also stop. The IAEA inspectors will have unmitigated access to all Iranian nuclear facilities. In return, Iran will get some relief from the economic sanctions, particularly in trades related to oil, gold, petrochemical, pharmaceutical, airplane spare parts, and some industrial parts. Iran will also get some relief in using the international banking system and access to its frozen assets.

From the moment it was announced, the deal was hailed both as a major breakthrough and as a ploy to buy time for the Iranian regime. To be sure, the agreement is not a complete surrender by either side. It is best viewed as the first step towards possibly reaching a comprehensive agreement. To fully understand and assess the situation however, this complicated issue must be disentangled.

First, it should be recognized that Iran has historical ties and interest in areas stretching from Tajikistan and northern parts of the Indian subcontinent to the Mediterranean Sea. From the steps of Central Asia to the Southern shores of the Persian Gulf and Arabian Peninsula. Naturally, Iran attempts to preserve and defend these ties and interests. The US and the West also have legitimate interests in these areas and obviously attempt to preserve them.

The mistrust between Iran and the US stems from previous experiences. Particularly from the 1953 CIA engineered coup that removed a democratically elected government of Mossadegh and replaced it by the dictatorial rule of pro-US Shah on one side and the 444 day takeover of the American embassy in Tehran and keeping 53 American diplomats as hostage on the other side. Against this background, the two sides interacted during the past three decades or so. Normally, in pursuit of their interests, parties will engage in activities that might not be approved by the other side and at times may even be harmful to the interests of the other party. Accordingly, on many occasions the Iranian regime may have acted in a manner that was harmful to the US interests and the United State may have pursued policies that adversely affected the Iranian interests. However, if a genuine resolution to an issue is desired both sides must engage in an honest dialogue and accept compromise. Insults and name-calling is counterproductive and should be avoided. One side's "terrorist" is normally the other side's "freedom fighter" and "misdeed" by one group could be "virtuous" by others. These labels are meaningless. To resolve an issue, dialogue and negotiation should be carried out with good faith.

Iran aspires to develop nuclear energy and most likely is after nuclear weapons. Regardless of the wisdom of this pursuit, one should recognize that the atomic energy and atomic weaponry, at least as perceived by Iranians, is a matter of national pride and an existential issue. Moreover, one should acknowledge that there is nothing inherently illegal about pursuing nuclear power and weapons. Further, it should be clear that although the Iranian regime

violates the Human Rights of the Iranian people on a daily basis, it is not alone in the world in doing this. The Iranian regime helps groups that are hostile to the US and Israel in Lebanon, Gaza strip, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. These activities, however, should be viewed in the context of the bigger picture and considered as helping one's allies in the struggle for preserving one's interests.

From the early days of the Islamic regime in Iran, there have been two factions within it as well as the United States government on how to deal with the other side. Broadly speaking, in Iran there are religious fundamentalists who advocate strict hardline-no compromise positions internally, regionally, and internationally. A more moderate line within the Islamic regime wants to improve and expand the relationship with the West internationally and follow a less strict social policies along with economic growth path internally. In the US, the Neo Cons in conjunction with the conservative Arab states and Israel have always advocated isolation, and possibly removal, of the Islamic regime in Iran. The process of rapprochement, beginning with the negotiation to resolve the hostage crisis, has been continuously sabotaged by oppositions in both countries. The recent agreement is no exception. Several members of the US Congress, as well as officials from some Arab governments and Israel have already denounced this agreement. In Iran, the hardliners have warned the negotiators against surrendering and suggested that Iran should use this opportunity to establish itself as a regional atomic power. The fundamentalists further suggest that even giving up the atomic energy endeavor by Iran will not yield a resolution to the Western concerns with Iran. They argue that the next step is Iran's regional policies, opposition to Israel, missile program, etc. Iran's leader, Ali Khamenei, for the moment appears to be in favor of negotiation, although he has expressed his doubts and questioned the US sincerity. Nonetheless, Khamenei has called for "heroic flexibility" and to silence the critics and defended Rouhani and the moderates by specifically proclaiming that the engagement is on behalf of the regime and no one should doubt their revolutionary credentials.

