



### Our Mission

The Boundary Peace Initiative represents a growing number of area residents of diverse backgrounds brought together over the 2002 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.

BPI web site: [www.boundarypeace.20m.com](http://www.boundarypeace.20m.com)

**Boundary Peace Initiative meets on the 2nd & 4th Thursday @ 4 pm for now at Laura's; info call 250 442- 0434.**

### To Do

Young Women's (15-35) Peace Leadership Camp; Aug. 24-28  
Nelson, BC is co-sponsored by Canadian Voice of Women for Peace. For info: call Madelyn MacKay 250-505-4122 or email [peacecampnelson@gmail.com](mailto:peacecampnelson@gmail.com)

\Watch for the times and venues for Hiroshima Day on Aug. 6<sup>th</sup> in Castlegar & Nagasaki Day on Aug. 9<sup>th</sup> in Grand Fork to commemorate all victims of the nuclear industry.

### We Need the Dissolution of NATO – It Has No Mission

By: Karina Boeckmann

BERLIN, Jun 2, 2014 (IPS) - Since the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the United States has developed from a super power into a hyper power, says **Subrata Ghoshroy**, researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). This development has far reaching negative consequences in terms of global security – continual promotion of the international arms race as well as persistent devaluation of diplomacy and international law.

As one of the key speakers at a symposium on 'Science between War and Peace' held in Berlin from May 16 to 18 one hundred years after the outbreak of the First World War, Ghoshroy highlighted the militarisation and utilisation of research for war purposes in the United States. The Berlin symposium was organised by 'Network 1914-2014', an alliance of peace groups including the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA) and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW).

In an interview with IPS, Ghoshroy, an engineer of Indian descent, describes how sophisticated weapon systems are being used as dominant instruments of U.S. foreign policy. Ghoshroy himself had worked in the field of high-energy laser before he turned defence analyst and whistleblower against faked 'Star Wars' missile defence tests by U.S. government contractors. At MIT, a private research university in the U.S. city of Cambridge, he directs a project to promote nuclear stability in South Asia.

**IPS:** We are experiencing ongoing militarization and the use of research

(Continued next column)

(From last column) **Dissolution of NATO** for military purposes. Are peace scientists like you an endangered species?

**Ghoshroy:** Yes, and very much so, unfortunately. The term 'peace scientist' really doesn't exist in the United States.

It's more in a German context that you have these terms such as 'Friedensforschung'. There are individual scientists who are opposed to war. They express themselves. But there is really no discipline. So, individuals do things their own way. And of course there are scientists all over the United States with the heritage of the Manhattan Project, the U.S.-led research and development project that produced the first atomic bombs in the 1940s. All these scientists from top universities worked there, they came back and became very much against the bomb. And there is some legacy of them still lingering in U.S. departments, particularly in physics departments where more people have become more anti-war and openly speak if not write about the problems of military research – but very few. "The collapse of one super power, the Soviet Union, marked the beginning of the United States as a hyper power. Blind faith in technology fuelled unilateralism" – Subrata Ghoshroy.

**IPS:** How much of U.S. academic research is sponsored by the Defence Department and how much is being invested annually?

**Ghoshroy:** In the United States, the Defence Department spends together about three billion dollars annually in universities. In certain disciplines— in physical sciences, in engineering, materials

(Continued page 2)

(From page 1) **Dissolution of NATO**

engineering, aerospace, mechanical engineering, physics, chemistry and computer science – the support from the military is absolutely crucial and dominating. So, if you look at numbers in electro-engineering, 72 percent of all research at U.S. universities is funded by the military, and in mechanical engineering maybe 60 percent and in computer science maybe 55 percent.

**IPS:** There is a long history of using academic research for military purposes. How has it developed since the end of the Cold War and 9/11 (the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States)?

**Ghoshroy:** The real collaboration between science and the military started with the Manhattan Project (a research and development project that produced the first atomic bombs during the Second World War II. That was the beginning. And then, after the war ended in 1945, this military had already established laboratories in different universities like MIT and other schools. So, they wanted to see how they could continue this relationship after the war and they came up with this plan that the military would invest massively and it would be very easy politically to support spending on science if it was done through the military. Public support for the military was very strong after the defeat of fascism. The Second World War was a tremendous thing for the Americans. So they wanted to keep doing it and found a way for all science to be done through the military and then they would get support in Congress for this. As the Cold War developed, the new rationale was science and technology to give the United States the upper hand against the Soviet Union. I believe that this paradigm that started after the end of the Second World War and continued throughout the Cold War has been maintained in all the years since the collapse of the Soviet Union. But there is no big enemy, no enemy that we need so much money for our military to defeat. Russia spends so little money compared with the United States or China, also although it's coming up. But regardless, all this spending on weapons is primarily coming from the United States. The universities, the military and its contractors, they all act together to promote science and science for weapons.

