



MOTION REGARDING A POLICY ON HARMFUL MILITARY TECHNOLOGY 2021-01-28

Submitted for: 2021-01-28

Submitted to:	SSMU Legislative Council	Document no.:	LEG-PUB-MOT-2021-01-28-001 (to be assigned by Steering)
Moved by:	Ayo Ogunremi <i>Vice-President (External Affairs)</i>	Current Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> FOR APPROVAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> POSTPONED <input type="checkbox"/> COMMITTED <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPROVED
Seconded by:	Darshan Daryanani <i>Senate Caucus Representative</i>		

Issue

This motion seeks to adopt a policy on harmful military research, harmful military technology, and the military-industrial complex, in order to elaborate upon, and establish concrete directives with respect to, the SSMU's commitment to a campus free from harmful military technology.

Background and Rationale

The Policy on a Campus Free from Harmful Military Technology expired in April 2020. While an important step for advocacy on transparent and ethical research at McGill, it was less than 2 pages long, and included neither a definition of harmful military technology nor specific mandates and reporting mechanisms. Nonetheless, it served as a basis for some of the SSMU's positions on research, which affirm that the ongoing on-campus development of military technology intended to inflict harm on people is immoral and that the University must adopt higher standards of transparency with regard to the sponsors and intended applications of research contracts.

As a result of the expiration of the Policy on a Campus Free from Harmful Military Technology, the importance of transparency and ethics in research, and the need to establish actionable mandates for SSMU representatives to undertake in this regard, the former Policy has been transformed into the new Policy on Harmful Military Technology, appended to this motion. This policy concretely commits SSMU representatives, in particular the SSMU Executives, to engage in meaningful advocacy on the problems of harmful



military research, harmful military technology, and the military-industrial complex.

Alignment with Mission

First and foremost, the Policy on Harmful Military Technology aligns with and expands upon the SSMU's position on research, as outlined in the Positions Book. More generally, it aligns with the SSMU's commitment to showing leadership on matters of human rights, social justice, and environmental protection by taking a stance on harmful military technology. Finally, the Policy treats the topic of harmful military research and technology in a manner consistent with the Equity Policy, the Sustainability Policy, and the Indigenous Solidarity Policy.

Consultations Completed

This motion and the Policy appended to it were drafted in consultation with several relevant stakeholders, including the Equity Commissioners, the Sustainability Commissioner, the Engineering Representatives to Council, the Science Representatives to Council, the Office of the Vice-President (University Affairs), the Office of the President, and Students for Peace and Disarmament.

Risk Factors and Resource Implications

Adopting the Policy appended to this motion would convey a strong message to universities, student associations, and their related organisations that the SSMU takes seriously the problem of harmful military research on its campus.

The risk of limiting research opportunities by advocating for the cessation of harmful military research is anticipated and addressed by the "Framework" section of the Policy, which articulates a framework of solidarity, anti-oppression, and a just transition towards alternative research opportunities for students.

Lastly, this position would enable the Campaigns department of the office of the Vice-President (External Affairs) to support student-led campaigns that advocate for a just transition away from the military-industrial complex. This has such resource implications as would be needed to carry out popular education and awareness-raising activities.



Sustainability Considerations

At the heart of this motion is a concern for sustainability, of a social, economic, and environmental kind. With respect to social sustainability, this policy recognises the profound interactions between social marginalisation, oppression, and the military-industrial complex, and positions the SSMU firmly against structures that perpetuate these harms.

Further, this position contributes to economic sustainability by recognising the need for a just transition away from the military-industrial complex, which would call upon the SSMU to attend to the impact that disarmament would have on students involved in fields implicated in the research and development of harmful military technology, as well as the communities who are economically reliant on the military-industrial complex.

Finally, with respect to environmental sustainability, this motion recognises the extraordinary damage to the environment of harmful military technology, especially nuclear weapons, and would concretely position the SSMU against them.

