You are invited to a slide show and talk, presented by John Eastlake, about the history, camps and activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in the North Central 'Big Woods' area of Pennsylvania.

Using original photographs from the era, Mr. Eastlake will share the fruits of his research into the life and times of this former federal agency which existed from 1933 to 1943. This talk and slide show will be held on Tuesday, February 22 at 7:30 p.m. upstairs at the Bull Frog Brewery, 229 West 4th Street, Williamsport (across from the Community Arts Center). This event is free and open to the interested public, and is being sponsored by the Otzinachson Regional Group of the Sierra Club. Please note: Should hazardous weather conditions prevail on the day of the 22nd this talk will be postponed. Call Ed Lawrence at 570-925-5285 for more information, or last minute update.

**A Green Lining** By Will Rogers, President, Trust for Public Land

Though nobody seemed to notice, Republican and Democratic voters seemed to be of similar minds on one issue this election: the environment. Across the country, in red states and blue states, Americans voted decisively to spend more money for natural areas, neighborhood parks and conservation in their communities. Of 161 conservation ballot measures, 120 - or 75 percent - were approved by voters. Three-and-a-quarter billion dollars were dedicated to land conservation.

In Florida, for example, President George W. Bush won at least 60 percent of the vote in Lake, Indian River and Collier Counties. On the same ballot, more than two-thirds of the voters in each of those counties approved local park bonds worth $126 million, by margins as high as 73 percent. In Gallatin County, MT, where the president beat John Kerry by 56 percent to 41 percent, 63 percent of voters approved $10 million in bonds to buy conservation easements to preserve ranchlands. In Chesterfield County, VA, which Mr. Bush carried 63 percent to 37 percent, voters passed a $20 million park bond by 76 percent to 24 percent.

It was the same in states where Mr. Kerry prevailed. In Massachusetts, 10 townships approved extra taxes to support conservation and historic preservation. In Los Angeles, which Mr. Kerry won by 73 percent to 26 percent, 76 percent of voters approved a $500 million water-quality bond that included $100 million for conservation. And in both Burlington, VT, where Mr. Kerry won 75 percent of the vote, and in Kendall County, TX., where the president won 81 percent of the vote, voters approved $5 million to protect open spaces.

So what's the story? Simply put,
Message from the Chair: Pink Slip the President

The unholy alliance between the covetous economics of the extraction industries (which are invariably tax-payer subsidized), big energy (which is invariably tax-payer subsidized) and Biblical inerrancy (which is invariably...soon to be...tax-payer subsidized) means that the political road to the sacrificial altar will be well trodden with dusty feet through our public lands and public health.

If you are not yet ready to substitute embalming fluid for the waters of life then use your informed opinion to fight for what you believe to be right.

We celebrate the genuine in spirit, “kindredness” and conviviality. And consign the bogus hinter.

Ed Lawrence, Chair

Otzinachson now has 100% organic cotton t-shirts emblazoned with our Group name for $15.

Many thanks to Nancy Cleaver for the calligraphy and design! The sale of these shirts will help fund our newsletter and activities.

They will be available at the John Eastlake talk and slide show on February 22nd and by mail from Roy Fontaine, 3 Kirkland Estate, Watsontown, PA 17777.

www.sierraclub.org/chapters/pa/Otzinachson/

ENERGIZE OTZINACHSON!!!

Otzinachson's executive committee (ex-com) meets every other month. All members are invited and encouraged to attend. Our Sierra Club Group is only as effective and active as the volunteers who participate. We meet in the library of the First Baptist Church of Lewisburg located around the block from the post office at the corner of South 3rd and St. Louis Streets. Use the St. Louis St. entrance.