The question, then, is what has happened? Why did the two sides show interest in reconciliation and why does it appear that the pro rapprochement fractions on both sides have the upper hand? Could this be a result of sanctions imposed on Iran? Probably not. It is important to understand this assertion since the correct solution can only emerge from a correct comprehension of the problem. If the sanctions were the cause of negotiation, the solution will obviously be further and tighter sanctions and if sanctions did not yield the agreement the real cause should be discovered.

It is true that the sanctions have caused the Iranian oil revenue to decline by two-thirds. It is a fact that the banking and other restrictions have resulted in the depreciation of the Iranian currency by more than 75% against major currencies. It is also a fact that Iranian economy is experiencing an inflation rate of around 40% with over 25% unem-

ployment. Notwithstanding the ineffectiveness of economic sanctions in general as a means to stop a nuclear program, these problems, as severe as they might be, are not new in Iran and cannot be the answer to the question. To dispel the myth of sanctions forcing Iran to the negotiation table, one has only to look at the fact that the reconciliation movement by the moderates started long ago. Hassan Rouhani and Javad Zarif, the current Iranian president and foreign minister, were both part of the nuclear negotiation team and the national security apparatus in Iran. More than ten years ago, long before the intensified sanctions, they proposed a deal that is essentially the same as the current deal. They were both heavily involved in 2001 in cooperation with the US to help topple the Taliban in Afghanistan. In 2003, this same group offered the US and the West their so called “grand bargain” deal. According to that proposal, Iran agreed to almost all of the US demands including allowing the inspection of its nuclear facilities, holding the number of its centrifuges to 3000, soften its rhetoric against Israel and eventually recognize it, cooperate with the US in Iraq and restrain Hezbollah, Hamas, and other Islamic groups. The proposal, needless to say, was ignored by the US and its allies.

The real answer, then, lies in the dynamic of the US and Iranian society. The Iranian regime has come to realize that it must resolve its chronic economic problems. The regime is well aware of the aspirations and issues of women, youth, religious and ethnic minorities in Iran and the need to somehow address them. A large segment of the Iranian upper and middle class is weary of Iran’s isolation and missing out on global economic opportunities. Additionally, the regime itself has witnessed the Russian and Chinese position change on several issues including Syria. They have also awakened to the historical role and position of Iran and they want to officially assert and assume that role. Lastly, the regime wants to take advantage of the few years left in the Obama administration and reach closure on old issues.

The US on the other hand, suffers from internal problems and divided government. Budget deficit, national debt, long and deep recession, sluggish recovery, healthcare issues, the debate over the size and role of the government, social programs, and ideological and cultural divides are among internal issues faced by the US. Internationally, the US has had to deal with wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the increasing fundamentalism and radicalization of Muslims inside the Western countries as well as in Muslim countries. It must also manage the ongoing issues in the Middle East, North and East Africa, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Syria, Bahrain, and the Muslim world. Further, it is to the US interest to create a wedge between Iran and Russia and China. Moreover, the US can use Iran’s help in handling countries with substantial Shiite population (e.g., Yemen, Bahrain, Pakistan, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria) as well as utilizing Iran as a counterweight to Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and UAE in spreading a brand of Islam that breeds anti-American fundamentalism. Iran can also be beneficial to the US foreign policy in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and containing the opposition movements in Gaza strip and Lebanon. Lastly, the US is not prepared for another military involvement in the Middle East.

This current agreement could be a prelude to a deeper and longer lasting arrangement. The agreement is born out of necessity and could change the geopolitics of the Middle East. None of the problems in the Middle East and Central Asia could be reasonably resolved without Iran’s active participation. Therefore, either the regime in Iran must be changed or an agreement must be reached. Similarly, none of Iran’s problems will be solved without the US cooperation and commitment. The current Iranian anti-US and anti-Israeli position stem from what Iran perceives as necessity and as a reaction to what it sees as the US disrespect and hostility. Reconciliation is advantageous to both sides. By the dictates of geopolitics and history, Iran and the US are natural allies. As are Iran and Israel. By taking the long view and abandoning short sightedness, and by providing proper incentives, the interests could be aligned and issues resolved. Iran and its legitimate role, interests, and potentials should be acknowledged. As should interests and capabilities of the US and Israel. The US, Iran, and Israel can and will be friends.

