

**Blase Bonpane on WORLD FOCUS,
David Hartsough and David Swanson
Aired on PACIFICA RADIO NETWORK by way of KPFK, Los Angeles**

November 24, 2013

Hello, this is Blase Bonpane with World Focus coming to you from KPFK/ Los Angeles. We are podcast and available 24/7 at kpfk.org where we are heard internationally.

Today I'm privileged to have two leaders in the international movement for justice and peace. And how do we know who are the leaders? Well, certainly not by purchased elections, rather by the fruits of their lives which produce a nonviolent peaceforce and a serious movement to end all war. So, today I want to introduce the elder, David Hartsough, and David is the Executive Director of [Peaceworkers](#) based in San Francisco and Co-Founder of [Nonviolent Peaceforce](#) which has a mission to promote, develop and implement unarmed civilian peacekeeping as a tool for reducing violence and protecting civilians in situations of violent conflict. David has been arrested for nonviolent action over a hundred times, most recently for protesting the build-up of war with Iran.

David Swanson is a long time activist, organizer, author and educator. His books include War Is A Lie (2010), When the World Outlawed War (2011), and The Military Industrial Complex at 50 (2012). His most recent book is entitled, "War No More: The Case for Abolition" (2013). David is the host of Talk Nation Radio and blogs at www.davidswanson.org and www.warisacrime.org. David also works as Campaign Coordinator for the online activist organization [Roots Action](#) and is on the communications committee of [Veterans For Peace](#). I want to say that Veterans for Peace, of which I'm a member, is dedicated to abolishing war. And also, David Swanson is currently Secretary of Peace in the [Green Shadow Cabinet](#).

Welcome to both of you and David Hartsough, as the elder, would you like to tell us something about ending all war? And this document, I must say David, has been read twice in its entirety on this program, following an interview with Oliver Stone where he expressed his thoughts on this matter, as well.

The listeners at this time should have this document memorized and we'll have a test on that on Monday morning but in the meantime, would you care to comment on ending all wars?

David H: Well, I think that the time has come to end all wars. The world is suffering from wars, 180 million people died in the last century, and 80-90% of the people dying in wars are now civilians, including children. We, in the United States, know the terrible cost of wars. All our cities, states, counties as well as the federal government, are making horrendous cuts to social programs that meet human and environmental needs, so we can fight these wars and have military bases around the world and develop more nuclear weapons. I think the immorality of war – I think wars are counter-productive. We've been spending trillions of dollars on militarism and wars and we're no safer than we were before.

Blase: David Swanson, we've been at war since 1945, uninterruptedly. We have been at constant war. How are we going to change this, David Swanson?

David S: Well, I think that's exactly right and a very important point that World War II has never really been ended. We've never demilitarized. We've never put the taxes or the war spending back where they were, never brought the troops home from Germany and Japan; in fact, been putting troops in new countries every couple of years, up to 177 or so now. I think the primary lever that we have is information, education. Primarily it's an issue of facts rather than ideology. People imagine that these wars do good to the world. They don't know that these are one-sided slaughters, that 95% or more of the deaths are on one side. They are almost entirely, what we would call, civilians, though there are problems with

making that distinction when you are bombing somebody's town or city. And they are children and elderly and women and men who have no animosity whatsoever for us until we start bombing them. So they are not benefitting the places where the wars are happening and they are making us less safe, not more safe. They are creating hostility. They are creating enemies. And they are not needed to protect us. As soon as you start talking about eliminating all warfare, getting rid of the institution rather than a particular war, 99% of Americans go back to World War II. They can't find a war to really justify this madness, this trillion dollars a year, outdoing the rest of the world put together. In the past seventy years, they have to go back to World War II and of course, if there were this danger that someone was going to attack the United States, why not cut 90% of the military? Why not have a hundred billion dollar military like other wealthy nations rather than a trillion dollars and continue with that fantasy? But there is not a crisis like World War II on the horizon. There can't be. This sort of colonialism and the imperialism is gone. You don't need to create such crises. With a fraction of what's spent on militarism we could make the United States the most beloved country on earth by providing people with food and medicine and water and energy and sustainable economies. And if there were to be some sort of crisis, we've learned over the past seventy-five years, that nonviolence is more effective than violence in dealing with it.