Meeting schedule:
Tuesday, February 8, 2005
Tuesday, April 5, 2005
Tuesday, June 7, 2005

OTZINACHSON

Executive Committee:
Ed Lawrence, Orangeville; Chair
Jack Miller, Middleburg
Roy Fontaine, Watsontown; Treasurer
Dodie Lovett; Herndon
Nicole Faraguna, Coal Township; Secretary
Dave Jansky; Sunbury
Joseph Rebar, Shamokin

Volunteer Committee Chairs:
Conservation, Ed Lawrence
Internet Communications/Energy, Vacant
Environmental Education, Janet Jones
Fund Raising/Political, James Best
Membership/Publicity, Joseph Rebar
Leadership/Endangered Species, Dave Hafer
Publications, Roy Fontaine
Bogus Claims...

Introduction by Ed Lawrence

This op-ed piece, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, is the very definition of BOGUS. B-O-G-U-S. Peterson uses all the too familiar tactics; misrepresentation, distortion, and blatant fabrication to demonize the Allegheny Defense Project (ADP). In Peterson’s “Neverland” it is President Bush who embraces ‘scientific’ management principles and defers to the ecologists and biologists. Did I mention hypocrisy. Did I mention sophistry and mendacity. Otzinachson supports the good works of the ADP in protecting the Allegheny National Forest from Peterson’s ‘resource management’ goals and we support their ALLEGHENY WILD! management proposal. Like all tenacious grass roots organizations that operate on commitment and a shoestring, they need financial support. Please send them a check so they can keep on going to: Allegheny Defense Project Po Box 245 Clarion, Pa 16214. They will deeply appreciate the support.

HOW THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION IS HELPING FORESTS

So-called environmentalists clog the system with lawsuits to restore misguided Clinton-era policies

by: John Peterson (U.S. Rep. John Peterson, a Republican, represents Pennsylvania’s 5th District, which includes the Allegheny National Forest. He is vice chairman of the House Resources Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health.)

Our nation’s 155 national forests provide Americans with recreational opportunities, beautiful scenery, natural resources and a sense of pride. These forests, including Pennsylvania’s own Allegheny National Forest, deserve our strong protection.

But protecting our national forests does not mean locking the people out, throwing away the key and letting nature take its course. It is this philosophy, espoused by activist groups like the Allegheny Defense Project, which has prevented the Forest Service from protecting our forests from disease, decay, insect infestation and other threats, and is costing our region jobs, threatening tourism and reducing revenues for schools and townships.

True forest protection requires the use of scientific forest management, a concept that President Bush has wholeheartedly embraced through his Healthy Forests Initiative.

During the 1990’s, we saw the Clinton Administration throw forest management out the window. Our decades-long commitment to managing natural resources was replaced by bureaucratic gridlock, red tape and restrictions on public lands for recreation, hunting and responsible resource management.

While this approach might have kept urban environmentalists happy, it had no basis in scientific fact or on-the-ground reality. This misguided approach to forest management placed control over our forests in the hands of Washington bureaucrats and judges, most of whom have never visited our national forests or met the people affected by their decisions.

The result of Clinton’s experiment in land management can be seen today. More than 21 million acres of public forest have burned in 328,000 wildfires since 2000. Two-thirds of the trees in our national forests are deteriorating. The spread of disease and insect infestation threatens to destroy whole regions of Eastern forests. Clinton’s policies were a miserable failure, and our nation’s forests have been paying the price.

Soon after taking office, President Bush worked with Congress to implement the Healthy Forests Initiative, which returns science, local input and common sense to the process of managing public lands. Using the tools provided by the Initiative, forestry officials have made significant progress toward thinning high-fuel areas at risk of wildfire, undertaking reforestation projects, treating disease and insect infestation and engaging in salvage activities following natural disasters.

As a result, hundreds of thousands of acres of national forests will be less prone to devastating wildfires, disease, decay and environmental degradation. The Healthy Forest Initiative has been one of the most significant environmental accomplishments since passage of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts.