The recognition of the above-mentioned necessities by both sides is what resulted in the present short term agreement. However, a more comprehensive and permanent agreement is needed. US has released \$7 billion of \$100 billion Iranian money and minimally eased the sanctions. The money will be exhausted much sooner than the six months deadline for the next round of agreement. The US must lift most, if not all, of the sanctions very soon and Iran has to offer additional concessions. This, in turn, requires the Iranian regime to take positions contrary to the ones it has taken so far and negate the Islamic regime’s *raison d’être*. Given these and given the strong oppositions in both countries to any reconciliation, the future of this agreement is not bright. Furthermore, any long term agreement will lengthen the rule of the Islamic regime in Iran. This is contrary to the well-being of the Iranian people who suffer daily under this regime. Nevertheless, the question is what could be done? What is the alternative? War and devastation? Slowing down the hostility and starting to talk, even without much hope, is the first step that might, just might, lead to peace and cooperation between the US and Iran and an opening of the possibility of metamorphosis of the Iranian regime leading to a democratic and free Iran. Even without much optimism, that is the chance both sides must take.

*Dr. Ali Reza Jalili is a Professor of Business at New England College.*

**NH Peace Action  
Board of Directors**

Mike Bradley  
Lynne Clowes  
Dick deSeve  
Sue deSeve  
Greg Heath  
John Lamperti, Chair  
Olivia Zink

“If you don't like something, change it. If you can't change it, change your attitude.” - *Maya Angelou*

## Honduras Election Results Report

John Kerry said on Dec 12, 2013: “On behalf of President Obama and the people of the United States, I extend my warm congratulations to Juan Orlando Hernandez on his election as President of the Republic of Honduras. . . . on November 24, and we commend the Honduran Government for ensuring that the election process was generally transparent, peaceful, and reflected the will of the Honduran people.”

Kerry’s press release does much violence to language and to the truth with that phrase: “. . . generally transparent, peaceful, and . . . the will of the Honduran people.”

Members of several international organizations have given much different reports. The Honduran Supreme Electoral Council (TSE), controlled by members of Hernandez’s National Party, said that he won with 37% of the official votes, compared to the 29% going to his opponent Xiamara Castro de Zelaya of the new party LIBRE. However, members of international observer groups issued reports of vote buying, of murders and threats of LIBRE Party officials both before and after the voting, of voting records showing that dead people voted, and of living people listed as dead and therefore ineligible to vote, of discrepancies between totals reported at polling places and at TSE headquarters, and of exit polls indicating a victory for Xiamara Castro.

Xiamara Castro and the LIBRE Party have demanded a recount.

Xiamara Castro is the wife of former President Jose Manuel Zelaya, who was ousted in a coup in June 2009 and replaced in a subsequent suspect election (praised by the US) which installed the Liberal Party president Porfirio Lobo. Zelaya had been popularly elected, and had begun plans for popular reforms that threatened powerful interests in Honduras. Honduran priest Father Ismael Moreno Coto, SJ, who spoke about his country during a tour of New England this Fall, sponsored by Witness for Peace. “Padre Melo”, as he is known, said that 80% of Honduras’s 8.3 million people lack the basics needed for everyday life, and an oligarchy of 215 very wealthy individuals controls everything. The world’s highest murder rate (20 per day), narco-trafficking (80% of cocaine bound for the US passes through Honduras), international business investments in mining, sugar cane, African oil-palm, and hydroelectric projects, and 2 permanent US military bases, all leave most of the population at the mercy of a few powerful interests, and eager to embrace true reforms, like those hoped for from Xiamara Castro.