**IPS:** And since the beginning of the so called war against terrorism?

**Ghoshroy:** After 9/11, the public was completely terrified, so it gave the government tremendous power to do anything and, yes, it gave the military and universities money for everyone who wanted to go into research to support the so-called war on terrorism.

(Continued next column)

(From last column) **Dissolution of NATO**

I would not say that the money has increased so much for research. Money has increased for other things like homeland security. But it certainly has given them another opportunity to support and boost science to fight this new enemy.

**IPS:** You have said that since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States super power has turned into a hyper power. What have been the consequences?

**Ghoshroy:** Well, first of all, they are really blinded by this position that they have now. Nobody can do any check and balance on their actions. When I was in Congress, when we discussed foreign policy in meetings of the staff in Congress to advise members, there were no counter arguments against what they were doing. They would say “we will prevail, eventually; there are some people making noises, but that doesn't matter, we will prevail.” This is very dangerous. This vision of America – being a force for and doing good in the world – is really believed by the people and policy makers. But in many instances, or actually most instances, they are certainly doing the opposite. They don't understand different cultures, the peculiarities of different societies and civilizations, so they see everything in this American way. “Our democracy, our form of democracy, is the right one” even though there are other civilizations that have lived for thousands of years. The collapse of one super power, the Soviet Union, marked the beginning of the United States as a hyper power. Blind faith in technology fuelled unilateralism, variously termed as humanitarian, pre-emptive and regime change interventions. This hyper power is totally defying the United Nations, it is totally against everything. That has led to lawlessness in and out of the country. “We don't like the government in Iraq. So let's go change it.” But, I am optimistic that the post-Cold War order may be coming to an end.

**IPS:** Are we experiencing a devaluation of diplomacy?

**Ghoshroy:** Definitely. U.S. foreign policy always talks about diplomacy. But American diplomacy means that you speak softly but carry a big stick. This is how they operate.

(Continued page 3)

## (From page 2) **Dissolution of NATO**

So the big stick is always there. Diplomacy is about give and take. U.S. policy is not diplomacy in that way. Yes, they have their diplomats who sit down across the table with the people of Iran or wherever. But the moment that their plan is not accepted, diplomacy is over. They will bomb. So they don't care about diplomacy in the original sense of the term where you negotiate for a peaceful solution of give and take. Either, it's my way or the highway.

**IPS:** Is the economic downturn a chance to counter the trend of militarisation and reduce military expenditure?

**Ghoshroy:** It does offer an opportunity, but it's a very hard uphill battle. Cutting a military budget is very difficult in the United States because military contractors are very tied to politicians, no matter whether they are Republicans or Democrats. All these people and their election campaigns receive funds from the military contractors like Lockheed and Boeing and the others all have strong lobbyists in Washington. All sides are benefitting.

**IPS:** What are the chances of winning the war against wars?

**Ghoshroy:** It's a slow process. In the United State there is a lack of political consciousness. The country is isolated. And in the media you read what is being propagated by the establishment. In Viet Nam, the public reacted against the war when thousands of their beloved ones came back in body bags. In wars such as in Iraq and Afghanistan the number of victims is relatively low. Further, journalists were not allowed to photograph the returning dead. And there is another big difference. The people being killed are not middle class people who can influence the system. Yet, people are turning against these wars, although it is not moral but economic reasons that are the decisive factors.

**IPS:** European members of NATO rarely criticise the United States for its unilateral warfare. Do you have any advice for them?

**Ghoshroy:** I have been saying in many meetings that it would be so fantastic if European countries like Germany that suffered and inflicted so much pain on other countries in the world were to be the ones to take the initiative to stand up against the United States in terms of what they want to do with NATO. First of all, we need its dissolution. It should have been dissolved when the Warsaw Pact was dissolved. It has no mission. And I think stopping warmongering in Europe would be a further important first step for world peace.

## **Book & Film Recommendations**



### **Books**

#### **Tragedy in the Commons: Former Members of Parliament Speak Out About Canada's Failing Democracy**

By [Alison Loat](#) (Author), [Michael MacMillan](#) (Author)

**Publisher:** Random House Canada © April 15 2014

In *Tragedy in the Commons*, the authors, founders of the non-partisan think tank Samara, draw on an astonishing eighty exit interviews with former Members of Parliament from across the political spectrum to unearth surprising observations about the practice of politics in Canada.

Though Canada is at the top of international rankings of democracies, Canadians themselves increasingly don't see politics as a way to solve society's problems. Small wonder. In the news, they see grandstanding in the House of Commons and MPs pursuing agendas that don't always make sense to the people who elected them.

How did one of the world's most functional democracies go so very wrong?

In *Tragedy in the Commons*, MPs describe arriving at their political careers almost by accident; few say they aspired to be in politics before it "happened" to them. In addition, almost without fail, each MP describes the tremendous influence of their political party: from the manipulation of the nomination process to enforced voting in the House and in committees, the unseen hand of the party dominates every aspect of the MP's existence.

