

F-35: More jobs-- or actually a lot fewer jobs?

James Marc Leas

Burlington City Hall

January 20, 2011

Air Force does not even argue that the F-35 will bring more jobs to Vermont

- Air Force acknowledges that F-35 system will provide fewer jobs than F-16 now provides
- Air Force merely argues that Vermont might not lose as many jobs if the F-35 system comes to Vermont
- **But even that sad story is not the whole story**

If the F-35 creates jobs how can it also cause job loss?

The Air Force is right that an expanding military budget creates jobs

But this could still lead to a large loss of jobs in the U.S. economy and more unemployment

How? If other budget items that generate more jobs are cut to make way for the F-35

Choice

- Like ourselves, governments make choices about how to spend a limited budget
- Hundreds of billions of dollars going to F-35 requires hundreds of billions less government spending on other items
- Those other items would create far more jobs
- So choosing the F-35 is choosing fewer jobs and more unemployment

U Mass Economic Study

“The Employment Effects of Downsizing the U.S. Military,” by Robert Pollin and Heidi Garrett-Peltier, Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts, November 2007

http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/working_papers/working_papers_151-200/WP152.pdf

U Mass Economic Study

Jobs created for each billion dollars of spending

	Jobs/\$ billion
Defense	8,555
Tax cuts for personal spending	10,779
Health care	12,883
Education	17,687
Mass transit	19,795
Construction for home weatherization	12,804

Military spending causes job loss

- Spending money on education, health care, mass transit, energy efficiency and infrastructure and other domestic programs **creates far more jobs than spending on military**
- For example, for each billion dollars taken from education to spend on the F-35 **twice as many jobs are lost** in education as created in the F-35 program

U. Mass economic study shows:

Military spending causes massive job loss as it takes dollars from items, such as education, health care, mass transit, and energy efficiency that would create far more jobs

Average pay is higher in education

In addition, spending the money on education creates better paying jobs on average than military spending

	average pay+benefits/worker
Defense	\$65,986
Education	\$74,024

Total wages and benefits from spending \$1 billion

Defense	\$564 million
Tax Cuts for personal spending	\$504 million
Health care	\$730 million
Education	\$1309 million
Mass transit	\$880 million
Construction for home weatherization	\$693 million

These figures include:

Direct: wages and benefits from jobs created by producing the listed product or service (such as the F-35, teachers, doctors, etc)

Indirect: wages and benefits from jobs created by industries that provide supplies for producing that product or service, and

Induced: wages and benefits from jobs created because of spending by direct and indirect workers to purchase other products or services

Air Force argument is flawed

Spending on socially useful programs, such as education, provides more jobs, higher paying jobs, more economic stimulus, and more benefit to the American people.

Spending on the F-35 will destroy far more jobs than will be created and stimulate the economy less.

Air Force argument is flawed

The Air Force argument relies on limiting discussion to jobs created by F-35, omitting mention of the many more jobs that are lost because the money to design, build, deploy and maintain this plane is taken from other domestic programs

President Eisenhower

“Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed.”

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States, April 16, 1953.

Who wins?

- In his farewell address in 1961, President Eisenhower warned of a “military industrial complex.” He said that it “would cause military spending to be driven not by national security needs but by a network of weapons makers, lobbyists and elected officials.”

Challenge our Senators and Congressman

- Whenever one of these individuals says that the F-35 or other military spending creates jobs in Vermont ask how many more jobs are lost, and how much more unemployment is being created, because the money for weapons is not being spent on education, health care, mass transit, energy efficiency, or other useful projects?

Campaign Contributions → Contracts

→ CEO Pay, lobbying & Campaign Contributions → Contracts

- In 2002 and 2003 for the largest defense contractors: the size of defense contracts tracks with the size of their campaign contributions.
- From 2001 to 2002, overall CEO pay rose by 6% while
- CEO pay for the 37 largest defense contractors leaped by nearly 79%.
- In 2002, defense CEOs raked in an average of \$11.3 million, 577 times as much as the \$19,600 annual earnings of an Army private.
- Near top of list CEO of F-35 prime contractor Lockheed Martin made 2,000 times the pay of that Army private

“War without end: the domestic economic fallout of empire,” by Sheila D. Collins, William Paterson University, [New Political Science](#), Volume [26](#), Issue [3](#) September 2004 , pages 347 - 369
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a713627380&fulltext=713240928#fn87>

Who loses

- Democracy: replaced by rule of money and rule by corporations whose only goal is profit
- Our economy: lose jobs and get massive government debt which is used to justify cuts in education and other useful programs

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{Military spending} \\ + \\ \text{Tax cuts for the rich} \end{array} = \text{Federal Deficit}$$

- Our environment
- F-35 puts America in a tailspin

Burlington Vermont votes overwhelmingly to bring troops home now

Burlington 2005 Town Meeting Ballet QUESTION 7

"Shall the voters of the City of Burlington advise the President and Congress that **Burlington and its citizens strongly support the men and women serving in the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and believe that the best way to support them is to bring them home now?**"

Yes: 4674

total votes cast 7174

No: 2500

percent yes: 65.2%

This resolution won majority support in every ward in Burlington

Democracy

The people of Burlington have
already spoken

We don't support sending our soldiers to attack
other countries

Greenwashing

- The attempted greenwashing is an admission that they have no convincing case for basing the F-35 in South Burlington.
- Lockheed-Martin and the Air Force are attempting to place \$3 billion of F-35 planes at our airport in South Burlington by offering funding for their version of green projects.
- Instead, we demand that the \$3 billion be spent on saving our planet from climate change and canceling the F-35.

What we can do

- They claim the F-35 will defend democracy
- Not true
- What will defend democracy is members of the public participating.
We need to mobilize the public to stop the F-35 and stop the militarization of Burlington under Lockheed-Martin
- Petition
- Letters to editor
- Talking to neighbors
- Town Meeting resolutions
- Meetings and other events to educate and mobilize the public
- Meetings with public officials to explain why we want our public money spent for education, health care, mass transit, repairing roads and bridges, energy efficiency, renewable energy--not the F-35