Among the reported irregularities that make the official results and US congratulations suspect: Some voters were given “La Chacureca” discount cards, useful for medical care, cell phone use, etc., in return for registering with the National Party. Some who received government checks because of poverty were told that the checks, postdated after the election, couldn’t be cashed if the National Party lost. (SOA Watch Website).

The Honduras Solidarity Network’s website (and other sources) reported murders of LIBRE Party officials and 16 LIBRE candidates, threats of election workers, and intimidation of international election observers by Honduran government officials.

Although the US State Department’s statements referred to endorsement of the election’s outcome by the European Un-

ion’s official observers, one of those observers spoke out in dissent, as Mark Weisbrot writes on the Counterpunch website for 12/6-8/13: “[A] big thing in this election has been the defection of a delegate from the official EU observer mission, Leo Gabriel of Austria. In a [press interview with Brazil’s Opera Mundi](#), Gabriel explained why he breached protocol and denounced the EU’s preliminary report:

*“I can attest to countless inconsistencies in the electoral process. There were people who could not vote because they showed up as being dead, and there were dead people who voted. . . . the hidden alliance between the small parties and the National Party led to the buying and selling of votes and [electoral worker] credentials . . . . During the transmission of the results there was no possibility to find out where the tallies were being sent and we received reliable information that at least 20% of the original tally sheets were being diverted to an illegal server...”* He also noted that the majority of his fellow EU observers disagreed with the mission’s report but were overruled by the team leaders.

“Gabriel concludes that although ‘EU missions have played a relevant role and have appropriately dealt with lack of transparency in [other] electoral processes,’ this was not the case in this election, where ‘political, economic, commercial, and even partisan interests prevailed.’

The process of reporting and tabulating votes at TSE headquarters was computerized. Eric Sperling, an observer from the National Lawyers Guild, wrote “the TSE had rejected calls for parties to examine the software used in this process, claiming it would be a violation of the company’s intellectual property rights. . . .” (National Lawyers Guild website).

In his Counterpunch article, Weisbrot continues: “The most important partisan interest is that of Washington, which put \$11 million dollars (that we know about) into the election and wanted to legitimate the rule of its ally, the National Party, just as it did in the more [blatantly illegitimate election](#) four years ago after the [U.S.-backed military coup](#). . . . But the battle over this election is not over yet. [Thousands of Hondurans have taken to the streets](#), in spite of the increasing repression and militarization of the country. The response of the international media and observer missions will be relevant: will they investigate to see if the charges of electoral fraud are true? Or will they simply watch as the National Party government consolidates itself with repression and support for the results from the U.S. and its allies?”

Weisbrot’s warning should give us all reason to stay vigilant about US policies and actions in our part of the world. While we may applaud and encourage John Kerry’s diplomatic efforts vis-à-vis Syria and Iran, we must speak out and act in solidarity with the people of Honduras, as they continue their struggle to bring justice to this violent nation so burdened with inequality.

We should also be alert to, and ready to denounce, official efforts by the US government to interfere in elections in neighboring El Salvador, which will take place February 2, 2014.

*Chris Hansen is a member of the NHPA Education Fund Board of Directors.*

SIGNATURE AD!

NH Peace Action Education Fund will be running the following signature ad in mid-January. We hope to be able to have it in the all major statewide papers. Please consider adding your name to it (\$10 per name) by filling out the coupon on the back page and mailing it to the office.

**The city of Concord's contribution to the Pentagon in 2014 will be**



**\$69,920,000.00**

**That's the same as**



Hiring 1100 new teachers.



Providing 18,000 children with health care.



Fitting every home in Concord with solar cells providing 100% of Concord's electric grid... five times over.

**MOVE THE MONEY**



Ask NH Peace Action how you can put forth a Town Resolution to cut military spending in your town and add you name here!

[WWW.NHPEACEACTION.ORG](http://WWW.NHPEACEACTION.ORG)



*Protestors gather in opposition to bombing Syria. More than 150 people attended the September 5th rally in front of the State House in Concord*

**Move the Money: A Call for Action**

*by Sandra Yarne*

If you are searching for a New Year's resolution please consider this one; resolve to reduce the Pentagon's budget by 25%. Of the top three New Year's resolutions that people make one of them usually is to address personal finances. How about addressing our national finances? Isn't it time that we stop spending 60% of our country's discretionary budget on the military?