Blase: David Hartsough, I would like to ask you exactly, and I hate to talk about winning and losing – it's terrible, but I think we've lost every war since World War II. I don't know if you have any comments on that?

David H: Well, I think we have lost and the world has lost every war. I don't know how many millions of people have died but all of them have died in vain - the soldiers on both sides as well as the communities of people who have lived where those wars took place. As David Swanson was just saying, we keep fighting these wars one after another and all of them we end up less secure and, even on the face of it, in Korea we had two dictators and the 38th parallel was the line between it. And after several million people were killed and hundreds

of billions of dollars, we end up with two dictators – one in the North and one in the South and the borderline is the 38th parallel. So, what's the point? And what was the point in Vietnam? Not allowing the free elections to take place which were supposed to take place in 1956. Instead of fighting this war in which two to three million Vietnamese were killed and over 55,000 Americans, and much more than 55,000 American soldiers have committed suicide since then. What is the point of these wars?

Blase: There is no decent point, but David Swanson, fifty years ago I walked into my office in Denver, Colorado and the secretary told me that the President had been shot. Since that time we've had fifty years of scientific induction. I'm not talking about conspiracy. I'm talking about inductive thinking, the scientific method has told us for fifty years that "I have nothing to say but this was a military coup" and every President since that time has gotten the point. We have not had a President stand up to the military and the CIA since John Kennedy said he was going to break the CIA into a thousand pieces and what he did in Cuba was a victory for the Cuban people and a victory for us that we didn't massacre another group of innocents. There were children and he was concerned about them. And you know his nephew came out today with an article about John F. Kennedy's death, Robert Kennedy, Jr. Any thoughts?

David S: Well, I think what you've said is almost certainly the facts of the matter. I think Jim Douglas' book, "JFK and the Unspeakable" is a very good one. I think Oliver Stone's book is a good one. I think it is quite clear that this shadow has been hanging over the White House since that day. According to a report, the dean of the law school at Berkeley in California said that he was at a meeting of the Obama transition team where Obama explained that he would not be prosecuting the CIA for torture because he didn't want to be the next John Kennedy. Another credible report – a dinner where Obama publicly said to a group of people that he was not going to take on these sorts of powers in Washington because he didn't want to be anybody's Martin Luther King, Jr. So there is this fear that hangs over the elected government in Washington that there is a permanent government in the shadows in

Washington that controls it, not just economically, not just in terms of media and propaganda, but in terms of actual threats of violence and that has been devastating for half a century. And for that half a century, the war machine has paused, it has had glitches, it's had varying levels of public resistance which at times have proved quite effective and a little bit more would shut the thing down and that's what we need to do. But it hasn't quit and we continue with wars that are counter-productive on their own terms, that are disastrous for humanity and for our civil liberties and for the natural environment and they are losses in that win/lose column but they make certain people very, very wealthy, very, very powerful and give them an irrational sense of controlling the world that they live and breathe for.

Blase: Robert Kennedy, Jr. says in today's "Rolling Stone" that the close friend of JFK, Ben Bradley, was told that Kennedy wanted to keep the peace. He said, "That's what I want for my epitaph. I want it to say 'He kept the peace.'" And then he said, "I am almost a peace at any price President" and he meant that. He knew, as Franklin said, "There's no such thing as a good war or a bad peace."

David S: You know David Hartsough met with him.

Blase: Amen, David. What did you think about that?

David H: Well, I was with a small group that met with John Kennedy in May of 1962 and one of the things we were encouraging him to challenge the Soviets to a peace race. And he said, "I would like to do that. If you are serious about this, you need to go out and build a powerful movement to help enable me to do that." He told us that he had been reading "The Guns of August" and it was really scary to him how similar the situation then was to what it had been in 1914. Everyone was arming to the teeth to try to prevent war and ended up with a horrendous war. I've read Robert Kennedy's article and I've read Jim Douglas' book and I think it's very clear that both President Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev got scared stiff by the Cuban missile crisis. And they both, instead of being cold warriors, turned to

being peace warriors, and spent the rest of their lives trying to steer us away from nuclear conflagration and armed conflict. And Robert Kennedy, Jr. pointed out that President Kennedy went against all of his advisors, all his National Security advisors in not attacking Cuba and the Soviet Union during the Cuban missile crisis. The future things that came, the Berlin crisis, the question of Laos, of Vietnam, respecting nationalist movements in the third world, etc., and as Jim Douglas points out, this is the reason he was killed. This National Security establishment could not put up with this guy that was moving us away from this permanent war economy.

