



Vol. 11: No. 99: Jan. 01, 2012

Save a tree,
share
a copy

Our Mission

The Boundary Peace Initiative represents a growing number of area residents of diverse backgrounds brought together over the Iraqi crisis. We support multilateral action for non-violent conflict resolution, human rights, ecological integrity for the planet and international law, through education and dialogue locally and globally. We encourage everyone's participation as we strive for peace and justice to build a better world for future generations.

The Boundary Peace Initiative meets: 2nd & 4th Thursday @ 7 pm. in Selkirk College

To Do

No Peace events are planned for January, but keep your ears open as things develop concerning the Middle East and other areas of concern.

Did you know that from Jan. 1st to 3rd that Canadian CEOs (the 1%) earned at least \$44,000.00 each while the majority of the 99% earned about \$150.00? This comes from the Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives.

Don't Attack Iran!

By: Canadian Peace Alliance: Nov.10, 2011
Israeli President [Simon Peres](#) recently stated that an attack on Iran is becoming more likely. There have also been a series of moves by the [United States](#), [Israel](#) and [other NATO countries](#) that signal preparations for a possible attack or severe sanctions against Iran similar to those used against Iraq in the lead-up to Anglo-American invasion of 2003.

The [International Atomic Energy Agency \(IAEA\) report](#) released this week contains very little new information and still does not draw the conclusion that Iran is building a nuclear weapon. The report cites a series of tests that may be used for civilian or military purposes but doesn't point to any proof of the existence of a nuclear weapons program. It is instead a collection of unverified intelligence reports from "member states".

Regardless of the findings in the report, any use of military force against nuclear installations in Iran will be dangerous and illegal under international law and must therefore be opposed.

Protocol 1 of the Geneva Convention states that no country can attack a nuclear facility or any other target if, "if such attack may cause the release of dangerous forces and consequent severe losses among the civilian population." An attack on a nuclear facility will cause massive damage to the local environment and to the civilian population in the vicinity. A nuclear attack would cause untold civilian deaths.

The process that led to the US invasion and occupation of Iraq is very similar to the current situation with Iran. Without the support of the international community and in clear violation of international law, the US invaded and

(Continued next column)

Don't Attack Iran!

occupied Iraq ostensibly based on the same motivation about the threat of weapons of mass destruction. The fact that no weapons were ever found in Iraq and the proof that the evidence of such a program in Iraq was deliberately falsified renders the US accusations against Iran extremely questionable.

An attack on Iran would not be an effective way to stop or reverse nuclear armament in the Middle East. Israel has already built an arsenal of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, and unlike Iran, is neither a member of IAEA nor a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is the position of the CPA that nuclear proliferation will continue as long as those states, which currently have nuclear weapons, including the US, refuse to comply with their international treaty obligation to disarm their own arsenals. For this reason, the CPA believes that the call for a nuclear-weapons-free middle east, would be a useful first step towards global nuclear disarmament. This call has been part of the negotiations under the NPT since 1995.

The CPA therefore calls on the Government of Canada to oppose any military action against Iran and to condemn the escalating rhetoric and calls on our member groups to prepare for demonstrations and local events to stop the drive towards war with Iran.

A Farewell to Nuclear Arms

By: Mikhail Gorbachev Oct. 9, 2011

MOSCOW – Twenty-five years ago this month, I sat across from Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik, Iceland to negotiate a deal that would have reduced, and could have ultimately eliminated by 2000, the fearsome arsenals of nuclear weapons held by the United States and the Soviet Union.

For all our differences, Reagan and I shared the strong conviction that civilized countries should not make such barbaric weapons the linchpin of their security. Even though we failed to achieve our highest aspirations in Reykjavik, the summit was nonetheless, in the words of my former counterpart, “a major turning point in the quest for a safer and secure world.”

The next few years may well determine if our shared dream of ridding the world of nuclear weapons will ever be realized.