Loat and MacMillan ask: Just what do we want Members of Parliament to be doing? To whom are they accountable? And should parties be trusted with the enormous power they wield with such little oversight or citizen involvement?

With unprecedented access to the perspective and experience of Canada's public leaders, *Tragedy in the Commons* concludes by offering solutions for improving the way politics works in Canada, and how all Canadians can reinvigorate a democracy that has lost its way, its purpose and the support of the public it is meant to serve.

**Ed. Note:** If you have read a book or seen a film that you feel is of interest or informative please let us know. Email the name of the book, the author and the publisher with a brief explanation of the book, and for the film the name, the producer and a brief explanation of the contents to Laura at [l4peace@telus.net](mailto:l4peace@telus.net). Thank you.

## Paying for the Climate Change Pivot

By Emily Schwartz Greco and John Feffer from Truth Out  
April 27, 2014

We only have a few decades to deal with climate change. If humanity fails to cut back dramatically on carbon emissions by 2050, according to an alarming new UN report, our planet may warm past the point of our ability to fix the problem.

Given global dependence on oil, gas, and coal, weaning every economy from fossil fuels to save Mother Earth won't come easy or cheap. Fortunately, there's a big pot of money available to avert a climate catastrophe.

Accessing that money, however, requires cutting back on a different set of pollutants — the huge cache of weapons the world continues to produce.

Europe has trimmed its military spending and the Pentagon budget is leveling off. Yet other regions are burning through more cash to wage or gear up for war than they used to.

Military outlays are rising the most in Africa and the Middle East. And Asia surpassed Europe last year for the first time in terms of overall military spending.

The United States still faces no competition for its distinction as the world's military spending champion. The Pentagon's \$640 billion tab amounted to more than a third of the \$1.75 trillion in global military spending the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute itemized for 2013.

What does worldwide military excess have to do with today's reliance on fossil fuels? Instead of investing in ways to slow global warming and adapt to a changing climate, too many nations are pouring money into weapons in an ongoing fight over the dwindling resources we haven't quite used up yet.

There's still time to pivot in a new direction. One big step governments, industries, and investors must take is to quadruple the money they're pumping into sustainable alternatives to oil, gas, and coal.

Those investments now total about \$250 billion a year. While that may sound like a lot of solar panels and wind turbines, the United Nations says it's not enough. It will take a "clean trillion" every year between now and 2050 keep the world livable, the International Energy Agency estimates.

Yes, the private sector needs to play a role in building a fossil-free global economy. So do governments, which possess the power to tax carbon-intensive energy. That's certainly one good way to generate revenue for meeting the climate challenge while creating incentives to increase efficiency.

But world leaders can't really fight climate change unless they slash military spending. (Continued next column)

## (From last column) Climate Change Pivot

As climate writer and activist Bill McKibben says, do the math. Just shrinking the global military-industrial complex by 25 percent would free up \$437.5 billion a year. Given the security challenges climate change poses, this makes perfect sense.

The head of the U.S. fleet in the Pacific has identified climate change as the biggest threat facing the region. The Pentagon is devoting considerable resources to studying rising temperatures as "threat multipliers" bound to stoke competition for resources, make humanitarian disasters more common, and increase political instability.

Battleships and fighter jets can't defeat the threat of a melting ice cap or rising sea levels. It will take mountains of money to reduce our carbon emissions while maintaining a modern economy.

It may help to think about climate change as "getting embroiled in a war that lasts 100 years" without any obvious exit strategies, as retired Brigadier General Chris King puts it.

"You can see in military history, when they don't have fixed durations, that's when you're most likely to not win," warns King, the dean of academics at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Unless every nation ramps down military spending, we'll all lose the next big war over the fate of the Earth without even firing a shot.

*John Feffer is co-director of Foreign Policy In Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies. Emily Schwartz Greco is the managing editor of OtherWords, the Institute of Policy Studies' national non-profit editorial service.*

Whenever you are confronted with an opponent.  
Conquer him with love."

Mahatma Gandhi

Peace comes from within. Do not seek it without.

Gautama Buddha

Those who stand for nothing fall for anything.

Alexander Hamilton

The Boundary Peace Initiative (BPI) welcomes articles. All articles are the responsibility of the author and may not be common consensus. To submit an article, contact **Laura** at **250-442-0434** or **L4peace@telus.net**. The BPI is a member of: BC Southern Interior Peace Coalition, Abolition 2000, Lawyers Against the War, an affiliate of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and works with various local and global peace, social justice and environmental groups.

Voice your opinion to the Prime Minister and all MPs. Free postage: {Name of MP}, Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0A6  
Go to the Government of Canada website for emails of all MPs, Ministers at <http://www.canada.gc.ca>