Blase: I think Douglas has an amazing case here. We see the Warsaw Pact nations involved here to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, to prevent their use in surprise attacks. Kennedy would not see the letter that Khrushchev sent to him. The last of his personal letters was taken away by the State Department and that's according to Robert Kennedy, Jr. They intercepted it and he never saw it and Khrushchev had already secretly proposed his own government radical reductions in the Soviet military including the conversion of missile plants for peaceful purposes. And after JFK's death, Kremlin war hawks Khrushchev's plan as treasonous proposal. So we had military industrial on both side. Khrushchev was very afraid of them and John Kennedy knew what their plans were.

David Swanson, how did you come across this concept of this document, this statement that all of you have made together about ending war?

David S: Well, I think we've looked at this history of the past fifty years or more, a little more than fifty since Eisenhower coined the phrase "military industrial complex" and it seemed that this problem is not going away. That, while public opinion is fluctuating and in some ways moving against war, and wars are being sold more often as "humanitarian" rather than defensive or aggressive. And we are seeing changes in war-making in response to particular demands so that we demand that wars not cost as much and they make wars cheaper with drones. We demand that US troops suffer less and they use robots that don't carry pilots

and so forth. But the war machine itself is not going away and, in fact, the deaths are not diminishing. The wars are not becoming less severe. Alleged declines in violence in many other areas for which there is great evidence in use of the death penalty and child abuse and violence in a whole array of areas of our lives – toward people and toward animals, may be declining but war isn't. It's dominated by the United States but we need a global movement to say no to it. And there has been analyses that have looked at all the contributing factors and what could possibly be causing war and most of them appear to us to be – at least to me – to be incredibly misguided. The factor that is contributing the most to war-making is the acceptance of war in US culture. The United States is providing more weapons than anyone else to dictatorships and democracies around the globe, is spending itself as much as everyone else on war, encouraging arms races in China and elsewhere. Getting rid of war in poor African countries would go little distance toward getting rid of war. Getting rid of war in the United States – the way that the United Kingdom got rid of slavery as the leading slave trader on the globe – would go an incredible distance toward getting rid of war.

Blase: Let's look at your document, "Ending All War: An Idea Whose Time Has Come for our Children and All Future Generations." This is by David Swanson and David Hartsough, with input from George Lakey, Jan Passion, Mike Ferner, Colleen Kelly, Ruth Benn, Leah Bolger, Nathan Schneider, Hakim, Paul Chappell, Colin Archer, Kathy Kelly, and many others. And their groups and individuals are quite serious about this. I believe that wars are fought by slaves.

What was I told when I joined the Marine Corps? "Keep your mouth shut. Follow orders. Do what you're told." That's how you speak to a slave and "besides that, if you don't follow orders we can kill you." Well, what kind of a pattern is that?

David H: Do the American people and do the people of the world want to live in slave states where the military is telling us we have to hate one another? We have to kill one another. We have to kill each other's children. My belief is if we really were able to help people think

that all wars are killing our children and that we're really one human family, these national borders are very artificial. I see us all as brothers and sisters. And when a very major proportion of people we're killing are children. Those are our children and how would we feel if our own children were getting killed? Back to John Kennedy; in his address at the American University, he said "Our goal is general and complete disarmament." And a place where we're dissolving these conflicts through peaceful means and not from war or nuclear confrontation. Well, that's our goal. Kennedy was pretty radical. That's why they killed him. I think that the nonviolent movements around the world which have overcome dictatorships and thrown military regimes out, the people have overcome their fear. They have found that there's something more important than staying alive in a slave state or in a dictatorship. Part of my hope and my belief is that if the world's people come to realize that wars are no longer in their interests, if they ever were, and that they are willing to put their lives on the line to create peace in the world and our governments refuse to listen to us, that's a signal that we need to have nonviolent people-powered revolutions like they've had in the Philippines and in Egypt and all over Eastern Europe where the people, as I say, overcome that fear and act to create governments of, by and for the people.