Impact of Decision and Next Steps

If passed, the new Policy on Harmful Military Technology will immediately become a policy of the Society and will expire in May 2026. The offices of the Vice-Presidents (External Affairs) and (University Affairs) would receive extensive mandates to advocate for a just transition away from the presence of harmful military research at McGill and the military-industrial complex more generally.

If this motion fails, the Legislative Council will have defaulted on the SSMU's established position on research, adopted by the Legislative Council in Winter 2020, setting a concerning precedent for SSMU governance.

Motion or Resolution for Approval

Be it resolved that the Legislative Council adopt the SSMU Policy on Harmful Military Technology, as provided in Appendix A;

Be it further resolved, that the Legislative Council reaffirm its support for a campus free from harmful military technology;

Be it lastly resolved, that this Policy expires on May 1, 2026.



Results of the Vote

In favour	(22)
Opposed	(7)
Abstain	(2)

2021-02-25

In favour	(22)
Opposed	(7)
Abstain	(2)

2021-03-11

In favour	(15)
Opposed	(7)
Abstain	(5)

APPROVED



Appendix A : Policy on Harmful Military Technology

Policy on Harmful Military Technology

1. Scope

This Policy will apply to all individuals and bodies involved in Society decision-making processes for the duration of their formal involvement with the Society, including but not limited to Officers, Directors, Senators, Councillors, Committees, Committee Members, Clubs, Services, and Staff. It will direct advocacy on issues relating to harmful military technology, including but not limited to that within McGill University, the City of Montréal, the Province of Québec, and Canada.

2. Definitions

2.1. Harmful military technology: harmful military technology is any technology produced for the purpose of conducting military activity that contributes to harm against individuals, groups, or natural environments. Harmful military technology is not limited to technologies directly related to weaponry, but includes all military technologies whose purpose is to carry out or enhance the effectiveness of causing physical harm, psychological harm, marginalisation, or insecurity, whether in the immediate or long term. Non-harmful military technology, in contrast, involves technologies used by the military for rehabilitation or peacebuilding purposes, such as medical technologies that alleviate medical conditions of military personnel, or technologies that enhance peaceful negotiations simulations.¹

2.2. Harmful military research: harmful military research is the systematic investigation of scientific knowledge with the purpose of developing or improving harmful military technologies.

2.3. Military-industrial complex: The military-industrial complex is the network of individuals and institutions involved in the development, production, sale, purchase, and use of harmful military technology. It involves the companies, organisations, and government departments that fund harmful military research; the research institutions, research groups, and individual researchers that conduct harmful military research; the companies, organisations, and government departments that

¹ This definition of harmful military technology is an original definition developed by members of Students for Peace and Disarmament in consultation with scholarly sources. It was designed to be particularly applicable to manifestations of the military-industrial complex that may be overlooked in the academic context.



manufacture and sell harmful military technology; and the organisations that purchase and employ harmful military technology.²

2.4. Militarism: The term militarism includes all efforts, ideas, and resources that contribute to the creation, organisation, and preparation of military forces, as well as the warfare that takes place as a result of such systems. Militarism is not limited to warfare itself; it is imbued within economic activities, social hierarchies, and national identity.³

2.5. Disarmament: Disarmament refers to a range of actions taken by an organisation to reduce its quantity of or capacity to obtain harmful military technology, or to reduce its involvement in the military-industrial complex.⁴

2.5.1. Nuclear disarmament: Nuclear disarmament refers specifically to the actions taken by an organisation to reduce its quantity of or capacity to obtain harmful nuclear military technology. Such actions include the cessation of constructing new nuclear weapons construction, the dismantling of existing nuclear weapons currently in operation, and the refusal to contribute to the development of nuclear arsenals, whether through by the extraction, enrichment, and sale, enrichment, or extraction of uranium for that purpose.⁵

2.5.2. Divestment: Divestment refers to the withdrawal of an organisation's investments from another organisation or group of organisations. Divestment includes the selling of stocks in a company or industry and the refusal to conclude new loan agreements with a company or in an industry.⁶ Divestment campaigns seek to challenge the social license to operate of a given organisation or group of organisations, such as the weapons manufacturing industry, galvanising social pressure to force the industry to adapt to more socially sustainable practices, which may include dissolving entirely.