Critics present nuclear disarmament as unrealistic at best, and a risky utopian dream at worst. They point to the Cold War’s “long peace” as proof that nuclear deterrence is the only means of staving off a major war.

As someone who has commanded these weapons, I strongly disagree. Nuclear deterrence has always been a hard and brittle guarantor of peace. By failing to propose a compelling plan for nuclear disarmament, the US, Russia, and the remaining nuclear powers are promoting through inaction a future in which nuclear weapons will inevitably be used. That catastrophe must be forestalled.

As I, along with George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, Sam Nunn, and others, pointed out five years ago, nuclear deterrence becomes less reliable and more risky as the number of nuclear-armed states increases. Barring preemptive war (which has proven counterproductive) or effective sanctions (which have thus far proven insufficient), only sincere steps toward nuclear disarmament can furnish the mutual security needed to forge tough compromises on arms control and nonproliferation matters.

The trust and understanding built at Reykjavik paved the way for two historic treaties. The 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty destroyed the feared quick-strike missiles then threatening Europe’s peace. And, in 1991, the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) cut the bloated US and Soviet nuclear arsenals by 80% over a decade.

But prospects for progress on arms control and nonproliferation are darkening in the absence of a credible push for nuclear disarmament. I learned during those two long days in Reykjavik that disarmament talks could be as constructive as they are arduous. By linking an array of interrelated matters, Reagan and I built the trust and understanding needed to moderate a nuclear-arms race of which we had lost control.

In retrospect, the Cold War’s end heralded the coming of a messier arrangement of global power and persuasion. The nuclear powers should adhere to the requirements of the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty and resume “good faith” negotiations for disarmament. This would augment the diplomatic and moral capital available to diplomats as they strive to restrain nuclear proliferation in a world where more countries than ever have the wherewithal to construct a nuclear bomb.

Only a serious program of universal nuclear disarmament can provide the reassurance and the credibility needed to build a global consensus that nuclear deterrence is a dead doctrine. We can no longer afford, politically or financially, the discriminatory nature of the current system of nuclear “haves” and “have-nots.”

(Continued next column)

A Farewell to Nuclear Arms

Reykjavik proved that boldness is rewarded.

Conditions were far from favorable for a disarmament deal in 1986. Before I became Soviet leader in 1985, relations between the Cold War superpowers had hit rock bottom. Reagan and I were nonetheless able to create a reservoir of constructive spirit through constant outreach and face-to-face interaction.

What seem to be lacking today are leaders with the boldness and vision to build the trust needed to reintroduce nuclear disarmament as the centerpiece of a peaceful global order. Economic constraints and the Chernobyl disaster helped spur us to action. Why has the Great Recession and the disastrous meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan not elicited a similar response today?

A first step would be for the US finally to ratify the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). President Barack Obama has endorsed this treaty as a vital instrument to discourage proliferation and avert nuclear war. It’s time for Obama to make good on commitments he made in Prague in 2009, take up Reagan’s mantle as Great Communicator, and persuade the US Senate to formalize America’s adherence to the CTBT.

This would compel the remaining holdouts – China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, and Pakistan – to reconsider the CTBT as well. That would bring us closer to a global ban on nuclear tests in any environment – the atmosphere, undersea, in outer space, or underground.

A second necessary step is for the US and Russia to follow up on the New START agreement and begin deeper weapons cuts, especially tactical and reserve weapons, which serve no purpose, waste funds, and threaten security. This step must be related to limits on missile defense, one of the key issues that undermined the Reykjavik summit.

A fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT), long stalled in multilateral talks in Geneva, and a successful second Nuclear Security Summit next year in Seoul, will help secure dangerous nuclear materials. This will also require that the 2002 Global Partnership, dedicated to securing and eliminating all weapons of mass destruction – nuclear, chemical, and biological – is renewed and expanded when it convenes next year in the US.

Our world remains too militarized. In today’s economic climate, nuclear weapons have become loathsome money pits. If, as seems likely, economic troubles continue, the US, Russia, and other nuclear powers should seize the moment to launch multilateral arms reductions through new or existing channels such as the UN Conference on Disarmament. These deliberations would yield greater security for less money.