Despite these positive changes, significant roadblocks remain before we can restore forests to a healthy condition. Half of Pennsylvania’s forests have a regeneration problem, according to forestry experts. Ironically, the roadblock that prevents the Forest Service from addressing this and other forest health issues are self-proclaimed environmentalists, most of whom have no academic credentials or field experience.

These activists have hijacked the forest management process through costly lawsuits and time-consuming appeals. Rather than let the Forest Service do its job to protect our forests, these activists continue to exploit our legal system in order to change the mission of the Allegheny National Forest from a multiple-use forest into a

(Continued on page 4)
Bogus Claims (continued)

wilderness with a "no trespassing" sign posted at the gate.

The U.S. Forest Service has close to 100 years of experience managing healthy forests based on hands-on expertise of foresters, ecologists, fish and wildlife biologists, soil scientists and other professionals. They conduct rigorous environmental reviews, follow strict legal guidelines and conduct a public process with public input before making forest management decisions. They are the experts.

In their zeal to separate the trees from the people, the Allegheny Defense Project recently filed a lawsuit to prevent the salvage of thousands of trees that have been rotting on the ground since last summer’s severe windstorms in northwest Pennsylvania. These activists would rather leave trees on the ground to breed insects, spread disease and even catch fire rather than let them be removed. Until the public, media and courts reject this extreme ideology, our forests will continue to deteriorate and communities to suffer.

Fighting for Local Control

The following piece was an Editorial in the New York Times which appeared 12/2/04. It aptly applies to Pennsylvania as well, where the ACRE proposal being floated in Harrisburg would set up a centralized review panel and strip away democratic authority from local governments. Big Pigs wish list doesn’t include your rights. Read, be aware and get on the phone to your local elected officials.

FIGHTING FOR LOCAL CONTROL

Given the results of the election, voters' power should be strong and healthy in rural America. Perhaps it is when it comes to voting for statewide and national offices, but not when it comes to local environmental issues - especially concerning factory farms. The latest example is Minnesota. Unlike Iowa and Wisconsin, Minnesota still retains the principle of control at the township level. Local residents can, for instance, decide whether they want a large-scale hog-confinement operation next door. That has kept Minnesota relatively free of the mammoth factory farms that have polluted Iowa.

But last year Gov. Tim Pawlenty convened a 14-member advisory group - a virtual cross section of industrial agriculture in the state - to find ways to increase the number of livestock in Minnesota. The task force released its report last June. Its principal recommendation is to weaken local control in order to remedy what the report calls "the lack of predictability and uniformity" in the creation of factory farms.

The report also advises exploring the possibility of raising the number of animals allowed on such farms before environmental reviews kick in and moving the approval process to the state capital. And it attacks Minnesota's Corporate Farm Law, which prohibits corporate farming.

The report has caused an uproar, for good reason. It's a blueprint for the destruction of family farms in Minnesota. The way to aid animal agriculture isn't to sell out to corporate interests or make rural residents feel powerless. It's to increase the diversity of Minnesota farming, build new markets and preserve rural life. Massive feedlots and hog-confinement operations do none of that.

This report is the result of a one-sided task force, whose advice was assembled without consulting a wide range of Minnesota farmers. It fosters one-sided agriculture, driven only by corporate interests. The concentration and homogenization of animal agriculture, which ultimately depends on under-priced grain, has been a social and environmental disaster in the Upper Midwest. The evidence isn’t hard to find. All Governor Pawlenty needs to do is take a drive through central Iowa, where corporate factory farms are a blight on the land.
Green Lining (continued)

these measures unify Americans. It's hard to be against new parks and trails, or to disagree with wanting to protect farms and forests from development. What's more, voters have learned that these measures often provide local solutions to water-quality problems: preserving natural lands in watersheds can help protect drinking water sources or reduce storm-water runoff.