3. Context

3.1. McGill and the Military-Industrial Complex

The SSMU recognises that McGill University has a long history of involvement in the military-industrial complex. The Shock Wave Physics Group (SWPG) is McGill's longest standing military-funded

² For more, see James Ledbetter, *Unwarranted influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the military-industrial complex* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), and William D. Hartung, *Prophets of war: Lockheed Martin and the making of the military-industrial complex* (New York: Nation Books, 2012).

³ Colleen Burke, "[Women and Militarism](#)," *Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*.

⁴ For more context, see "[Military Industrial Complex](#)," *Reaching Critical Will*.

⁵ For more context, see the [Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons](#), New York, 7 July 2017, *United Nations Treaty Series*.

⁶ For more context and an example, see the [Divest from the War Machine](#) campaign.



laboratory, whose basic principle is to study the sharp changes of pressure in air resulting in and from explosions. The SWPG is funded by Defence Research and Development Canada, the Canadian Department of National Defence⁷, and the US Department of Defense⁸, among others. Another lab, the Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) lab, specialises in the development of complex 3D modelling software for use by the aerospace industry and arms manufacturers.⁹ Historically, the CFD lab has collaborated with Aeronautical University for drone development and online drone simulations, and has been funded by CAE (formerly Canadian Aviation Electronics), Bombardier, Lockheed Martin, and Bell Helicopter.¹⁰

Funding from military industries is not benign; rather, such funding severely affects the uses of scientific research. For example, thermobaric explosives (also known as Fuel-Air Explosives) developed by military manufacturing companies¹¹ using research conducted in the SWPG have been used¹² in the occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as in the Syrian Wars.¹³ Further, cooperation between universities and the military-industrial complex compromises transparency in research applications and processes. In 2001, for example, an agreement between Bombardier and McGill University granted Bombardier the right to veto any application of the CFD lab's research which might work against their corporate interests.¹⁴

The Society recognises and affirms the importance of student activism against harmful military technology. In 1988, decades of student-led advocacy opposing harmful military research on campus

⁷ Igor Sadikov, "McGill profs signing military research contracts via private companies," *The McGill Daily* (Montreal, QC), February 16, 2015.

⁸ "Activity Report," Document 14, Page 3 of Document 64 of the documents released by McGill after an Access To Information Request was filed in 2015. For more detail, see the primary sources on the Students for Peace and Disarmament [webpage](#).

⁹ "McGill CFD Laboratory."

¹⁰ "Application for a Grant" of the Computational Fluid Dynamics lab. Document 14 of 147 documents released by McGill after an Access To Information request was filed in 2015. For more detail, see the primary sources on the Students for Peace and Disarmament [webpage](#).

¹¹ "Activity Report" of the Shock Wave Physics Group. Document 14 of the 147 documents released by McGill after an Access To Information Request was filed in 2015. For more detail, see the primary sources on the Students for Peace and Disarmament [webpage](#).

¹² For more information on the context on the sale of FAEs to various governments prior to use, see "Hellfire thermobaric warhead approved for production," *Lockheed Martin*, 23 August, 2005; "U.S. Army Awards contract to Lockheed Martin for Hellfire missiles," *Army Recognition*, July 23, 2020. For more context on how FAEs may be used by various actors in conflict, see Nicholas Marsh, "Two Sides of the Same Coin? The Legal and Illegal Trade in Small Arms," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 9, no. 1 (2002): 217-28.

¹³ For context on the use of FAEs in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, see William Grant-Brook and Verity Hubbard, "The impact of explosive weapons on children in Syria," *ReliefWeb*, 16 October, 2020; "Mother of all bombs: How powerful is US mega-weapon?" *BBC News*, April 13, 2017; "Activity Report" of the Shock Wave Physics Group. Document 14 of the 147 documents released by McGill after an Access To Information Request was filed in 2015. For more detail, see the primary sources on the Students for Peace and Disarmament [webpage](#).