Blase: David Hartsough, you have in your writings what appears to be proof that nonviolent actions are more effective than military actions. Just last week I had Mother Agnes on from Syria and the venom against her is overwhelming because she is talking about reconciliation. She is talking about – look, don't tell me that this side killed that many and this side tortured that many – are we going to talk or not? And reconciliation is very difficult. We've seen it in South Africa and elsewhere and you have documented from various quotes that I've seen of yours, that the nonviolent approach is more effective. Could you explain that?

David H: Well, Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan have written a book called "Why Civil Resistance Works" and Erica was actually quite excited about guerrilla warfare as a way to bring about change when she started this study. And they studied 323 movements, violent

and nonviolent, to overthrow dictatorships to bring about major changes in society over the last 110 years and they found that the nonviolent movements were twice as likely to be successful and were also much more likely to end up in democratic societies and not just further civil war. For all the people who say that “if nonviolence doesn’t work then you use violence” that’s totally screwed up. That’s not what has happened in history. The US spent trillions of dollars trying to win the cold war over the Soviet Union and were unsuccessful. Nonviolent people-powered movements in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union itself overthrew the communist dictatorships in those countries. We saw in Serbia the US spent billions of dollars bombing Milosevic trying to get rid of him in Bosnia and Serbia and Kosovo – all of that was totally unsuccessful. But a nonviolent people-powered movement started by twelve students that had studied nonviolent action and nonviolent change built a movement that brought down Milosevic.

Blase: I think that your position is quite clear and I wanted to ask David Swanson about something and that is that the study of history. We have military industrial history in our newspapers and disastrously in our schools. Recently we saw the discussion of “Was President Reagan our greatest President or was it George Washington?” This kind of discussion, to me, is so sick and it’s led young people to go off and die in places where they weren’t wanted, to die as the enemy, because they really only studied triumphalism. They never studied history. Thank you, Howard Zinn. Any thoughts on that, David Swanson?

David S: Well, I agree that Howard Zinn had great advice and set a great example for historians and that our history books in many US schools, public and private not to mention the US corporate media, are disastrous. I think the lies that are told about wars are most damaging when they’re told after the wars. To take nothing away from the importance of exposing the lies before a war begins as we attempted with Afghanistan and Iraq and in large measures succeeded a couple of months back on these missiles into Syria that didn’t go. It’s the lies that are told after the fact that the Pentagon is putting millions of dollars right now into over a decade of trying to beautify the war in Vietnam – clean it up, glorify it, make it

palatable. We have a President who, despite the description that David Hartsough just gave, declared Korea a victory these many years later. We have a war on Libya that's declared a success the next day and then we're not supposed to look for the following days and weeks and months and years of catastrophe. Same with Iraq. And so it is absolutely critical that we have a little bit of a grasp of history so that we see the incredibly destructive behaviors that lead to a crisis and we don't have to deal with just this imbecilic question of what do you do when the crisis hits. When the primary answer is don't create it; and so that we understand that you don't have humanitarian wars in the past. Humanitarian wars are all imaginary future wars because thus far you can't point to a war that benefitted humanity in any way. Not if you pay attention to outside of what your television is telling you.

Blase: Well, David Swanson, we had an action against war that you've written about called the Kellogg-Briand Pact and its signing and what happened?