(Continued page 3)

A Farewell to Nuclear Arms

But the buildup of conventional military forces – driven in large part by the enormous military might deployed globally by the US – must be addressed as well. As we engage in furthering our Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) agreement, we should seriously consider reducing the burden of military budgets and forces globally.

US President John F. Kennedy once warned that “every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment.” For more than 50 years, humanity has warily eyed that lethal pendulum while statesmen debated how to mend its fraying cords. The example of Reykjavik should remind us that palliative measures are not enough. Our efforts 25 years ago can be vindicated only when the Bomb ends up beside the slave trader’s manacles and the Great War’s mustard gas in the museum of bygone savagery.

Mikhail Gorbachev, former President of the USSR, founded Green Cross International, the independent non-profit and nongovernmental organization working to address the interconnected global challenges of security, poverty eradication, and environmental degradation.

Atomic Deserts A Survey of the World's Radioactive No-Go Zones” Der Spiegel, 04/12/2011

Below is a list of places on the Earth that have been rendered uninhabitable by nuclear weapons and nuclear power:

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,756369-2,00.html>

1. Harrisburg Pennsylvania USA Three Mile Island reactor site.
2. Semipalatinsk (Semy), Kazakhstan Soviet missile testing grounds.
3. White Sands, New Mexico USA atomic testing site.
4. Pripyat, Ukraine, Chernobyl reactor site.
5. Asse, Germany radwaste storage site.
6. Nevada Proving site, Nevada USA atomic testing site.
7. Hanford site, Washington State, USA.
8. Hiroshima, Japan atomic bomb attack site.
9. Thar Desert, Rajasthan, India atomic testing site.
10. Morsleben, Saxony-Anhalt, Germany radwaste storage facility.
11. Windscale, now Sellafield, England decommissioned damaged reactor site.
12. Reggane district of Algeria, French atomic testing site.
13. Mururoa atoll, South Pacific, USA atomic testing ground.
14. Fangataufa atoll, South Pacific, USA atomic testing ground.
15. Enewetak Atoll, South Pacific, USA atomic testing ground.
16. Palomares region, Spain, crash site of American B-52 bomber loaded with hydrogen bombs.
17. Mayak plutonium plant in the southern Urals, 15 kilometers east of the Russian city of Kyshtym.

CPA Convention: October 14-16, 2011

By: Laura Savinkoff (installment #2)

Next up to the podium was a young Afghani woman from Toronto, Suriaia Rahar. She along with a group of Afghanis in the US, Canada and Afghanistan took on the task of creating a voice for Afghanis calling for the end to the occupation of their land, despite the fear of repression and oppression. Many have been silenced through imprisonment and physical attacks but we feel we must speak out, bring forward vital information on the actual situation on the ground as we call for peaceful resolution and sustainable development by our own hand, she stated. She continued: I am an Afghan. I do not support war now, in the past or the future. I want all foreign troops to leave my homeland now! [I spoke with Suriaia over the weekend and she explained that her family fears for her safety but she has a difficult time understanding why the majority of Afghani Canadians are so fearful of taking a stand against the occupation. Since her parents and their friends are of my generation I do understand their reluctance to be vocal and involved. My people, the Doukhobors, were severely punished and many silenced through the same types of repressive actions by Government with compliance by the surrounding communities, which led to many succumbing to the pressure of assimilation and a disconnect with the best of our culture and peace actions in order to protect our children. I reassured her that the peace movement as a whole does understand and will support these young people seeking a world of peace and justice.]

Derrick feels there is a need to ensure that Afghanis have a voice in the Canadian media, which to date has been sorely lacking, except for those who support the occupation for their own reasons. Through the peace movements networks we must help get the message out that the majority of Afghanis, in Afghanistan and the Diaspora do not support neither the war nor the continued occupation.