¹⁴ "University Research Agreement" between Bombardier, Inc. & McGill University, May 22 2001. Documents 16-18 of the 147 documents released by McGill after an Access To Information Request was filed in 2015. For more detail, see the primary sources on the Students for Peace and Disarmament [webpage](#).



culminated in the implementation of regulations on military-funded research being passed through the McGill Senate.¹⁵ McGill was the first U15 university to implement regulations of this nature; other universities around the world have been successful in passing similar policies since.¹⁶ In 2009, the 1988 policy was rescinded in order to “align with [other] Canadian universities” who did not have similar policies in place. An anonymity clause was added, allowing funding sources to remain hidden, thereby increasing opacity in McGill’s connections to the military-industrial complex.¹⁷ This was in spite of strong opposition from SSMU and Post-Graduate Student Society (PGSS) executives, student senators, and student groups. In recent years, student activism led to SSMU adopting a Policy on a Campus Free from Harmful Military Technology, which lasted from 2015 to 2020. Student activism challenged McGill legally, resulting in the eventual release to students of about 6,500 pages of information regarding McGill’s relationship to military industries.¹⁸

3.2. Inequities in the Military-Industrial Complex

The SSMU recognises that settler governments in Canada have relied on harmful military technology to deprive Indigenous peoples from their lands, and to subjugate enslaved Black and Indigenous peoples.¹⁹ Further, the SSMU recognises that governments in Canada are involved in the funding, production, purchase, or sale of harmful military technology today.²⁰ This has had prolonged effects on many marginalised communities which continue to this day.

War has a disproportionate impact on Black people, Indigenous peoples, and People of Colour (BIPOC), in the Global South and Global North.²¹ Wars today are primarily fought in the Global South and, as a result, the military-industrial complex contributes to socio-political and economic destabilisation of these regions. In the Global North, BIPOC communities face higher rates of targeted recruitment into the military in what is informally known as the “school to military pipeline.”²²

¹⁵ Stephanie Law, “[McGill removes research regulation](#),” *The McGill Daily* (Montreal, QC), November 5, 2009.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ “[Minutes of meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, November 4, 2009 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room \(Room 232, Leacock Building\)](#),” *McGill University* (Montreal, QC), 2009.

¹⁸ Max Binks-Collier, “[McGill releases 600 pages of documents to Demilitarize McGill](#),” *The McGill Daily*, July 10, 2016; Benjamin Shingler, “[McGill University hands over documents to group seeking info about military Research](#),” *CBC News*, June 21, 2016.

¹⁹ Sean Byrne, “[The Legacy of Colonialism Among Indigenous Peoples: Destructive Outcomes, Healing and Reconciliatory Potentials](#),” *Peace Research* 49, No. 2 (2017).

²⁰ Nicole Bogart, “[Armenian-Canadians protest in Ottawa after officials decline comment on exports of military technology to Turkey](#),” *CTV News*, October 23, 2020.

²¹ Christine Hong, *A violent peace: Race, U.S. militarism, and cultures of democratization in Cold War Asia and the Pacific* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020).

²² Anderson, G. L. (2011). [The Military “Pipeline” from our Public Schools to Returning Veterans: What should be the Role of Public Schools?](#) *Power Play: A Journal of Educational Justice* 2, No. 2 (2011); Nick Martin, “[The Military Views Poor Kids as Fodder for Its Forever Wars](#),” *The New Republic*, January 7, 2020; Seth Kershner and Scott Harding, “[Militarism goes to school](#),” *Critical Military Studies* 5, No. 3 (2019).