David S: Well, back after World War I those who admirably opposed it and those who swallowed the propaganda hook, line and sinker, were united. Everyone now wanted it to be the war that ended all wars and so there was an incredibly widespread mainstream respectable and funded peace movement in the United States, the like of which we couldn't imagine today, that attempted many approaches and finally succeeded in getting the State Department to lead the nations of the world, most of the big wealthy, armed nations of the world, in putting through a treaty to ban war. And very intentionally to ban war, period. Not aggressive war or unphilanthropic war, but war as an institution. To do away with it on a model of doing away with dueling where you didn't keep defensive dueling but you said that dueling is a barbaric way to settle disputes among individuals. So is war among states. We're going to do away with it. Well, at the same time, during the twenties, thirties, early forties, you have all the nations arming themselves to the teeth. You have this vengeance being wreaked on the people of Germany, not just its war makers. You have the funding flowing from Wall Street into the fascist governments on the rise. You have nations doing everything wrong except for passing this treaty. And so, of course, this treaty was not

enough. But following World War II, they took the Kellogg-Briand Pact and for the first time in the history of the world, prosecuted war making. And they perverted it and prosecuted only one side of the war making. Nonetheless, they did it. And that, I think, in large part, together with the existence of nuclear weapons and various other factors, has resulted in there never yet being a World War III. Instead we have limited ourselves to wars on poor nations and among poor nations. So the question is now, how can we get back to the understanding that our great-grandparents had of the progress toward eliminating war entirely? How can we make use of this law that's still on the books that we choose to simply ignore the way Alberto Gonzales told George W Bush that the Geneva Conventions had been rendered quaint. Well, across the spectrum of lawyers from liberal to conservative, they'll all tell you the Kellogg-Briand Pact has been rendered quaint. But it's still on the books. How do we use it? How do we get the poor nations that aren't making war to use it? Or create a new one? I don't think the treaty is a big part of the solution in the movement we're trying to spark here but I think it's one tool and I think there are some lessons from the 1920's when that treaty was successfully created that we can learn from.

Blase: David Hartsough, you have a nonprofit. I have a nonprofit. I'm sure David Swanson has a nonprofit. Suppose defense spending was nonprofit. Suppose oil was nonprofit. Suppose medical care was nonprofit. Suppose education was nonprofit. Do you think we might improve a little bit by removing profit? Because you know the DOW is up, the DOW is up, the DOW is up! Why? Because we might attack Syria. We might attack Iran. War and profit go together. Wall Street is War Street. How do we take the profit out of this?

David H: Well, I think if we could take the profit out of war, I think that would be dealing with one of the major causes of war. My own feeling is probably over 99% of the people of the world could benefit by ending war. I think the people who are making billions from war unfortunately are not thinking very much about either their children or future generations. And that's part of our job is to convince them and/or to build a movement that is going to force the governments to listen to the people instead of the war makers.

Blase: Well, David Hartsough, you are the co-founder of [Nonviolent Peaceforce](#). This is not a fantasy. This is a peaceforce in operation throughout the world. Would you care to comment on this most unusual organization?

David H: Well, Gandhi, seventy or so years ago, proposed Satyagraha, a nonviolent army where people could be trained as nonviolence soldiers, not in killing people but in trying to help prevent conflicts and protect civilians. So, starting in 2002, we started what we call a Nonviolent Peaceforce which now has hundreds of trained nonviolent peacemakers who are going into conflict areas to help protect human rights workers, peace workers, people working for a people resolution of conflict, and civilian populations that get caught in the middle of those war zones. And we have in the Philippines for instance, been invited both by the government and by the Muslim Islamic Liberation Front to be there and to help monitor the ceasefire.

Blase: We know how much that means to be present where people are being oppressed. We saw it all through Central America for at least ten years. Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras – the presence of an international peace force is so powerful. People all over the world are so friendly when you don't arrive with a weapon.

David H: I was in Iran a couple of years ago and a man, when he found out I was American said, "Oh, welcome to Iran. We'd like thousands of your people to come, but don't bring your guns."

Blase: Of course, that's the whole point. And David Swanson, you are the Secretary of Peace in the Green Shadow Cabinet. Aren't you ashamed of yourself?

David S: I'm not exactly sure what I should be ashamed of but I think that, just as the Nonviolent Peaceforce does good work and sets an example that there is an alternative to war – you don't need war as an answer to every problem. There is a better tool to use.