It helps that success is contagious. For example, more than a decade ago, New Jersey created a program to provide extra money to local communities that had approved measures to raise money for local conservation programs. The program has enjoyed sustained support from Republican and Democratic legislators and governors. Now, every county in New Jersey has a program to finance land conservation, along with more than 200 of the state's cities, townships and boroughs.

True, this year's election didn't turn on environmental issues. But the voters sent a message anyway: whether we're red or blue, we all have a little green in us.

Lewisburg River Walk

The Lewisburg River Walk, a nature trail created over a decade ago through the efforts of Sierra Club member Betty Black, borders the Susquehanna River in the Borough of Lewisburg. This half-mile path is popular with Lewisburg residents. During the spring, it's a good location to see a variety of ephemeral wild flowers and watch for migrating waterfowl.

Earlier this year several fallen trees blocked the path and recent flooding covered portions with debris. On Saturday, November 14, a group of Sierra Club people removed the log and flood debris. Thanks to the work of Joe Detely, Jack Miller, Roy Fontaine, Debby Meade, and Dave Hafer, the path is now open for walking. In the near future, trail markers will be placed along the path and a new map installed at the trail head post.

The river walk is located just off Saint George and S. Front Street, Lewisburg. For more information or if you want to volunteer for trail maintenance, contact Dave Hafer at 570.523.3107 or write PO Box 65, Lewisburg, PA 17837.

With Friends Like These

By Ed Lawrence

Food Label Fraud,
The Marketing of Misinformation

Seeing the seal "Earth Friendly, Farm Friendly" on products at the grocery store would be a good indicator that the food was sustainable produced, right? WRONG! The Union Of Concerned Scientists (UCS) warns that consumers wanting to support sustainable agriculture should AVOID products bearing this seal, which was created by the Center for Global Food Issues. This offshoot of the Hudson Institute - a right wing think tank funded by corporate agribusiness, chemical and pesticide manufacturers, the biotechnology industry, and others - OPPOSES organic farming and efforts to reduce the use of medically important antibiotics in farm animals, while supporting the spread of Factory Farms. Another misleading food label is the United egg producers' "Animal Care Certified" which falsely implies that the animals have been treated humanely.

However, some certification labels ARE trustworthy, and deserve support. The "USDA ORGANIC" seal, which agribusiness interests have tried to weaken, holds foods to a rigorous standard of production and independent certification. Other trustworthy labels include TransFair USA's "Fair Trade Certified", the Northeast Organic Farming Association's "Certified Organic", and the Humane Farm Animal Care Certification Program's "Certified Humane Raised and Handled".

Learn more about the organizations behind the labels at the Consumers Union Guide to Environmental Labels at www.eco-labels.org. Learn more about the Union Of Concerned Scientists at www.ucsusa.org.

Take Action! Urge Congress to Make Clean Water a Priority

For over 30 years, the Clean Water Act has provided critical protections for our nation's waters, including streams, lakes, wetlands, beaches and other waters we depend on to provide safe drinking water, for recreational purposes, and for crop irrigation and other commercial uses. The importance of restoring and maintaining the quality of our nation's waters is vitally important, both to our environment and our economy, yet the Bush administration continues its agenda to dismantle the Clean Water Act. Visit Earth Justice's Website http://www.earthjustice.org/action/ and lend your support today!
Why Shopping Wal-Mart May Not Be Very Patriotic! By Nicole Faraguna

Next time you want to shop at Wal-Mart, you might want to consult your conscience. At what price are you willing to get cheap merchandise? Wal-Mart’s objective, in this capitalist society, of course, is to make money. . . No matter who they hurt and it seems it is Americans that are hurting the most.

The formula for Wal-Mart’s success is under-pricing the competition, a simple strategy that Sam Walton, the conglomerate’s founder, utilized in his first dime store in Arkansas. He realized that Americans wanted cheap merchandise . . . and as Wal-Mart grew bigger and bigger, he would make sure that his stores offered the cheapest prices, no matter the “cost”.