The effects of the military-industrial complex disproportionately affect women and non-binary people, especially in the Global South. These effects are rarely considered by international actors when making military decisions. The military-industrial complex is fuelled by a neoliberal economic model that impedes social welfare and humanitarian support for poor nations.²³ This promotes dangerous labour practices, especially as the Global South struggles to compete where the international order values the Global North. Women perform the most labour in this sense (i.e. sweatshops, child care), bearing the burden of poverty caused by the male-dominated military-industrial complex. In addition, military bases in the Global South engage in economies of colonial control and exploitative female employment, particularly in sex work.²⁴

The military-industrial complex is also a major contributor to the climate crisis. The Canadian military is one of the largest national consumers²⁵ and emitters of fossil fuels,²⁶ and the US military is the largest consumer of petroleum in the world.²⁷ Further exacerbating this situation, emissions reports required of member countries of the United Nations exclude any fuels purchased and used overseas by a country's military, severely limiting the world's capacity to commit to serious, concerted action on the crisis of anthropogenic climate change.²⁸

3.3. Nuclear Weapons as a Case Study

Nuclear weapons are the clearest example of harmful military technology. They are the most destructive, inhumane, and indiscriminate weapons ever created, both on the scale of environmental devastation as well as their uniquely persistent radioactive fallout, which results in genetic damage.²⁹ Nuclear testing in Indigenous communities in Kazakhstan and the Marshall Islands throughout the 1970s resulted in 50% higher rates of cancers and genetic mutations³⁰ among the population, producing suffering that endures to this day. Further, a 2016 Columbia University study revealed that radiation levels in some of these Indigenous lands are almost double what is deemed safe for human habitation.³¹

²³ Pierre Guerlain, "[The Social and Economic Consequences of US Militarism](#)," *Revue LISA*, November 2013.

²⁴ Tamar Mayer, "Embodied Nationalism," in [Mapping women, making politics: Feminist perspectives on political geography](#), eds.: Lynn A Staeheli, Eleonore Kofman, and Linda Peake (New York: Routledge), 153-167.

²⁵ Joyce Nelson, "[The military's carbon footprint](#)," *Sentinel*, January 30, 2020.

²⁶ Tamara Lorincz, "[Tamara Lorincz: NATO is a threat to the climate](#)," *The Nova Scotia Advocate*, December 9, 2019.

²⁷ Union of Concerned Scientists, "[The US Military and Oil](#)," *Union of Concerned Scientists*, June 1, 2014; Neta C. Crawford, "[Pentagon Fuel Use, Climate Change and the Costs of War](#)," *Eisenhower Study Group on the Costs of War*, 13 November 2019.

²⁸ Tamara Lorincz, "[Burning and Bombing: Military Expenditures, Military Emissions and the Climate Emergency](#)," *Peace Magazine*, April 1 2020.

²⁹ "[Impact of Nuclear Weapons](#)," *International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons*; Alexandra Witze, "[How a small nuclear war would transform the entire planet](#)," *Nature*, March 16, 2020.

³⁰ Wudan Yan, "[The nuclear sins of the Soviet Union live on in Kazakhstan](#)," *Nature*, April 3, 2019.

³¹ Autumn S. Bordner et. al, "[Measurement of background gamma radiation in the northern Marshall Islands](#)," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, June 2016.



Less than one percent of the nuclear weapons in the world could disrupt the global climate and threaten as many as two billion people with starvation in a nuclear famine.³² This could precipitate a nuclear winter, destroying the essential ecosystems on which all life depends. Additionally, nuclear weapons manufacturing contributes to widespread depletion of important resources via deforestation, mining for fossil fuels and minerals, contamination of resources, air and water pollution, reduced arability of land and clean water supply, and soil erosion.³³ A large carbon footprint is produced by the overconsumption of resources for the production of war, including the production of greenhouse gases by transport and manufacturing facilities.³⁴

Whether or not they are detonated, nuclear weapons cause widespread harm to health and the environment.³⁵ Across the world, these impacts have often been felt most acutely by Indigenous peoples,³⁶ as in the case of the uranium mines on Dene Nation lands near Patterson Lake in Northern Saskatchewan.³⁷ In similar cases, radioactive tailings of the uranium mining process have contaminated the Indigenous lands they surround, jeopardising the health of Indigenous communities.^{38 39} In Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba, highly enriched uranium (HEU) is mined on Ashton, Janvier, and Dene Nation lands near the Clearwater River and Patterson Lake to be used almost exclusively for nuclear weapons production. Uranium mining often leaks radiation into the surrounding Indigenous lands, as in the case of Patterson Lake. Radiation is transferred into Indigenous communities via the consumption of animals exposed to contaminated land and waters. These instances of environmental racism⁴⁰ represent a repeated pattern of nuclear weapons storage, testing, and development having a disproportionate impact on the health and ecosystems of Indigenous communities.