We've set up, I and dozens of others have set up, this shadow cabinet of someone to run the Justice Department who believes in justice, someone to run the State Department who is not a servant of war. In my position, I'm not an alternative to anyone because there's not a Secretary of Peace. We don't have one. I'm not sure we'd need one if we had a Secretary of Defense who actually cared about defense and a Secretary of State who wasn't a marketing firm for weapons companies, maybe we wouldn't need one. But I think we would benefit, regardless, if we had a Secretary of Peace and a Department of Peace because we don't put energy and resources into peaceful opportunities. We dump a trillion dollars a year, much of it into planning possible war scenarios, gaming them out, testing weapons for them, and as you move down that path, the momentum builds for war and no one has considered the possible alternatives that don't include war. It's missing in Washington, DC.

Blase: Well, I'm glad you're doing that and David Hartsough, we have so many things going on here but I want to talk for a moment about the incredible threat of a nuclear conflict. I feel it's more dangerous now than it's ever been and here we are, ready to attack a country that may have none or possibly developing, allegedly, a nuclear weapon. We have tens of thousands and other nations have them. I'm worried, David Hartsough, that the biggest threat of nuclear war is from the United States and Israel and that is my concern at this time. I think that we could destroy this beautiful planet. Any thoughts on that?

David H: Well, I think Kennedy thought back in 1962 that if he pushed the button and gave the order to start a nuclear attack on Cuba and the Soviet Union, that could have been the end of the human race. And I think it's only gotten worse and it's a terrible double standard. We say to Iran and the rest of the world, "We have a perfect right to have as many nuclear weapons as we want and develop a whole new generation of nuclear weapons but if you even think about it, we're going to attack you and we will use any means necessary." Most Americans don't know the history of Iran. Iran has not attacked any country in over two hundred years. Who are we, and there's a move in Congress right now to say, "Let's not even negotiate. Let's just attack." Israel's preparing for an attack. What has gotten into us?

It's like a person – the only tool they have is a hammer so they're always looking for a nail to hit. If we had a Secretary of Peace, if we were putting our resources into how we can resolve conflicts peacefully, how can we find solutions that will meet everybody's needs, so we not only kill the people in that country right now, but so that we don't sow the seeds of conflict for generations to come. We have to change our whole mindset from "How do we rule the world and force people to do what we want them to do?" to "How do we build a world that is just and peaceful and meet the needs of all the people in the world?"

Blase: I think we have developed a sadistic culture from the top, not in our people. We think of our relatives and our friends and we think of people who are friendly, who are compassionate, but in terms of governance I see sadistic behavior of our people in prison – 25% of the prisoners of the world are here. I see sadistic behavior in the lack of healthcare delivery and the lack of dentistry, but maybe half the people in our country have never even seen a dentist. I see sadistic behavior in the inability to make education a right and to follow the magnificent document called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which remains a goal for the entire world so I see too much sadism and today, David Swanson, I see that you are calling on Congress to make massive cuts in runaway military spending and you're including groups of peace, human service, economic and environmental justice organizations, food sovereignty, green energy groups, grassroots community organizations – all of these groups have had an impact and I do think the Occupy movement elected the new mayor of New York. So you're getting somewhere with this and you're asking Congress to focus on critical social needs including food stamps – we have to starve the children in order to continue our wars, social security, all of this - and that call is coming from you. Is that not correct, David Swanson?

David S: Well, there's no question that we have to cut the military spending. We have to cut the creation of the multibillionaires as well, and the two go together. War is a means of shifting wealth upward and we're not going to survive either of these trends. It's about survival, not just utopianism here. Either we continue the proliferation and the investment

in militarism and we see war as the tool to use in the coming climate crisis or we move the money that's badly needed to protect the climate and to invest in our quality of life for which we do not need the wars. That we can take energy from the sun and the wind. We do not need wars in order to have a high quality of life. And there's no question that the government is miles behind the people and it is corrupted by money and corrupted by our broken communication system, apart from great stations like this one. But the people are not where we need them to be, either. And people will tell you they're for peace but they're not against wars, they're not against the troops, they're not against their neighbor who's in the Army. They're not against attacking another nation. They're going to be against it in a year and a half when they figure out that it was a bad idea and so when we got to say no to the missiles in Syria, that was a remarkable accomplishment and a large part the result of educational and organizing work of a decade or more. But we have a majority in this country who will tell you that war cannot be ended, that will tell you that war should not be ended, will tell you war is not and should not be illegal, that we should have less of them, that we should only have the good ones, that we shouldn't spend so much money on them, but that we have to keep the institution around and that's where we need the educational work and outreach to all kinds of constituencies to build the popular awareness and motivation and activism and confidence in the possibility of success and then we've got to take it to the government and move the government to where it needs to be.