The cost these days refer to the loss of good-paying jobs, reckless land development, larger trade deficits and of course the exploitation of Wal-Mart’s very own work force.

In the news recently, we have read the stories of pending lawsuits against the large chain for not paying appropriate overtime pay, sexual discrimination, denying its work force a viable health care plan, and even using contractors that hire illegal immigrant workers. Wal-Mart likes to believe that they have a moral conscience. . . After all, they have banned certain books and videos from its shelves because it was thought they were not appropriate. But Wal-Mart doesn’t seem to have a problem with mistreating its workers.

Wal-Mart employees are paid very low salaries and various lawsuits have been filed for discrimination on the part of female workers who do not receive comparable salaries as their male counterparts. Over 1 million current and former female employees have signed on to the lawsuit. Wal-Mart employees do not have the luxury of good health benefits either. . . the cost to participate in the company’s health care plan is too expensive for most employees who are already living on meager salaries. It has been reported that Wal-Mart’s management personnel will recommend state assisted health care to new employees. This way Wal-Mart isn’t paying for employees’ healthcare . . . we are.

Wal-Mart employees have also been forced to work overtime without pay resulting in one of the largest class action lawsuits in history. Among the claims of direct violation of overtime laws, Wal-Mart has been accused of purposely understaffing stores to lower overhead costs.

According to the Law firm of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP, who along with co-counsel represent the plaintiffs, the suit specifically include the following allegations that Wal-Mart: “understaffs its stores and pressures employees to complete assignments while refusing to permit employees to stay on-the-clock for the time it takes to accomplish them; denies pay for time worked off-the-clock, through meal or rest breaks, and overtime; and keeps employees locked in Wal-Mart stores after closing and requires that they remain there after clocking out until store managers have visited every department.” (source: http://www.lieffcabraser.com/wal-mart.htm)

Wal-Mart has consistently kept employees from unionizing. “In fact, in February of 2000, a dozen meat cutters in the Jacksonville, Texas, Wal-Mart voted for representation by UFCW Local 540. By July of that year, the company had abruptly replaced fresh meat with pre-packaged products in all of its stores, neatly eliminating the need for skilled meat cutters and rendering the election moot. The company was reportedly proud of its novel ‘union avoidance strategy.’” A few years later, Wal-Mart was forced by the National Labor Relations Board to restore the department. (source: http://www.laborresearch.org/story.php?id=310)

It’s hard to believe that anyone would want Wal-Mart as a neighbor after learning how the jobs created are so poor quality and taxpayers may end up even subsidizing employee health care. . . but it gets worse. When Wal-Mart comes to town, the whole community suffers. To begin with, Wal-Mart stores are consuming large portions of our farm fields across America. There “Big Box” mentality has taken its toll on land preservation initiatives, and those communities trying to be land use conscious have found it difficult to fight off the huge corporation. Sprawl activists claim that Wal-Mart and their Big Box counterparts often times don’t even plan on moving in permanently. According to Sprawlbusters.com, Wal-Mart has abandoned many sites in the vision of building even bigger facilities, and their gluttonous desire for more and more space has actually left nearly 20 million square feet of empty stores on the market at one time. (Source: http://www.sprawl-busters.com/caseagainstsprawl.html)

Wal-Mart has also managed to destroy Downtown America. Through buying in large bulk, utilizing cheap labor, and importing from overseas, small local businesses have found it impossible to compete with Wal-Mart’s low, low prices. Even large nationwide stores like K-Mart and Sears have felt the pressure (The two companies recently announced a merger).

Professor Nelson Lichtenstein, recently interviewed by PBS Frontline in the documentary Is Wal-Mart Good for America?, explains how Wal-Mart actually now controls the manufacturers. . . in not only what they produce, but more importantly, for what price. Wal-Mart uses a reverse auc-
tioning process where manufacturing representatives must underbid the unit price of their product to compete with other manufacturers for shelf space in the stores. According to Frontline, Wal-Mart has even encouraged manufacturers to find cheaper forms of labor (e.g., transporting operations overseas) to ensure that they are selling the product at the cheapest price.