These catastrophic humanitarian and environmental consequences span decades and cross generations; they breed fear and mistrust among nations; they divert public funds from healthcare, education, disaster relief, and other vital services due to their cost of production, maintenance, and

³² ["Impact of Nuclear Weapons," International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons](#); Alexandra Witze, ["How a small nuclear war would transform the entire planet," Nature](#), March 16, 2020.

³³ ["Nuclear weapons production," International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.](#)

³⁴ Charles Digges, ["Before the bombs go off: The environmental and health consequences of nuclear weapons production," Bellona](#), December 26, 2012.

³⁵ Gordon Edwards, ["Canada's Nuclear Industry and the Myth of the Peaceful Atom,"](#) in *Canada and the Nuclear Arms Race*. ed. Ernie Regehr and Simon Rosenblum (James Lorimer & Company, 1983).

³⁶ Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee, ["Whose Land is it Anyway? National Interest, Indigenous Stakeholders, and Colonial Discourse: The Case of the Jabiluka Uranium Mine,"](#) in *Organization and Environment* 13, no. 1 (2000); Bengt G. Karlsson, ["Nuclear lives: Uranium mining, Indigenous peoples, and development in India,"](#) *Economic and Political Weekly* 44, no. 34 (2009): 43-49.

³⁷ Michael Toledano, ["Indigenous Canadians are fighting the uranium mining industry,"](#) *Vice*, November 3, 2015; Jason Warick, ["Sask. First Nations rally behind Northern Community in Dispute with Uranium Company,"](#) *CBC News*, February 24, 2021.

³⁸ Carrie Arnold, ["Once Upon a Mine: The Legacy of Uranium on the Navajo Nation,"](#) *Environmental Health Perspective* 122, no. 2 (2014): A44-A49.

³⁹ [Hibakusha Interactive Map.](#) *International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War*, 2021.

⁴⁰ Robert D. Bullard, ["Environmental justice in the 21st century: Race still matters." Phylon](#) 49(3/4), 2001.



modernisation.⁴¹ Banning these cruel, immoral, and inhumane weapons was a critical step on the path to ridding the world of them. With the entry into force of the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons⁴² (TPNW) on January 22, 2021, making the development, testing, production, manufacturing, otherwise acquiring, possessing or stockpiling nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosives illegal for signatory nations under international law, the world took a critical step towards making a future without nuclear weapons a reality.

4. Framework

4.1. Principles for Advocacy: The Society will adopt a framework of justice-focused peace activism, in accordance with its values and based fundamentally on anti-oppression, as outlined in the Constitution, Equity Policy, and Sustainability Policy. The Society will refer to the following framework when organising around harmful military research:

4.1.1. Anti-oppression: The Society will organise initiatives around the recognition that harmful military research and the military-industrial complex disproportionately impact the most vulnerable groups in society. The Society will strive to ensure these voices are centred in its initiatives, and provide educational resources on the connections between oppression and the military-industrial complex.

4.1.2. Solidarity: The Society will act in meaningful solidarity by maintaining relationships with communities directly affected by the military-industrial complex, with a particular emphasis on Indigenous groups in accordance with the Indigenous Solidarity Policy.

4.2. Just Transition: The strong grip of the military-industrial complex over the private and public sector should not be an excuse to avoid addressing it. As such, the Society will advocate for a timely and equitable transition away from harmful military technology and towards transparent and ethical research on campus. This transition will be rooted in the knowledge that McGill students rely on University-based research opportunities to further their education and work experience. Thus, research that violates the principles of this policy should be replaced with alternative, equitable research opportunities to ensure students' continued access to this form of learning. Additionally, this transition will be rooted in the knowledge that the military-industrial complex has employed and sustained many Canadians for decades. As such, the transition towards disarmament must consider the complexity and entrenched nature of the military-industrial complex and account for the needs of communities economically reliant on militarism and the military-industrial complex.