Blase: Well David, conventional wisdom is a lie like war is a lie. 1850 everybody would be saying, "You know, slavery is really a terrible thing but you must realize this is our economic system and there are many unfortunate things in the economy and this is one of them and we must continue to have slavery." Conventional wisdom is a drag and I don't know of anyone who is more opposed to conventional wisdom than the wonderful words of Jesus and his statement on the Sermon on the Mount. To focus our attention on the needs of the poor, to have a preferential option would turn the whole world upside down. If we looked not first at the rich and the famous but we looked at the poor. Just as you said, David

Hartsough, if you look at the children first, then you can change. What do you think about that, David Hartsough?

David H: Well, I would invite all the listeners to this program to really think about if they had one trillion dollars to spend, how would you spend it? Would you spend it on keeping military bases in over a hundred countries all over the world? Would you spend it on more nuclear weapons? Would you spend it for fighting more wars in the Middle East? Or would you put it into more funds for schools for our children, and for libraries, and for job creation in this country, rebuilding the infrastructure, for funding a total transition to a renewable energy society so we don't "need" wars to keep our cars going.

Blase: The manipulation of fear is the essence of corrupt politics. Here's Chomsky today saying, "America is a terrified country" and we've been kept terrified by a cold war that was unnecessary, by hot wars that were unnecessary, by constant threats – as someone said recently, "The only people who are listening to us today are the National Security Agency people!" No one else cares what we want except the NSA, so we're a terrified country and perfect love casts out fear, but fear is so paralyzing to people. Afraid to think and afraid to realize that the nation state is so outdated. It's as outdated as the city states of old. None of our problems can be solved by one little nation even like ours having 4% of the world's people. Can we save the ocean? Can we save the air? Everything now has to be international, thinking internationally, one race, one family, one people on the earth and I think that's where we have to go. David Hartsough, could you give us a website that you'd like our listeners to pay attention to?

David H: Well, there's a bunch of them. There's Nonviolent Peaceforce, the American Friends Service Committee and Shared Security. People are saying that we can no longer get security for just one nation. We need to be thinking about shared security for all people on the planet. There is David Swanson's website. There are lots of them.

Blase: Well, there certainly are. And how about you, David Swanson? Would you like to give us a website?

David S: Well, I blog at davidswanson.org and warisacrime.org and I work for an online activist group with some colleagues out in your part of the country called RootsAction.org.

Blase: Those are wonderful, wonderful sources and we have the privilege of using them all the time and we're so pleased with what the movement for peace is doing. We've all been on the road quite a bit and I'm accustomed to being a pariah when I speak, but now we're finding out something very strange. People are agreeing with us. Do you think, David Swanson, that there is a realignment taking place? Not a change in party but a change in consciousness?

David S: I think on the question of war there is. It's not as much as we would like it to be but it's growing and it's building. In some ways it's twisted and limited. People didn't want to bomb Syria because the Syrians aren't worth the effort and we don't owe them that much and imagine that the Iraqis are grateful we destroyed Iraq and so forth. But between the misinformed and the self-interested opposition to war and the better-informed and generous opposition to war and all sorts of varieties, we are building a strong majority with a willingness to act and a growing awareness that we can act. Of course, they don't ask us about the drone strikes but when they did ask us about those missiles into Syria, everybody from Rush Limbaugh to the Pope stood up and said "No" and they listened. And the fact that they listened and the fact that the drone strikes are diminishing and the fact that the money for the Pentagon is going down ever so slightly and the sky isn't falling, proving that it can go down more... these are the sorts of steps people need. People need to see successes. They are so success-dependent but they can build courage out of that and out of solidarity and working together and out of successes even from the past. There's a great author out in the Bay area, Adam Hochschild who has a book called "Bury the Chains" about how people in

Great Britain ended the slave trade. It was very, very similar to what we need to do right now in the heart of the war machine in ending this institution of our time.