Sadly, one of the largest casualties of the Wal-Mart success story has been American jobs. When Wal-Mart discovered importing goods from overseas meant lower prices, they became obsessed with the cheapest labor they could find. This has created an unholy alliance of sorts between Wal-Mart and China, a country that had only relatively recently been allowed to trade with the U.S. and lacks any environmental or labor quality standards. Wal-Mart, alone, imports $15 billion of goods from China, each year, making it reportedly the third largest trading partner. (Source: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/walmart/etc/script.html)

What does this mean for America? Well, Americans can buy all the cheap junk they want. But American companies that make the same type of products have found they can’t compete and must close their onshore operations and find cheaper labor. Good paying jobs with competitive wages and benefits are leaving and going overseas. More and more Americans are becoming unemployed and soon the question will be asked: who in America will be able to afford even Wal-Mart’s cheap stuff???

America doesn’t seem to make goods anymore. We rely on the cheap labor overseas to do that for us. According to Frontline, one California Shipping port imports $36 billion worth of goods while exporting $3 billion of raw materials.

Wal-Mart wants consumers to believe that they are selling the cheapest goods (by selling our nation out) because it is good for us. But be clear, Wal-Mart does not care about our livelihood. Isn’t that apparent by the way they treat their employees or how they have forced manufacturers to close U.S. factories down. In fact, when one American company sued China for dumping cheap goods into the American market and making it impossible to economically compete, Wal-Mart got on the side of the Chinese. Fortunately, the courts ruled in favor of the American company.

Perhaps the winds of reason are slowly making a difference. The chain has found more and more resistance nationwide, and in California it was the subject of local ballot initiatives, in attempts to make the company more accountable. With Wal-Mart the largest employer in Pennsylvania, it is hard to believe that some communities still have the will to fight. But three proposed Wal-Marts in the state have been stopped indefinitely. All of them in Lancaster County and mainly due to the great organizational efforts of Communities First, a grassroots organization founded by residents of Lancaster County to fight off the coming of Wal-Mart.

Wal-Mart has become as un-American as communism and tyranny. They have bedded down with a Communist nation fighting against the rights of Americans to pursue the American Dream. This isn’t capitalism. This is war and our nation’s future is at stake. We must start holding Wal-Mart (and other companies like it) accountable and we must start now.

State and local governments must recognize the need for competition to ensure quality products in their area. This means eliminating any types of taxpayer subsidies and ensuring that Wal-Mart complies to all labor, environmental and zoning regulations. The federal government needs to take a good hard look at what the inequality of trade has done to our global environment, our economy and our lives.

Personally, each of you must reflect on what Wal-Mart means to you. Is buying a cheap DVD player justified the careless exportation of jobs, the exploitation of foreign workers, the global assault on the environment and the regression of America into a third world country? Wal-Mart isn’t the only evil store in our neighborhoods, but it is one of the most visible examples of how greed and power, in this capitalist society of ours, can prove so unyieldingly detrimental. After all, capitalism without conscience is not the ideal of a free and democratic society. Like any venture based on personal gain, it will always concentrate its benefits into the hands of the few while exploiting the many.

### The 10 sins of retail sprawl

- It destroys the economic and environmental value of land
- It encourages an inefficient land-use pattern that is very expensive to serve.
- It fosters redundant competition between local governments, an economic war of tax incentives.
- It forces costly infrastructure development at the edge of towns.
- It causes disinvestment from established core commercial areas.
- It requires the use of public tax support for revitalizing rundown core areas.
- It degrades the visual, aesthetic character of local communities.
- It lowers the value of other commercial and residential property, reducing public revenues.
- It weakens the sense of place and community cohesiveness.
- It masquerades as a form of economic development.
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