As for the growing Occupy movement we, as non-violent peace activists, must bring forward the information that the 99% fight wars on behalf of the 1% and connect the fact that these wars only create profit for the 1%, leading to an erosion of social programs, education, civil liberties and human rights both at home and abroad. There are no winners, except the 1%, from militarism and war. The elite use every possible means to convince us that there is a need for bigger and better equipment for the military, even using the Winnipeg Jets as an organ of propaganda—the logo for the Jets portrays a jet fighter and through that promotes militarism. It is not enough that Canada will be purchasing the F-35 Jet Fighters but now, with the support of all political parties, has contracted 39 new warships billed as a move towards job creation. As Judith stated the present increase in military spending has nothing to do with national security but everything to do with the War on Terror that sets up the scenario of a constant need for

(From page 3) CPA Convention

more military build ups and excuses invasions and occupations such as Afghanistan, Iraq and Libby.

The floor was opened up for questions. And there were many and as with most events such as this sadly, time was limited for a full and thorough discussion. (The answers to the questions will be a synopsis of the responses of the panel)

Q: The vote on the intervention in Libby was disappointing and even more so when the NDP supported it. What strategy can we develop to address Canadian military spending?

A: We cannot look to the politicians to change, so we must take the lead and return to basic principles of sustainable living by restructuring our lives so as not to exploit the resources of others. As for strategy, well, this can change as the focus of issues changes but the main principle of non-violent principled action must continue to be implemented.

Q: How can we create links among peace and social justice groups and keep up the momentum to address the broader issues?

A: We must get involved locally and internationally and connect the dots of the rise in militarism and poverty, job losses, erosion of human rights, etc. If most people had the choice they would not participate in jobs that aid and abet the military because they do not wish to support killing but we must inform them of the connection--war is not sustainable either at home or abroad. Canada, not just the Government, but we the people, need to decide if we are for war and empire or peace and once we do that then we will be able to change our domestic and foreign policy to reflect the will of the people. Every action, big or small, affects and inspires others and the Occupy Movement is the opportunity to expand, connect and network with broader and more representative collective. The CPA and the people of Canada need to assess the last decade, including the Afghan occupation and the erosion of civil liberties and human rights that has led to the Arab Spring and the Occupy movements and what our role has been and is in that movement.

The evening ended but the conversations had just begun and would continue over the next two days and hopefully would lead to more concrete and sustainable actions by all of our member groups.

(More next issue)

Resolutions to the CPA Convention 2011 2011-04. Reduce military spending, diverting its funding to social programs and human needs

Whereas the Government of Canada continues to increase funding to the Military and its supports, including recruitment;

And whereas the budgets for social programs are continually being cut;

And whereas cuts to social programs, to the human needs of families, children and seniors, their housing, education, nutrition and health care, affect Canadian safety and security in a much broader, real sense than any perceived military threat;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Canadian Peace Alliance urge the Government of Canada to make it a priority to reduce military expenditures and to divert the funding of military recruitment, facilities, equipment, etc., to good jobs, human needs and social programs.

Submitted by the B.C. Southern Interior Peace Coalition

We used to wonder where war lived, what it was that made it so vile. And now we realize that we know where it lives...inside ourselves.

Albert Camus

Peace cannot be kept by force. It can only be achieved by understanding.

Albert Einstein

The Boundary Peace Initiative (BPI) welcomes articles, which are the sole responsibility of the authors and may not be common consensus. To contribute please contact **Laura** at **250-442-0434** or **l4peace@telus.net**. The BPI is a member of: Southern Interior Peace Coalition, Canadian Peace Alliance, Abolition 2000, Lawyers Against the War, Uranium Free Kootenay Boundary, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace and an affiliate of the Fellowship of Reconciliation as well as other local and global groups.

Exercise your democratic rights:
Voice your opinion to the Prime Minister
Free postage: Prime Minister, Steven Harper, Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6
Phone: 613-992-4211 Fax: 613-941-6900
Email: pm@pm.gc.ca