⁴¹ "[Impact of Nuclear Weapons](#)". *International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons*.

⁴² [Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons](#), New York, 7 July 2017, *United Nations Treaty Series*.



5. University Advocacy

The Society will advocate for the cessation of harmful military research, the interests of harmful military technology organisations at McGill University, or any other connection to the military-industrial complex.

5.1. The Vice-President (University Affairs) will make use of Senate questions, resolutions, and other mechanisms to advocate for more ethical and transparent military research at McGill.

5.1.1. These standards will include the requirement that researchers disclose any interaction of their research with the military-industrial complex, including but not limited to the receipt of funding from organisations involved in the military-industrial complex or the applicability of their research to the development of harmful military technology. Further, these standards will require that research funded by organisations involved in the military-industrial complex explicitly name these organisations in its publication, so as to increase the transparency of military-funded research. Finally, as more information regarding harmful military research at McGill is obtained, an ethics review board or other mechanism of ethical, transparent evaluation must be developed in order to regulate military-funded research at McGill.

5.1.2. For greater certainty, the Vice-President (University Affairs) will advocate on behalf of students to the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) and the Academic Policy Committee and its subcommittees for the adoption of policies and mandates to the effect of s. 5.1.1.

5.1.3. In the interim, the Vice-President (University Affairs) and President will advocate for the revision of the Regulation on Conduct of Research with special focus given to the implementation of transparency and accountability measures for military research.

5.3. The Vice-President (University Affairs) and Vice-President (External Affairs) will support campus and community-based campaigns opposing the development of harmful military technology. This support will make use of the Society's institutional capacity and will include both resource allocations and logistical assistance.

5.3.1. The Vice-President (University Affairs) will advocate for the revision of the Operating Procedures Demonstrations Protests Occupations to exclude the use of police forces and prioritise principles of harm reduction and de-escalation.

5.3.2. In the interim, the Vice-President (University Affairs) will advocate on behalf of students to the Principal and Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) for the active exclusion of military and police forces from campus, including recruitment efforts.



5.3.3. Further, these Offices will support in the development and dissemination of popular educational resources on McGill University's connections to and involvement in the military-industrial complex. This will include support for a dedicated researcher within their portfolios, who will work closely with relevant student groups to examine McGill University's involvement in the military-industrial complex and military research.

5.4. The Vice-President (University Affairs) will advocate on behalf of students to the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) for increased research funding and paid internship opportunities in fields outlined above, with specific interest given to studies that contribute to a just transition towards disarmament. This advocacy is undertaken with the intention to outway research and internship opportunities lost as we transition away from military research.

6. External Advocacy

6.1. The Society, through the Office of the Vice-President (External Affairs), will collaborate with external organizations to protest the research, development, purchase, sale, or use of harmful military technology by municipal, provincial, and federal governments, and advocate for treaties, laws, and regulations that mandate a just transition towards disarmament.

6.1.1. In particular, the Office of the Vice-President (External Affairs) will collaborate with organizations to advocate the City of Montréal to support the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons by the Parliament of Canada, by committing to adopt the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) Cities Appeal, which call upon the city's country to adopt the treaty. This commitment would call upon Canada to adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.⁴³

6.2. The Vice-President (External Affairs) will advocate for the adoption of similar policies on harmful military research and technology at other student unions in Quebec and in Canada.

6.3. The Office of the Vice-President (External Affairs) will collaborate with external organizations to advocate for the adoption of more ethical and transparent standards for military research at research-related organisations, such as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities.

6.4. The Office of the Vice-President (External Affairs) will collaborate with university and external actors to develop more concrete directions for advocacy regarding harmful military technology at all levels of government.

⁴³ ["ICAN Cities Appeal," International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.](#)



7. Reporting and Review

7.1. At the end of each academic year, the Vice-President (University Affairs) and the Vice-President (External Affairs) will present a joint report on the status of the mandates outlined in this Policy to the public session of the SSMU Legislative Council.

APPROVED