Blase: We were so happy to see the House of Commons come out against attacking Syria. They've approved every war that anyone could imagine for centuries. This was truly amazing and a great step forward so we do have things that we can be quite happy about at this time. But we must not continue to repeat history. The military approach basically in our history and perhaps in the history of the world is based on the fascist concept of "might makes right." That's what military thinking is. Do what we want or we will kill you. And that is not self-defense. That is not protecting oneself from the aggressor. That is aggression. One of Howard Zinn's last talks, and he'd been on this program so many times, was about three holy wars, and he spoke about the Revolutionary War and the Civil War and World War II and he made it clear that none of them had to happen. It didn't have to happen. You study them because they did happen but after you study them, if you have an intelligent teacher, you spend the rest of the semester talking about how could that war have been avoided. That's the only way to study it and when are we going to start that in our schools, David Swanson?

David S: Well, I certainly encourage it every time I speak by skype or in person with a college class or a high school class or a peace and justice group. That is the line of reasoning I try to get people to take. I try to explain to them how distant Hitler is in the past. We excused Thomas Jefferson's slavery because that was what was done then. Well, war is what was done in the 1940's. You can excuse Franklin Roosevelt's war making but it's not needed anymore. We've learned so much since and I try to get people to look at what was done in the 20's and 30's to create Hitler and to create World War II, in fact not to end World War I. Rather than this obsession with what do you do in that moment to which, even then, the answer that common sense and the history books teach us is wrong. But we need that broader view of history so that we can see the blowback that we're experiencing now for the secret CIA operations and overthrows of the past half century is nothing compared to the blowback we're going to be seeing in the coming decades from what we imagine is the cheap

and easy form of warfare known as drones. If we don't have history we don't know that there are consequences. We don't know that actions that look meaningless or easy or benevolent have horrible consequences that some people can foresee. So there is no question that if we had a Department of History and a Secretary of History and historians as advisors to officials in Washington and they were listened to, we wouldn't be making the kind of mistakes we are.

Blase: David Hartsough, we are in a terrible position because we see a classic obstructionism coming from the party, the GOP, the Republican party, and then we abhor that because frequently we suspect racism and just sheer hatred. And then on the other hand, we have to observe our President signing kill lists every week and even apparently, implying that he was a pretty good killer. I think he said that the other day. How do you deal with this kind of contradiction?

David H: Well, I think we need to say no to both of these political parties which are really war parties and are corporate-supported parties and support parties that will really represent what we believe in such as the Green Party. I think we need to withdraw our support from the system. That means we don't go and volunteer to be a part of their wars. We inform and educate other people so that they don't get lied into going into their wars. We refuse to pay 50% of our federal taxes which goes for wars and for killing people. We withdraw our cooperation from listening and believing the lies which are told us over and over and over again. And then we work actively to help support the movement that David and I are trying to jumpstart right now which is a global movement to end all wars. This will not happen without people around the world saying, "Yes, we're going to join this movement. We can't remain silent." Remaining silent leaves the power to the power holders and they're screwing us up and they're bankrupting us and they're making us ever less secure. So it's time for the people of the United States and the people of the world to say "We're going to create a different future."

Blase: Amen. And David Swanson, do you have a final thought for us?

David S: I think we just have to remember that every movement that has changed things significantly for the better was denounced as, among other things, impossible, right up until it was done. And there is no question from the historical record that war has been eliminated from cultures and societies, it's been sporadic. It has only existed for a fraction of the time our species has existed. It's not in our genes. It's not in our DNA. It pre-dates capitalism and it can end while capitalism goes on, not that it necessarily should. But we have it well within our power to do away with the entire institution of warfare and be better off as a result. And we will do it if a fraction of us that understand that get together and do a little work.

Blase: David Swanson and David Hartsough, two great leaders internationally for peace. I want to thank you for being with us today.