Join New Hampshire Peace Action in our Move the Money campaign. This campaign sends the message from our communities to the federal government to decrease the military budget by 25% and fund projects within our communities.

This campaign makes sense. The peace movement has long understood the relationship between our oversized military budget and resulting decrease in our well-being, both collectively and individually. Because of the sequester and the recent government shutdown, most citizens in our country are acutely aware of how the federal budget affects our daily lives. As activists we need to seize this moment to advance a cause we believe in. Help to put pressure on our elected officials locally and federally to take a stand for all things that contribute to our well-being such as schools, roads, bridges, affordable housing, healthcare, sustainable energy sources, railroads, addressing climate change and the safety net to provide for the disabled and elderly.

Why should we cut the US military budget by 25%? Because it is too large. The US military budget is greater than the military budgets of all the world's countries combined. We have enough nuclear bombs to destroy every living creature on earth several times over. The F 35 bomber is a project which has not produced a reliable plane and if ended would save as much money as the total sequester. The Pentagon has said it could live without this plane.

Move the Money proposes that pay, benefits and healthcare for servicemen and women and veterans not be cut. Cuts should be made to expensive and redundant weapons systems, unnecessary foreign military bases, costly foreign wars, nuclear weapons, the size of our standing armed services and use of mercenaries.

*continued on page 8*

# Events and Announcements

Happy Holidays from all of us at the office: Will, Doreen and Emily, and a few reminders:

- ➔ Membership renewals are now done once a year in late January. Watch for yours in the mail!
- ➔ If you move or are going to be away for any length of time, please let the office know either by phone (603) 228-0559 or email (Doreen@nhpeaceaction.org). The organization has to pay full postage on returned mail.
- ➔ You can help save us even more money (and trees) by receiving your newsletter electronically. Just call or email.
- ➔ Don't forget to check out and join our Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/4576422949> You can post articles and information for other "peace-niks".
- ➔ The Ed Fund Board of Directors is in need of a Treasurer. Jessica Wixson-Shaw submitted her resignation over a year ago but is still continuing the duties. If anyone knows of a pro-peace accountant willing to put in a few hours a month, please give Will a call at the office.

Please see the website [www.nhpeaceaction.org](http://www.nhpeaceaction.org) or call 603-228-0559 for more information and updates.

*Move the Money continued from page 7*

How can we do this? Move the Money has set up a nationwide model that calls upon people to build strong alliances between the peace movement and labor, economic justice and human needs groups whose constituencies have been devastated by the economic crisis. We need you to be the person that organizes others or identifies the people in your community that see the need for changes in the federal budget priorities. This is a grassroots effort that cannot be done solely by Peace Action's board or staff. We need your knowledge of your community in order to pass these resolutions and educate about what is possible in a peace economy.

Peace Action's Move the Money campaign will sup-

ply ideas and help you to organize like-minded people in your community to pass a resolution for your town meeting or city council. Please join us in this important effort. Call 228-0559 today and visit [nhpeaceaction.org](http://nhpeaceaction.org).

"There is no way in which a country can satisfy the craving of absolute security but it can bankrupt itself morally and economically in attempting to reach that illusionary goal through arms alone." *Dwight D Eisenhower*

*Dr. Sandra Yarne is a member of NH Peace Action Education Fund Board of Directors, Seacoast Peace Response and the Palestine Education Network.*

## YES, I WANT TO HELP SPREAD THE WORD THAT WE NEED TO REDUCE MILITARY SPENDING AND SUPPORT HUMAN NEEDS!

\_\_\_\_\_ Here is my donation to help publish the ad. \_\_\_\_\_ (\$10 per name)

\_\_\_\_\_ check enclosed    \_\_\_\_\_ Visa or M/C (please circle)    CVV # \_\_\_\_\_

Card # \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City, State Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Please clip and mail to NH Peace Action Ed Fund, 4 Park St., Concord, NH 03301